

[« Prayer: The Ultimate Hypocrisy](#)[Creationism: An Insult to the Collective of Human Intelligence »](#)

Taking The Gloves Off...

When Diplomacy Fails, It's Time To Fight Using The Law

"We've made too many compromises already, too many retreats. They invade our space, and we fall back." - Jean Luc Picard

"...first you've got to get mad. You've got to say, 'I'm a HUMAN BEING, God damn it! My life has VALUE!' I want all of you to get up out of your chairs. I want you to get up right now and go to the window. Open it, and stick your head out, and yell, 'I'M AS MAD AS HELL, AND I'M NOT GOING TO TAKE THIS ANYMORE!'" - Howard Beale

The dictionary defines intolerance as lack of toleration, an unwillingness or refusal to tolerate or respect. Sometimes, though, it becomes quite necessary. Intolerance toward beliefs and doctrines that serve only to promote hatred, bigotry and discrimination should be lauded, as should extremist points of view toward the eradication of these beliefs and doctrines.

It should come as no surprise that the individuals who abide by fundamentalist Christian and radical Islamic doctrines would be the first to cry out that they are being persecuted when their dangerous, damaging and disingenuous beliefs come under attack. Most of these people lack the maturity and intelligence to act in a socially acceptable manner. Many of them are sociopaths and quite a good number of them are psychopaths. All of them are clearly delusional.

What should come as a surprise is just how many people stand in their court, offering support. There are frequent cries of "foul" when the more polemic amongst the atheist community make negative sweeping, generalized statements about fundamental Christianity and radical Islam. There are demands made for tolerance and respect for the religious beliefs of all people and that nobody has a right to condemn someone based solely on their religion. Those who spout these cries of foul and who call for tolerance toward these two very dangerous ideologies are speaking from ignorance.

Bigotry, discrimination, hatred, coercion, terrorism, slavery, misogyny and everything else that is part and parcel of fundamental Christianity and radical Islam should not be tolerated, and when any of these rear their ugly heads outside of the context of religion they are not. There are laws in the United States and many other nations that protect people from these things because they have been proven detrimental to societies. Add God into the picture and all of a sudden the perpetrator becomes the victim because religion seems to change the context of everything.

Hold up a Westboro Baptist Church style sign without being connected to a religion and you will likely be arrested, tried and convicted of a hate crime. Add God and it becomes an issue of tolerating a religious belief. Hold up a sign calling for the beating, torture or death of someone and you will likely be charged with any one of several crimes. Add God and it again becomes an issue of tolerating a religious belief.

There are even atheists who state that everyone should be tolerant of all individuals right to believe or disbelieve as they see fit. That we should all coexist. Along with these statements come the accusation that many within the Atheist movement are "just as bad" as the fundamentalist Christians and radical Muslims.

The fact is that fundamentalist Christians and radical Muslims are not interested in coexisting or getting along. They have no desire for peace. They do not want to sit down with us in diplomatic efforts to iron out our differences and come to an agreement on developing an integrated society.

They want us to die.

Their interpretation of the Bible and Koran are such that there is no other course of action but to kill the infidel, and if anyone believes otherwise they are only fooling themselves. It is not just in the best interests of atheists to be intolerant of fundamental Christianity and radical Islam, but it is also in the best interest of mainstream believers within these faiths, as well. Moderates and even Progressives who stand in support of extremists just because there is a claim to the same deity are not doing themselves any favors. Fundamental Christians make all Christians look bad and radical Muslims make all Muslims look bad.

The growing ranks of fundamental Christians and radical Muslims should be of concern to everyone who is not part of these two groups. Everyone. Again, bigotry, discrimination, hatred, coercion, terrorism, slavery, misogyny and everything else that is part and parcel of fundamental Christianity and radical Islam should not be tolerated and anyone who agrees with this needs to adopt extremist points of view that includes the intolerance of their very existence. The only reason these groups exist is because they are allowed to, and we, as a society, are allowing them to.

The atheist community gets angry when we read about the antics of idiotic, ignorant and imbecilic politicians and celebrities like Palin, Bachmann, Beck, Limbaugh, Pawlenty and Santorum. We post our thoughts on our social networks and our blogs and try to expose these creeps for exactly what they are. Most of the GOP, just about all of the Tea Party movement and even some Democrats and Independents should be ashamed of themselves for going out in public wearing the equivalent of an intellectual diaper. We criticize them for their rejection of science in

LINKS

[AA Affiliates](#)
[AA on Twitter!](#)
[AA State Directors](#)
[Alabama Atheist](#)
[Atheist Nexus](#)
[Bad Astronomy](#)
[Blasphemous Blogging](#)
[Camp Quest](#)
[Critical Eye Podcast](#)
[Friendly Atheist](#)
[JREF](#)
[Landover Baptist Church](#)
[NoGodBlog RSS Feed](#)
[Pharyngula \(PZ Myers\)](#)
[Snopes](#)
[Talk Origins Archive](#)

NoGodBlog Archives

Select Month

Recent Comments

[BLOCKED BY STBV]

protectionspecialties on You can't prove god doesn't exist! So there!

ken on What Does The Future Hold For Atheists?

Buckeyenonbeliever on What Does The Future Hold For Atheists?

favor of their fairy tales and write our letters and support our advocate organizations when our legal rights are abrogated.

But the underbelly of fundamentalist Christianity and radical Islam does not operate in the legal system. They don't respond to lawsuits, letters, amicus briefs or other grass-roots campaigns and they must, must, must be eradicated. As long as they are allowed to exist, we will continue to be inundated with accounts of buses, buildings, markets and abortion clinics being blown up, rape victims being murdered for adultery, wives being beaten (sometimes to death), airplanes being flown into buildings, people being tortured and sometimes beheaded for blasphemy, people being burned for witchcraft and sorcery and all the other horrific, inhumane and insane practices that are part of fundamental Christianity and Radical Islam.

If we don't take a stand and, as a society, insist that these doctrines and beliefs are treated just the same as they would be if religion were not part of the equation, we will become extinct not due to natural selection, but at the hands of those who believe that the supernatural has made the selection.

AI Stefanelli - Georgia State Director, American Atheists, Inc.

PS: To those of you who are coming here from *The Blaze*, which has accused me of calling for the eradication of living people, take note that I called for the eradication of the doctrines that are espoused by the fundamentalists and radical extremists. Also note that your death threats are being forwarded to the FBI. - AI

Tags: AMERICAN ATHEISTS, Bigotry, Christianity, Discrimination, Fundamentalist, Hatred, Intolerance, Islam, Politics, Religion

This entry was posted on Wednesday, September 14th, 2011 at 15:17 and is filed under Blog. You can follow any responses to this entry through the RSS 2.0 feed. You can leave a response, or trackback from your own site.

125 Responses to "Taking The Gloves Off..."

TTR63 says:

September 14, 2011 at 15:37



Very much appreciate your article AI. Very well thought out and perceptive. I agree that to be a quiet Atheist is tantamount to not being one at all. It is time we pool our individuality and produce an intellectual tidal wave to wash away the ignorant, the pseudo-religious, and the brainwashed.

[Log in to Reply](#)

jmcg1213 says:

September 17, 2011 at 20:48



When you consider that about 80% of the U.S. population considers itself Christian and less than 2%, atheist, I say let the tidal wave begin.
My hot toes could use a bit of moisture.

[Log in to Reply](#)

jvoigt79 says:

September 14, 2011 at 16:14



I have been trying to write this exact thing for a year and failed, repeatedly. Very well said, I agree with everything you said 110%! Cognitive Dissonance is the key - we have to confront their ignorance with facts, and do it loud and often. Keep up the good work!!!

[Log in to Reply](#)

jmcg1213 says:

September 17, 2011 at 20:58



You have tried and failed for years.
Well you failed again, failed to confront any perceived ignorance with a single fact.
What is it you feel needs to be said "loud and often"?
Cognitive dissonance seem to be your problem.

[Log in to Reply](#)

geoih says:

September 15, 2011 at 08:46



"The only reason these groups exist is because they are allowed to, and we, as a society, are allowing them

to.”

“They don’t respond to lawsuits, letters, amicus briefs or other grass-roots campaigns and they must, must, must be eradicated.”

When you become that which your are fighting, then what is the point? The end does not justify the means. If you can’t see the problem with ranting about who should be allowed to exist and eradication, then you’ve lost your perspective. You become no different than those you claim to be fighting.

This article is nothing more than a call for violence.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Al Stefanelli says:

September 15, 2011 at 08:49



It is most certainly NOT a call for violence. Not once did I ever suggest that we use weapons, violence or physical contact. Not once. Nor did I say we be “mean” to them. Nor is my article aimed at a majority of believers in the world of any one specific religion. The individuals that I am referring to, and that I was very careful to point out, are the fringe groups. The minority of the religious. The fundamentalist extremists who have no desire to talk with us, to open a dialog with the exchange of ideas.

What is so hard to understand that these people want us to die. They want us dead. They do not want to negotiate, they do not want to budge from their points of view, they do not care about what we think and they could care less about the things we hold to high value.

We need to be firm with them, we need to counter their activism with our own activism and make sure that we stay within the bounds of the law, and use the legal system to our advantage. We need to call them out on their doctrines of hate, bigotry and discrimination. We need to let them know that we are not going away, no matter how much they want us to.

I work very hard and with due diligence to create relationships between theists and atheists, including organizing “Freethought Awareness Day” events and getting involved in interfaith activities.

So, with all due respect as well, my position stands regarding the fundamental extremists.

[Log in to Reply](#)

geoih says:

September 15, 2011 at 13:43



Quote from Al Stefanelli: “The individuals that I am referring to, and that I was very careful to point out, are the fringe groups. The minority of the religious.”

You’re slicing it mighty fine there. Does a message of intolerance really need to explicitly call for violence? Does only implying it make it somehow better?

You can say you’re talking about ‘good’ religions, but when you’re preaching eradication, then I might think the fine distinction between a fringe group and a not-fringe group (whatever that means) could be lost.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Al Stefanelli says:

September 15, 2011 at 15:23



It’s intentionally and purposefully sliced fine, Geoih. They are a small group, but have a long reach. And how, exactly, did I imply violence when I specifically said,

“We need to be firm with them, we need to counter their activism with our own activism and make sure that we stay within the bounds of the law, and use the legal system to our advantage.”

As well, where did I state any religions was “good,” as you quoted. It is my opinion that ALL religion is poisonous to one degree or another. The fundamentalists and extremists are, by far, the most dangerous by virtue of their penchant for violence as a form of proselytizing.

Or, are you in favor of letting them continue on with their bombings, shootings, beatings and other forms of physical coercion?

[Log in to Reply](#)

Pixie5 says:

September 16, 2011 at 02:01



I am not an athiest but I do agree that many horrible acts of violence have been “justified” by those who use the name of God to control people and amass power. In my point of view this is a perversion of true spirituality. And after reading the Bible many times over I cannot ignore the fact that the old testament is full of hate and intolerance. The new testament is better but it is still there. Many Christians “excuse” the harshness of the old testament by saying that Jesus changed the need for such harsh measures. The famous example of Jesus preventing the stoning of an adulterous woman comes to mind. What they fail to explain is why a loving God would have instituted such a barbarous punishment in the first place! These are the same people who are horrified at the muslim extremists practice of “honor killings”! If they read the old testament they will find that in fact there is very little difference between the muslem extremist point of view and the biblical point of view which isn’t surprising since they both have the same roots.

When I say that I do not mean to imply that this is what Christians practice today. There has been a gradual evolution towards compassion and love and tolerance. The problem is that any wacko can pick up a Bible and find whatever he wants in there to justify his warped point of view. Plus, it isn't encouraging to me that the Bible ends with bloody warfare.

So I do agree with some of what you are saying but I do disagree with your assertion that all religions are poisonous. It is how they are practiced that is the problem. What about people like Mother Theresa, Ghandi, and Martin Luther King? Were their messages "poisonous"? Is it necessary to throw the baby out with the bathwater?

I am not trying to convert you at all but I would like to understand your reasoning behind the idea that religion should be abolished just because some people have used it to promote violence. I believe spirituality can and does promote peace and I do not confuse that with the dictators that use religion as a tool of war.

geoih says:

September 16, 2011 at 07:56



First, my quotes around the word good were single quotes ('good', not "good"). I was not trying to convey that you had said that, but that the word good can have multiple meanings.

You imply violence by using words like "eradicate" and "allowed to exist". Explain to me how you eradicate something without violence.

I have no problem recognizing that certain religious beliefs are inherently intolerant and potentially dangerous. There are many secular beliefs that are also inherently intolerant and potentially dangerous (the position you're advocating in your article, comes to mind). My question is, what makes secular intolerance somehow better than religious intolerance?

When you figure out how to slice that, let me know.

Al Stefanelli says:

September 16, 2011 at 07:59



If I used the word "eradicate" in the context of living, breathing human beings, you would be 100% correct. However, I used that word in conjunction with the dangerous and disingenuous doctrines that are held by these fringe groups. Completely different. As well, there are many forms of secular intolerance that are better than religious intolerance. Like being against the holocaust (for you Godwin fans), or slavery, or women's rights and any one of several other religiously inspired events in our timeline. I am advocating that the doctrines held by certain believers that call for the use of violence and murder in the proselytizing of their beliefs be eradicated. Period. End of story.

coopdetat says:

September 15, 2011 at 22:16



The difference between fundamentalist Christians and fundamentalist Islamists is that ONLY fundamentalist Islamists want you (and all "infidels", those that are not their flavor of fundamentalist Islamists) dead and they say so. The evidence about fundamentalist Christians is strikingly different. If you had ever actually met a fundamentalist Christian, you would know that they want everyone to become a fundamentalist Christian. They do not and have not ever advocated killing, or eradicating "unbelievers". Radical Islamists definitely want us dead. The same is simply not true about fundamentalist Christians.

Based upon your statements, it is clear that you want fundamentalist Christians dead: e.g., "fundamental Christianity ... should not be tolerated and anyone who agrees with this needs to adopt extremist points of view that includes the intolerance of their very existence"; "... and they must, must, must be eradicated."

If you do not want them dead, just exactly what alternative disposition do you propose in order to achieve the eradication of fundamentalist Christians or to express fully an intolerance of their very existence?

To be clear, I believe that your position is valid and justified when speaking of foreign Radical Islamists who have demonstrated their very real intention to eradicate us. If you ever find a U.S. citizen who claims to be a fundamentalist Christian (or Islamist) who promotes killing anyone, that person should be criminally charged, tried, convicted, and imprisoned. Eradication was Hitler's "final solution to the Jewish problem". I don't think you should go there.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Al Stefanelli says:

September 16, 2011 at 00:21



Coopdetat,

I am quite used to being taken out of context, it goes with the territory. I was very clear that I was referring to extremist doctrines, and not mainstream faith, and definitely not people. I was very clear that those of us who do not believe (infidels) are frequently targets. I was very clear that these radical groups are giving mainstream believers a bad name, and that they should also be speaking out against them.

Throughout my entire career as an activist, I have ALWAYS maintained the use of non-violent methods of activism and to remain, at all times, within the confines of the law. I have spoken out against violence so many times it makes my head spin.

The word “eradication” simply means to do away with, and doctrines that promote the murder of anyone for having no belief or a different belief need to be done away with.

Also, I think you may be misunderstanding my use of the word “Fundamentalist.” I am not referring to those who hold to the literal rendering of Adam and Eve, Creation, the Virgin Birth, etc. I am referring to those who believe that, according to the Old Testament, that unbelievers should be killed, or worse.

[Log in to Reply](#)

coopdetat says:

September 16, 2011 at 06:59



I challenge you to find anyone in american Christianity that believes that unbelievers should be killed, or worse. To say “they do not respond...” and “...they must must must be eradicated” in the same short sentence and then to insist that your meaning is clear that “they” means “fundamentalist Christians who want people killed according to Old Testament law” in its first use in the sentence and your second use of “they” means “the doctrines of such people” (which doctrines do not exist in any american practice) is to be anything but clear.

Most people, myself included, look at sentence structure to determine the writer’s meaning. Your explanation makes that practice useless and the meaning of your words subject to your own convoluted translations. It is hard to run from the inappropriate words you have used in this article and you look foolish trying to.

Trekienut says:

September 18, 2011 at 22:20



First of all coopdetat you are mistaken in your belief that there are no Christian Fundamentalist groups that call for the killing of non-believers. Al Stefaneli gave a perfect example of on in his article above: Westboro Baptist Church. Have you seen the film ‘Small Town Gay Bar’? I have, and as a gay man I can assure you with total, absolute certainty that they want me and every LGBTQ person on the face of this planet DEAD right this very moment. If given the chance they would exterminate every one of my community just as throughly as the Natzies did to both gays and Jews during the Holocaust.

[Log in to Reply](#)

jmcg1213 says:

September 17, 2011 at 21:04



If I wrote an article calling for the eradication of illegal immigrants, and I never suggested the use of a weapon, you’d be singing a much different tune. But isn’t that what hypocrisy is all about.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Trekienut says:

September 18, 2011 at 22:30



Not if you wrote about the eradication of illegal immigration and not the eradication of illegal immigrants. The distinction that Al is making is again lost to you here jmcg1213. He is not calling for the eradication of people. He is saying that their extremist views should not nor ever have had the protection of free speech and that members that espouse these extremist doctrines should be arrested for hate speech and nothing more. That society should shut them down and let them rant to un-hearing walls. A position that in my opinion is an interesting twist on how many faiths have their “Don’t hate the sinner, hate the sin” attitude toward gays. I’m not convinced it would work, but don’t ever mistake it as a call to violence.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Nathaniel says:

September 15, 2011 at 12:59



Education seems to be the biggest factor here. If these people were properly educated in science, philosophy, logic and critical thinking, it would be a lot more difficult for them to hold radical religious beliefs. Also, the more we learn about the Other, the less we consider them as the Other because we recognize our common connections.

The way science is heading, people are having to make a decision as to whether or not to have their children go to public school or to a private/home school where they can receive religious teaching. Because science is the biggest force of change in this world right now, people with insufficient scientific education will fall behind. The decision then becomes whether or not they raise their kids to be religious or successful, because it's going to get more difficult to do both (unless you're running a mega church or something).

Education is, by far, the best option for preventing future harm. The others all involve causing harm (threats and restraint). Education is the way to go. Unfortunately, our educational system is being undermined across every slice of government. If it's not the little guys trying to introduce intelligent design, it's the big guys cutting the funding. Not to mention the obvious preferential treatment of athletes over academics and the rampant anti-intellectual streak in this country. Right now, we've got people who are proud to be idiots. We've got people who hate intellectuals simply because they're so smart. We've got to stop the war on the intellect and fix our educational system or the religious nuts will just keep spreading.

[Log in to Reply](#)

geoih says:

September 15, 2011 at 13:56



Quote from Nathaniel: "If these people were properly educated in science, philosophy, logic and critical thinking, ..."

Will you be the one dictating what is a proper education? Will you be expecting the state to enforce this proper education on people who don't agree with it with their own tax dollars?

Do you really think you are going to change people who might be idiots, to not be idiots by forcing them or their children to get your proper education? Is it really that hard to understand why some people are not attracted to this sort of intellectual thinking?

[Log in to Reply](#)

Al Stefanelli says:

September 15, 2011 at 15:29



Geoih,

The people who dictate what a proper education is should not be religious people. Period. And yes, the state should pay for it with tax revenue and should enforce truancy laws when they are broken. I also reason that any parent who desires to home-school their kids needs to have the same qualifications that are expected of primary and college level teachers. This will go along way from idiots reproducing more idiots, as the best way to combat idiocy is through education.

The best way to combat violence, including threats, is to remove the perpetrator from the general public. Let me ask you a couple of questions. Are you Christian? Are you Libertarian?

[Log in to Reply](#)

geoih says:

September 16, 2011 at 08:10



Quote from Al Stefanelli: "The people who dictate what a proper education is should not be religious people. Period. And yes, the state should pay for it with tax revenue and should enforce truancy laws when they are broken."

So now the call for violence is explicit. Give us your money and your children, or we'll kill you. Then you go on to say that you should be removed from the general public for threatening violence, so I have to wonder if you will remove yourself.

It makes no difference what religious or political category I put myself in. Your arguments do not make any logical sense. You're simply spouting your own doctrine and advocating the destruction of those opposed to it. How does that make you any different than those you claim to oppose?

[Log in to Reply](#)

Al Stefanelli says:

September 16, 2011 at 08:24



Really? Seriously? How do you pull "a call for violence" out of this quote, unless you are one of those Libertarian types who think ALL taxation is a form of violence that is perpetrated by our government. Truancy laws have been around for many, many, many years and in most states they are enforced regularly. "Give us your money and your children, or we will kill you?" Is that the best you can do? You seem to be making a career out of taking my words out of context or adding your own definitions to them. Perhaps my arguments don't make logical sense to you because you are illogical?

geoih says:



September 17, 2011 at 12:15



Quote from Al Stefanelli: "How do you pull "a call for violence" out of this quote, unless you are one of those Libertarian types who think ALL taxation is a form of violence that is perpetrated by our government."

What happens if you don't pay your taxes? First your property is confiscated. If you don't surrender your property, then you are imprisoned. If you refuse to allow yourself to be kidnapped, then you are killed.

It's a chain of events that everybody knows will happen if you refuse the state anything. Everything demanded by the state, taxes, truancy, whatever, is predicated with the words 'or we'll kill you'. I guess I don't know why I would have to do better than that.

Trekienut says:

September 18, 2011 at 22:39



If you honestly think that the consequence of defying the government is that "we'll kill you" is written into any part of the constitution or any of the laws created at any level of government, at least in this country, then put your proof where your over active mouth is! Give us an example. This reply is in reference to this comment above and your reply to Al's reply to you below.

geoih says:

September 19, 2011 at 05:44



Quote from Trekienut: "Give us an example."

I just gave an example: Don't pay taxes.

It has nothing to do with what is written in the Constitution. It is the inherent nature of the state. The state is the final arbiter with a monopoly on the legitimate use of unlimited force.

Raymond says:

September 19, 2011 at 13:18



I can understand that you disagree on these issues of education and I'm going to abstain from taking a side, but you made a leap from taxing to killing.

In the U.S. at the very least, that wouldn't be permitted. The states are arbiters with a monopoly on the legitimate use of force, but that force is restricted by the constitution. That'd fall under the cruel and unusual punishment area. I can see imprisonment, fines, and possibly the government claiming property in reparation for not paying taxes, but the killing people for evading taxes is rather uncivilized and not apart of the American legal system. I apologize if I'm wrong, but I'm pretty sure that the whole death penalty thing is restricted to those who are convicted of murder and rape. Even if you evaded arrest you'd just get tracked down and maybe hit with a tazer or suffer some injuries while being captured. The only case of killing someone who evades paying taxes that I can think of would have to be if they evaded taxes and tried to harm or kill the officers tracking them or threatened others around them with extreme violence.

Because of this, your statement "Give us your money and your children, or we'll kill you." which was directed at Al's comment "The people who dictate what a proper education is should not be religious people...the state should pay for it with tax revenue and should enforce truancy laws when they are broken." seems to be a rather big exaggeration and I think that's where a major disconnect in the conversation occurred. Though I personally don't see his article as calling for acts of violence, I can see that interpreting parts of Al's article to be a call to violence might be a little believable, but saying that his comment that the states should pay for what he views as a "proper education" using tax revenues is a call to violence is rather unrealistic.

jmcg1213 says:

September 17, 2011 at 21:20



If you compare the average 6th grade Catholic school kid with the average 6th grade public school kid, the Catholic school kid is at the level of a 12th grader.

But apparently you believe it's better to turn out ignorant atheists as opposed to educated Christians.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Trekienut says:

September 18, 2011 at 22:42



And where did you get that gem of a statistic? Prove it!

jmcg1213 says:



September 19, 2011 at 17:46

No Trekienut
I stated the truth.
If you think it's false, disprove it.



DaveM says:

September 15, 2011 at 19:07



Good luck on your war, after 2000 years it looks like Christianity has history on its side.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Krystalline Apostate says:

September 17, 2011 at 00:57



Good luck on your war, after 2000 years it looks like Christianity has history on its side.

Slavery has history on its side as well. Along w/using leeches.
An argument from tradition is no argument @ all.

[Log in to Reply](#)

jmcg1213 says:

September 17, 2011 at 22:12



Krystalline

You messed up, you left your self open to a reply.

First of all, slavery has a history, but it's not on it's side.

And leeches were debunked long ago.

Do you have a thought of your own?

Is calling others wrong, all you can do?

Why are you right? There's a box at the bottom of the page, use it and tell everyone here what you believe.

Short of that, your opinion of what others believe is a waste of time.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Krystalline Apostate says:

September 18, 2011 at 02:40



You messed up, you left your self open to a reply.

I'm always open to a reply, so no, I didn't 'mess up'

First of all, slavery has a history, but it's not on it's side.

History doesn't take sides. DaveM invoked an argument from tradition.

And leeches were debunked long ago.

Actually, they're still used for some medicinal purposes.

Do you have a thought of your own?

Why yes, I've been sharing them. I'm certainly not parroting anyone.

Is calling others wrong, all you can do?

I only step in when it gets exasperating egregious.

(be sure to look those words up - I'm guessing you stick to monosyllabic content as a rule)

Why are you right?

How am I wrong, is a better question.

There's a box at the bottom of the page, use it and tell everyone here what you believe.

Of all the stupid advice I've been given for the past 6 years on this blog, that rates in the top 10.

Short of that, your opinion of what others believe is a waste of time.

I'd be crushed if your opinion was worth anything.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Trekienut says:

September 18, 2011 at 23:02



In fact your both wrong. Slavery still exists to this day. And leeches are making a comeback as a medical treatment.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Krystalline Apostate says:

September 19, 2011 at 01:27



In fact your both wrong. Slavery still exists to this day.

Where did I say otherwise?

And leeches are making a comeback as a medical treatment.

Where was I wrong, exactly?

The point was that 'history is on the side of X religion'. I was using analogies to show that an argument from tradition was a logical fallacy.(could've used a better example, maybe)

[Log in to Reply](#)

Raymond says:

September 17, 2011 at 21:54



The Australian Aboriginal culture predates that of the ancient Hebrews by about 40,000 years. They have innumerable Dreamtime stories "supporting" the existence of spirits like the Rainbow Serpent (the father of storms, carver of riverbeds and devourer of the sun). Since age is important to you, perhaps you'd like to convert.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Trekienut says:

September 18, 2011 at 23:13



And your point being? The ancient Hindu Brahmic texts are the only religion in the world that got the universes age even close to being correct. And as much as I love and enjoy that religion I am nowhere near converting to it and would not ask anyone else to either. Faith and belief are personal things, they are not to be taken lightly by you or anyone else. I have a deep and abiding respect for the Australian Aboriginal culture and beliefs which you seem to mock and insult with your statement. If an Australian Aborigine wanted to talk to me or anyone else about their faith and try to convince whoever they shared this information with into converting. That would be between the Aborigine and whoever they shared it with and non of your business. And that is beside the point that Australian Aborigine's never attempt to convert anyone to their beliefs.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Raymond says:

September 19, 2011 at 12:34



My mocking was directed towards DaveM's comment on the age of Christianity and how it has history on its side. I did not intend to be mock or insult the Australian Aboriginal culture, but reading my comment I see that it could be seen that way and for that I do apologize.

[Log in to Reply](#)

ScottinWinterHaven says:

September 15, 2011 at 22:40



Clearly your not one that listens to Glenn Beck of Limbaugh because if you di and which I do. None of what you said about these to or other consevative politicians is even further from the truth. Or any thing else you wrote by the way we have s many orginzations that do work like ACLU that we defend their clients in which atehisist file suits in court every day. They also file emicus briefs also. AL admit it your just one big damn liar.

[Log in to Reply](#)

sylveey says:

September 16, 2011 at 02:15



I've listened to beckerhead and limpballs and I'm not impressed with their rhetroic. What AI has said concerning these Jerry Springer type politicians is right on the money. AI is not a liar.

[Log in to Reply](#)

ScottinWinterHaven says:

September 17, 2011 at 12:22



AI is a liar. He does not mention quote from anyone. He can't and can produce any audio that presents any truth. First Rush Limbaugh doesn't talk about religion at all. He doesn't want nor will he to offend another person religion or faith. He keeps religion out of the discussion. Glenn Beck has two atheist on his staff and does not in form shove his religion down anyone throat. He does respect atheist beliefs because he is a Libertarian. None OF WHAT AI SAYS HAS ANY TRUTH IN HIS REASON.

[Log in to Reply](#)

HiredMind says:

September 16, 2011 at 00:26



So... Stalinist purges, is it? (Uncle Joe was a fellow Atheist, if I recall) But this article was better in it's original Russian.

Thanks for making us all look like sociopath lunatics, bent on destroying those with whom we disagree.

There are words for people who proudly boast of their intolerance of, and their wish to "eradicate" the beliefs of others, as you've just done:

"fundamentalist"

"fanatic"

"radical"

You are what you hate.

[Log in to Reply](#)

AI Stefanelli says:

September 16, 2011 at 00:33



HiredMind,

Again, I will state that I was very clear in my reference to extremist doctrines, and not mainstream faith, and definitely not people. I was also very clear that those of us who do not believe (infidels) are frequently targets of these fringe groups and that they are giving mainstream believers a bad name, and that they should also be speaking out against them.

I have always maintained the use of non-violent methods of activism and to remain, at all times, within the confines of the law. The word "eradication" simply means to do away with, and doctrines that promote the murder of anyone for having no belief or a different belief need to be done away with.

Are you OK with people who blow up abortion clinics and kill their doctors? Are you OK with the 911 terrorist attacks? Are you OK with honor killings? Are you OK with the unmitigated level of violence that is done by these fringe groups?

If you think I am attacking mainstream religion, or that I am calling for the destruction of anyone, then you have clearly misunderstood the post. I don't hate anyone, my friend.

[Log in to Reply](#)

HiredMind says:

September 16, 2011 at 18:19



"Again, I will state that I was very clear in my reference to extremist doctrines, and not mainstream faith, and definitely not people."

Actually, you did the exact opposite:

"It should come as no surprise that the INDIVIDUALS..."; "...to cry out that THEY are being persecuted when THEIR dangerous..."; "Most of these PEOPLE..."; "Many of THEM are sociopaths and quite a good number of THEM are psychopaths."; "All of THEM are clearly delusional."; "THEY want us to die."

There are dozens more of course. Your entire post was about people. If not, then to what did the emphasized words refer?

"The word 'eradication' simply means to do away with, and doctrines that promote the murder of anyone for having no belief or a different belief need to be done away with."

In fact the dictionary definition is to do away with something as is pulling up by the root. What happens to the plant when you pull it up by the root? It dies.

Clearly you are not interested in opposing religion the way I do - by arguing with religious people and exposing religion for the delusion that it is, in the hopes that people will shed those beliefs of their own volition. Even if one gives you the benefit of the doubt, and accepts your assertion that you are referring to beliefs rather than people, you are still interested in "societal eradication" of beliefs. I don't know what is more disturbing: the fact that you want to eradicate people's beliefs, or the fact that you seem to have no recognition of the the horrors brought on by a society - even the most "enlightened" one - trying to eradicate beliefs. Namely, mountains of corpses.

“Are you OK with people who blow up abortion clinics and kill their doctors? Are you OK with the 911 terrorist attacks? Are you OK with honor killings? Are you OK with the unmitigated level of violence that is done by these fringe groups?”

I'm not OK with any of these things. But lumping abortion doctor murderers in with islamists is absurd. Oh sorry - did I pluralize “abortion doctor murderers”? I didn't mean to, as there has been, to my knowledge, exactly one of those. This is akin to advocating the “eradication” of all sharks to prevent the (on average) 7 people that die each year in shark attacks, while opposing laws against drunk driving that kill thousands each year, and treating them equally.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Al Stefanelli says:

September 17, 2011 at 09:58



Hired,

So now you are going to tell me what I meant? Really? Seriously? I know what I meant, I wrote the damned thing. Is it inadvisable to tell people what they are thinking. The problem is that YOU have misunderstood what I meant (the writer), and have exacerbated the issue by still denying it after I have explained it many times over.

Oh, and all this “lumping” you speak of? No, it is not absurd to include someone who murders an abortion doctor with someone who blows himself up in a Middle Eastern market, killing dozens of people. Why? Because they both justified their actions through their holy books. That's why.

Did you ever hear of “The Law Of The Hole?” When you are in one, quit digging. It's time you put down your shovel

-Al

[Log in to Reply](#)

HiredMind says:

September 21, 2011 at 23:11



I didn't tell you what you meant, I told you what you SAID.

And I the reason I think it is absurd to lump those two groups together is due to their size: there has been exactly one abortion doctor murdered by a Christian fanatic. There have been almost 20K murders by Islamist fanatics since 9/11.

“Did you ever hear of “The Law Of The Hole?” When you are in one, quit digging. It's time you put down your shovel”

By all means! Please take your own advice. The reason that I keep “digging” is that, as an Atheist, I refuse to be tarnished by nutcases that advocate for the eradication of other people, or even the forced eradication of their beliefs. Even if I grant you every benefit of every doubt, your article advocates for intolerance, just as every murderous Islamist psycho does. (Don't deny it - you explicitly state as much!) You were vague about the methods to use, but the underlying principle is identical. I want no part of it.

Krystalline Apostate says:

September 26, 2011 at 11:59



I didn't mean to, as there has been, to my knowledge, exactly one of those.

Dude, do a little homework:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anti-abortion_violence#Murders

[Log in to Reply](#)

M.C. Williams says:

September 16, 2011 at 11:03



You begin from the assumption that there is no God. We fundamentalist types begin from the belief in and faith in God. We will not agree on the existence or non-existence of God, so I will not address that here. My God demands of me that I am tolerant of all peoples. So I am. You have every right to choose to not believe in Him. As do Islamic peoples. As do Hindus and Buddhists, and anyone who just doesn't want to believe in God. My God demands that I do not judge those who reject Him. So I don't. Frankly, so long as these others do not try to impede my worship of God, or attempt to stop me from believing in Him, or serving Him, I'm utterly indifferent to the misguided beliefs of those people. What may be known of God is plain to all, and God will handle that in mercy—He doesn't need my help. BUT, when someone declares that it is their intent to “eradicate” me and my belief system, to attempt to force me to turn my back on God, I'm going to stand and defend myself and my way of life. You accuse fundamentalist Christians of seeking to do violence and kill all those who don't agree with us. Neither I, nor any Christian person I know has any desire to kill you or any other person. As I said, and I repeat

here to be VERY clear-Beyond the concern I feel for you as a human person, my hope that you are healthy and stay well, and do not suffer some awful catastrophe, I am indifferent to your beliefs or lack of them as the case may be. I do not believe you need to be eradicated. Perhaps pitied...but not eradicated.

What exactly does "eradicated" mean in this case? It sounds a great deal as though you desire to remove my free will. Should I not be free to "wear an intellectual diaper" as you put it, if I choose to? Who are you to determine that I or any other person should not have free will, and be allowed to use it? If you do not mean to "eradicate" my belief system by removing my free will, and the free will of all those who embrace the Truth of God, if not by removing our will to choose to believe and practice our faith, then how? In fact sir, it would seem that you are espousing the idea of some sort of violence or some sort of cleansing to eradicate people who do not not-believe as you do. The very action you accuse your targets of. Sir, I wish you no harm, mental, emotional, physical, none at all. I do not, and true Christians will not wish to remove your free will. It is core to our belief system that free will is the first gift God gave to people-we cannot wish to remove it, that is an article of our faith.

Sir, we all enjoy our freedoms in this Country. If my exercise of my free will or my exercise of my Constitutionally protected, natural human right to believe and freely practice my religion is in some way a threat to you or a problem for you, then perhaps you have not grasped the scope of free will, unless that free will is yours. That would suggest a desperate need to control the will of others, to manage the minds and beliefs of others, and sir, that is not healthy either for you, or the others you apparently wish to control.

I would ask sir, how does the appearance of a cross or an ichthys or a dove with an olive branch, of a pair of tablets bearing the Ten Commandments in any way impede your free will to not-believe in God? If these things have no meaning to you, then why do they offend you so much? Your lack of such symbols has no affect whatever on me. Why should you demand that I and other Christians not enjoy the comforts and symbols of our chosen form of religion? Why should these symbols be altered or removed from our nation's history to accommodate those who state these symbols have no meaning for them? If we are truly infantile in our thinking and beliefs it seems rather than being militant and angry about these symbols, you might ought to laugh at our puerility and ignore the symbols. Why must they be, like us, eradicated? You sir, espouse tolerance, but are not willing to extend it to others. You sir, demand with vehemence your right to exercise free will, while you also demand to remove the free will of others.

I would suggest sir, that you re-examine your actions, and ask yourself who is truly behaving as a radical?

[Log in to Reply](#)

AI Stefanelli says:

September 16, 2011 at 11:09



Thank you for your comments, Mr. Williams. If you read my replies in this forum to similar comments to yours, you will understand that I am not referring to eradicating people, nor Christianity or any other religion, for that matter. My issues are with the fringe groups, the radical fundamentalist extremists who blow up abortion clinics, fly planes into buildings and shoot doctors who are on their way into church. To be sure, you can understand why these people bring a bad name to mainstream religion. I would hope that those believers out there who are fed up with being lumped in with the crazies would jump on the bandwagon and condemn acts of terrorism.

I have maintained throughout my career as an activist that all forms of activism should and must be non-violent and within the constraints of the law and legal system. I do not advocate violence for anything, let alone the free expression of ideas.

Thank you, though, for the well wishes. Right back atcha.

[Log in to Reply](#)

M.C.Williams says:

September 16, 2011 at 14:10



Mrs., but that's ok.

[Log in to Reply](#)

HiredMind says:

September 16, 2011 at 18:28



You must begin with no assumptions if you are to find truth. I don't know about AI, but for me, until God appears in the sky and proves his existence, (or one of the faithful can prove his existence scientifically) I assume there is no God.

Faith is not a valid means of acquiring knowledge.

[Log in to Reply](#)

AI Stefanelli says:

September 17, 2011 at 10:01



Hired,

That was very well stated, and I agree with you on this. I maintain that there is no god until it is proven otherwise.

-AI

[Log in to Reply](#)

Trekienut says:

September 18, 2011 at 23:27



Here is a perfect video for debunking any kind of belief:

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5wV_REEdvxo

[Log in to Reply](#)

risingshouting says:

September 16, 2011 at 11:17



Sounds like you are tired of being in the minority and that you feel you are being attacked or abused by many 'believers'. And by 'you' I mean of course all people who are grounded in atheism. If that is the case, I wish to stand with you. Although many of the accusations you make I feel don't pertain to me specifically, I can see how in the not too distant past, if one were to take a very narrow view of my religion, it wouldn't be hard to find atrocities committed by leaders of my church - the L.D.S. Church. I wish to stand with anyone who feels abused, downtrodden or victimized simply because they believe differently. I also feel that there are many Muslims, Christians and people of all faiths who feel the same as I do.

I wish you well. I hope you are able to accomplish the goals you seek that are good and right. The freedom to believe whatever you wish is fundamental to the founding of this country. If you feel that you are being trampled under foot of those who are believers, I wish to help you in your efforts to gain equal standing.

I hope you would do the same for me.

And by 'eradicated' I hope that what you mean is that the believers will have the fog of false doctrine removed from their eyes so that they can at last see the world as it truly is. If that is your goal, I am happy to have a truly open discussion about your evidence and support for your beliefs.

I hold no animosity towards anyone who simply believes differently than I do.

I am firm in my beliefs and I am not threatened by anyone who sees things differently.

Best regards

[Log in to Reply](#)

Al Stefanelli says:

September 16, 2011 at 11:23



Rising,

You said, "*And by 'eradicated' I hope that what you mean is that the believers will have the fog of false doctrine removed from their eyes so that they can at last see the world as it truly is. If that is your goal, I am happy to have a truly open discussion about your evidence and support for your beliefs.*" That is pretty close. I take it one step further and relegate my goal to the eradication of the doctrines that promote violence, murder and the destruction of property. Outside of that, I have no issues save the First Amendment violations.

Peace, out

[Log in to Reply](#)

risingshouting says:

September 16, 2011 at 12:23



Yeah, I'm with you on your one step further part. I also hope to change hearts from hatred and violence. From the link on the Beck site, it seemed like you were one of those in need of a change of heart. 😊

Best to you

[Log in to Reply](#)

M.C. Williams says:

September 16, 2011 at 16:09



I beg your pardon, but the First Amendment does not suggest or guarantee that no religious symbols or icons will be allowed in public places, on public property, and that there will be no mention of religion in Government. The First Amendment states:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

To "Make no law respecting an establishment of religion", is a clear reference to the establishment of a State Church body, the likes of which was forced upon the population of England- No forced tithing, no forced attendance, no forced membership. This "establishment clause" does not state

that religion will not be allowed to be seen in government or public buildings, but that the government will not, can not select and enforce a religion upon the populace. Also, it guarantees our basic human right to practice (or not practice) religion. Sir, the appearance of religious symbols and icons is no more an infringement upon the First Amendment, than the lack of them would be. However, removing them or demanding that they and any mention of religion not be present is in many cases enforcing a tacit regulation to prevent people from the free exercise of their religion. I fail to understand why the presence of such things is a problem for Atheists. If these symbols have no meaning for you, then ignore them. For example, I am not a Catholic. I personally feel that having statues of Mary, Jesus and other men and women, calling them saints, leaving flowers or incense by them and kneeling to pray by them is in it's very essence, an act of idolatry, which is a grievous sin. For me. However, just because I believe this and apply it to myself does not compel me to go out and try to remove all statues and symbols of this nature. I ignore them, and respect the Catholic's right to find comfort in them. It's really no skin off my nose. Most Christians feel the same. It has to do with removing the log from our own eyes before we try to remove the mote from our brother's. Why then must the Atheist demand that all Christian symbols and references be removed from any place where their eyes may fall? Why can't an Atheist ignore them? I've wanted to ask an Atheist this for many years, and every time I have, the answer has had to do with the First Amendment and the Separation clause of the Constitution. The thing is, there is no Separation Clause in the Constitution. The "Separation of Church and State," is no where in the Constitution, and such a separation did not enter the national consciousness of the United States until the late 1930's. By this time the Constitution was creeping up on it's 150th birthday. I'm sure that an individual as interested in this cause as you are, must be aware of that the only time there is a reference to Separation of Church and State was when Thos. Jefferson wrote a letter responding to the Danbury Baptist Association over their concerns of rumors that the Federal Government was getting ready to establish a federally required mode of practicing the Christian Faith. Pres. Jefferson's response:

Mr. President

To messers Nehemiah Dodge, Ephraim Robbins, & Stephen S. Nelson, a committee of the Danbury Baptist association in the state of Connecticut.

Gentlemen

The affectionate sentiments of esteem and approbation which you are so good as to express towards me, on behalf of the Danbury Baptist association, give me the highest satisfaction. my duties dictate a faithful and zealous pursuit of the interests of my constituents, & in proportion as they are persuaded of my fidelity to those duties, the discharge of them becomes more and more pleasing.

Believing with you that religion is a matter which lies solely between Man & his God, that he owes account to none other for his faith or his worship, that the legitimate powers of government reach actions only, & not opinions, I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation between Church & State. [Congress thus inhibited from acts respecting religion, and the Executive authorised only to execute their acts, I have refrained from prescribing even those occasional performances of devotion, practiced indeed by the Executive of another nation as the legal head of its church, but subject here, as religious exercises only to the voluntary regulations and discipline of each respective sect.] Adhering to this expression of the supreme will of the nation in behalf of the rights of conscience, I shall see with sincere satisfaction the progress of those sentiments which tend to restore to man all his natural rights, convinced he has no natural right in opposition to his social duties.

I reciprocate your kind prayers for the protection & blessing of the common father and creator of man, and tender you for yourselves & your religious association assurances of my high respect & esteem.

(signed) Thomas Jefferson

Jan. 1. 1802.

<http://www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/9806/danpre.html>

(Bracketed portion was not published in the newspaper, but was included in his draft, which is what is here cited. The "occasional performances of devotion" he mentions were the days of thanks giving and fasting and prayer that his predecessors, Washington and Adams had announced at different times. For although Jefferson was a devout Christian, he did not feel it was his place to make such proclamations)

The first incidence of "the wall of Separation" appearing in federal legal documents, that I've found to date, was in the hearings of one Mr. Reynolds (REYNOLDS v. U.S., 98 U.S. 145 (1878)) and the Supreme Court concluded that while the State cannot legislate or govern what a person believes religiously, (in this case that a Mormon man has a religious duty to marry as many women as he can), the State CAN govern actions, or govern to limit actions. It was not until 1947, in Everson vs. Bord of Education that the so-called "Separation Clause" was used to eject religion from a government establishment, in that case, a school-and this was not because the students were being forced to participate in religious activities, but because students were permitted the option of attending religious instruction activities, while others could choose secular activities. The religious activity was cobbled together by Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant individuals to be a sort of one-size-fits-all class, so a question of the State supporting one religion over another was not really in question. It was a question of religion in general being ejected from public or government activities, something that was never intended to be gleaned from the First Amendment. This supposed clause has been skewed and misinterpreted ever since unfortunately, and is now used to prevent people from the free practice of their religion in an ever tightening noose designed to remove any reference to our

Judeo-Christian heritage which is the basis for our system of laws and our American tradition.

So much for the history lesson, and my opinions on it.

My question to you then, is this: You state that “Outside of [a list of obviously illegal acts,] I have no issues save the First Amendment violations.” Understanding that historically, there is no Constitutional guarantee that there would be no religion, no prayer and no religious symbols in Federal or State buildings or on any public property, what are the “First Amendment violations” you refer to??

[Log in to Reply](#)

Trekienut says:

September 19, 2011 at 00:10



First of all, as an Atheist I can assure you that a religious symbol that is on public non-government grounds is a public place of worship. And has every public right to be there. However it is a violation of the “First Amendment” when tax dollars that I pay are used to put that symbol there.

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

With respect we ask only that the ‘Government redress of grievances’ because it taxed me, a citizen with the right to free exercise of any religion I choose (including no religion at all) to be forced by government fiat to pay for the establishment of a symbol of a particular religion on a public space. I do not say that the symbol must not be their. I say that the symbol cannot be their by means of tax dollars.

jmcg1213 says:

September 18, 2011 at 01:09



But Mr. Stefanelli

You don’t care about the meaning of the first Amendment.

People like you misquote it for sport.

Bob Beckle did it yesterday on the Fox news show “The Five”.

The sad part was the other four were not smart enough to catch it.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Pollo Frito says:

September 16, 2011 at 11:26



“But the underbelly of fundamentalist Christianity and radical Islam does not operate in the legal system. They don’t respond to lawsuits, letters, amicus briefs or other grass-roots campaigns and they must, must, must be eradicated. As long as they are allowed to exist, we will continue to be inundated with accounts of buses, buildings, markets and abortion clinics being blown up, rape victims being murdered for adultery, wives being beaten (sometimes to death), airplanes being flown into buildings, people being tortured and sometimes beheaded for blasphemy, people being burned for witchcraft and sorcery and all the other horrific, inhumane and insane practices that are part of fundamental Christianity and Radical Islam.”

Al, you stated in this paragraph that “they don’t respond...and must, must, must be eradicated”. Since doctrines cannot respond and people can, I can only conclude that you are talking about people. Living, breathing people that you say must be eradicated. I don’t care what you meant to say...and now that you’re statements are public record you offer a pitiful postscript to clarify. It still doesn’t change what you said.

“As long as they are allowed to exist” can only mean the “they” who don’t respond to the laundry list of whatevers. I understand that you believe we are foolish, I understand that you believe we subscribe to myths and legends. I even understand why you believe that prayer is ineffective. What I don’t understand is why the mouthpiece of an organization begging for “tolerance” and “non-discrimination” is preaching the opposite.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Al Stefanelli says:

September 16, 2011 at 13:07



The context of the article is about doctrine and the way certain people act out on their interpretation of it. Thus, “they” is in the context of the article. I’ve explained this a hundred times already. As well, I do not believe all Christians are foolish. I know plenty of smart Christians. I find certain beliefs to be foolish, though. I am sure you find some of mine thusly, as well. Our organization is about the separation of religion and government, which sometimes requires tolerance and others intolerance. If, by now, readers are not well aware of what I was conveying, then there is nothing more for me to say about it. Either you will understand it or you will not.

[Log in to Reply](#)

jv says:

September 16, 2011 at 15:01



Couple of problems with your essay.

1. I don't believe it fair to lump Christian fundamentalists in with muslim fundamentalists in that muslim fundamentalists are akin to muslim extremists. and those are the ones who were flying our planes into our buildings. I don't believe you will be seeing Sarah Palin or Pat Robertson doing anything like that in the near future. So right off the bat you seem to be exaggerating (just a little bit).

2. I'm sorry but atheism does not have a very good track record as a substitute ethical system for the Judeo Christian ethic (or even the Muslim ethic for that matter). As someone once said (and I agree with him) "All Christians are a**holes. But non-Christians are even bigger a**holes." (or something like that). Case in point - think in your mind of the biggest, most evil Christian ever. Got it? Good. Now compare that person to Hitler, Stalin, Mao, Pul Pot, etc. No comparison right? I mean these people murdered tens of millions of people and they did so thinking they were doing the world a favor. That is, they did so thinking they were being ethical. There are no religious leaders that even come close to what these men evolved into as atheists. And this I'm afraid is the fundamental problem with atheism as an ethical system. It's relativism. Solve that problem and maybe you have something. But until you do, I'm thinking we are far better off with religion.

3. Writing as a former atheist I can testify that atheists are motivated more by emotion than they are by logic. Given the enormous amount of evidence there is in nature for the existence of God, for anyone to say flat out there is no God seems kind of petulent to me. If you are truly trying to claim that science is on your side the best you might say is that you cannot yet determine scientifically whether God exists. To say anything more is to base your beliefs on your gut feelings (which is anything but scientific). From my own atheism (when I look back on it) I see that my main motivation was anger. And assuming this to be a common attribute with atheists I will generalize. At the core level the atheist is simply mad at God for some injustice they see in the world that they blame Him for. Maybe their father left them or died when they were too young to deal with it. Maybe they look at poverty and famine and natural disasters and wonder why won't our God do something to stop them. Maybe they just want God to plainly show Himself. (That was my ocmplaint). But there are any number of reasons an atheist may become angry with God. And their inclination is to somehow get even with Him. But how do you get even with God. Well for the atheist there is only one solution. They may not admit this (even to themselves) but I believe that within every atheist is a small child screaming out to God, "I'll show you. I'm not going to believe in you anymore." At least that was my experience. And it is the only thing I've found to make sense of the illogic of atheism.

4. But I will take argument 3 one step further and say to all those atheists who are angry with God because you feel that if He does exist He should show himself (as I was) your long wait is over. There actually is a scientific proof of the existence of God. It is a mathematical ratio interwoven into the fabric of our Universe called the 2/3rds Rule by some. And from the Big Bang to the present it corroborates every major event found in the Judeo-Christian Bible.

The booklet "Introduction to the 2/3rds Rule, a Biblical response to Darwinism" provides a thumbnail understanding of this extraordinary new discovery. And believe me, this is not like any so-called proof you've ever seen before. This one really delivers. (It got me, anyway) And it is currently available at Amazon.com at the link below

http://www.amazon.com/Introduction-3rds-Biblical-Response-Darwinism/dp/1450752489/ref=sr_1_2?ie=UTF8&qid=1316201561&sr=8-2

I would be very interested in reading an atheist's response to this book. Debunk it if you can. I couldn't. But maybe you will see something I didn't. So go ahead. Take my challenge. I guarantee that anyone who reads this small booklet from cover to cover with comprehension of what is being said will be forced to re-examine everything they once thought to be true. In short - everything you know is wrong. Check it out.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Al Stefanelli says:

September 16, 2011 at 15:38



JV

1. It is fair if you understand Christian fundamentalism in the context of radical extremists, i.e., terrorists. Read the article, I am very clear about this. Small group, large reach. They are making you look bad. I don't understand why you guys are not jumping up and down, shouting from the mountaintops, distancing yourselves from them as far as possible. But hey, that's me.

2. Atheism is really the only moral choice. It produces true altruism.

3. I find it difficult how one can be a former atheist, but to each their own.

4. Atheists are not angry with your god any more than we are angry with Zeus.

Thanks,

Al

[Log in to Reply](#)

jv says:

September 16, 2011 at 16:04



1. I agree the small groups of extremeists that are making the Christians (and Muslims) look bad. But this

is largely the fault of the media who seem to always focus in on the extremists. As for me I am no fundamentalist but I know of no Christian who doesn't condemn and distance themselves from the wacko extremists. But again the media doesn't cover it.

2. You didn't really respond to this one. So I will restate it in another way. Moral absolutism is superior to moral relativism. amnd to those who disagree I ask one simple question - If you were a Jew would you rather live in Hitler's Germany, 8th century Palestine, or 16th century Spain? All three were lousy options but only one of these regimes didn't have a stopping mechanism and that is because they based their morals on atheism, a philosophy that always degrades to the worst possible condition simply because we humans are always inclined to take the easy way out.

3. Your responses to #3 and 4 are kind of switched so I will answer them both at the same time. Atheism, as I said, is illogical and not based on science leaving me with anger (or some other emotion) as the only logical means to explain it. You say it isn't anger but what emotion is it since science certainly doesn't corroborate it. And on that line I already answered how a person can be a former atheist. The existence of God is provable. And all you have to do to know that is check out the booklet I recommended. I'll be happy to reimburse you if everything I've said about it isn't true. So what is holding you back? Are you up to the challenge or are you afraid I might be right?

[Log in to Reply](#)

theotherjimmyolson says:

September 16, 2011 at 18:42



I am sorry to have to inform you that you are grossly misinformed with regard to the information you are offering making any point you were advancing moot. Please bear in mind that this is the internet, and that minds far superior to yours have access to everything you type.

[Log in to Reply](#)

jv says:

September 16, 2011 at 20:53



Well given that you provide no evidence to back up your claims I wonder who it is that is really misinformed. You claim to be free thinkers yet your behavior is anything but open minded (which is also typical of most atheists I've known). I wash my hands.

Krystalline Apostate says:

September 17, 2011 at 01:08



I agree the small groups of extremists that are making the Christians (and Muslims) look bad.

You obviously haven't crunched any numbers @ all.

Moral absolutism is superior to moral relativism.

That makes you an extremist, then. Your 'small groups' espouse that very nonsense. Also, you're assuming that all atheists are moral relativists. I'm not, & you're laboring under a mistaken assumption. There's plenty of -isms to go around.

I'm sorry but atheism does not have a very good track record as a substitute ethical system for the Judeo Christian ethic (or even the Muslim ethic for that matter).

Idiot. Lack of belief in supernatural makes someone immoral? Are you joking?

Atheism, as I said, is illogical and not based on science leaving me with anger (or some other emotion) as the only logical means to explain it.

No, because

- A. we're not a bunch of raging narcissists like the religious folks, &
- B. it's your belief system that's not based on science OR logic.

And all you have to do to know that is check out the booklet I recommended.

I refuse to take the bible as an authority on anything.

I'll be happy to reimburse you if everything I've said about it isn't true.

4 whole bucks?!?!? Wow, hey big spender.

Are you up to the challenge or are you afraid I might be right?

What are you, 12?

[Log in to Reply](#)

jv says:

September 17, 2011 at 04:00



Your elitist vitriol is fairly indicative of the anger your belief system is based upon and kinda proves my point that it is emotion not science that motivates atheists. And your heavy reliance on insult further suggests you don't have a whole lot in the way of cogent counterarguments.

Accordingly I'm not going to waste a lot of time on you but i will say one thing. I believe in the Big Bang and evolution and pretty much everything else currently proposed by modern science. and there is nothing in it that conflicts with my belief in the God of Judeo/Christian tradition. (And the same is true of most every Christian I know). Where you and I differ is that you seem to think that science is your exclusive domain. It isn't. Science simply looks at empirical evidence and makes judgments on the hows and whats and whens of natural history. But it has nothing at all to say of the why. The why is reserved for theology.

But simply because science does not address the why you assume it does not even exist. And this belief is based not on science (which says nothing of the why) but, as I said, on emotion. In short, it takes faith to say emphatically that God does not exist. And in my opinion from having been on both sides of the fence, that given all the evidence to the contrary it takes far more faith to be an atheist than it does to believe in God.

Now yes there are some who believe that the Bible is in conflict with mainstream science and they steadfastly refuse to accept the idea that their interpretation of the Bible is exactly that, just one of many possible interpretations of Scripture. But how does that differ from that of the atheist who has his own interpretation of Scripture and refuses to accept that there can be any other.

I personally pity both groups. You are both in the fundamentalist and extremeist camps and because of it you miss out on a lot. But I would vastly prefer being under the rule of the absolutist fundamentalist than that of the relativistic fundamentalist (that is, the atheist) because those regimes always seem to end up thinking genocide and death camps are a good idea. Do you have any evidence at all to dispute this fact? I've brought this up in all of my posts and thus far it appears to be something you atheists prefer to sweep under the carpet.

Krystalline Apostate says:

September 17, 2011 at 11:02



Your elitist vitriol

My...what? It's not elitist. I treat everyone that way.

is fairly indicative of the anger your belief system is based upon and kinda proves my point that it is emotion not science that motivates atheists.

Here we go...again. GROAN.

A. Atheism isn't a belief system, &

B. science is a methodology, not a catalyst.

And your heavy reliance on insult further suggests you don't have a whole lot in the way of cogent counterarguments.

I might suggest that your heavy reliance on old, tired, constantly debunked talking points might be indicative of a lack of originality.

Accordingly I'm not going to waste a lot of time on you but i will say one thing.

You've already 'washed your hands' once, & threatened to go away.

I believe in the Big Bang and evolution and pretty much everything else currently proposed by modern science.

That's not a big surprise for me.

and there is nothing in it that conflicts with my belief in the God of Judeo/Christian tradition.

Judeo/Christian? Is that yet another obscure sect?

There's the flat earth, the 6 days of creation, the flood, the tower of babel, people wandering around in a desert for 40 years (it's a ten-day walk in a sandstorm), there's zombies, a darkness that covers the earth only TWO people saw - & yet somehow you can tailor this to your convenience.

How nice.

Where you and I differ is that you seem to think that science is your exclusive domain.

You should do abstract stand-up. That's HILARIOUS. I don't consider science (or any other damn thing) my 'exclusive domain'. I know how to share. You make a great deal of your assumptions based on no evidence. Which is standard fare for the religionist.

Science simply looks at empirical evidence and makes judgments on the hows and whats and whens of natural history.

Oh wow, a calendar day. You actually got a reasonable handle on science. How this is an 'exclusive domain' or a catalyst for my non-belief system is still yet to be explained cogently.

But it has nothing at all to say of the why. The why is reserved for theology.

There is no why.

But simply because science does not address the why you assume it does not even exist.

If the positive is unproven, the negative is given.

And this belief is based not on science (which says nothing of the why) but, as I said, on emotion.

This is known as the Negative Proof fallacy. I'm not making the extravagant claim here, you are. Prove it.

In short, it takes faith to say emphatically that God does not exist.

It takes evidence to say it does.

And in my opinion from having been on both sides of the fence, that given all the evidence to the contrary it takes far more faith to be an atheist than it does to believe in God.

Your opinion ain't worth much. The 'former atheist' trope is usually trotted out by some malcontent who was a lazy thinker & didn't bother to address the context, but rather was an atheist because it was too much work to be religious, till they changed their minds.

Now yes there are some who believe that the Bible is in conflict with mainstream science and they steadfastly refuse to accept the idea that their interpretation of the Bible is exactly that, just one of many possible interpretations of Scripture.

The wholly bible is in conflict with REALITY. You obviously haven't approached the topic objectively.

But how does that differ from that of the atheist who has his own interpretation of Scripture and refuses to accept that there can be any other.

See, it's insulting stupidity that invokes vitriol, not elitism. You manifest so very many fallacies, it's hard to take you seriously. This is the tu quoque fallacy.

I personally pity both groups.

I think everyone will get over that quickly.

You are both in the fundamentalist and extremeist camps and because of it you miss out on a lot.

You really don't know enough about me to make that call.

But I would vastly prefer being under the rule of the absolutist fundamentalist than that of the relativistic fundamentalist (that is, the atheist) because those regimes always seem to end up thinking genocide and death camps are a good idea.

- A. Move to Saudi Arabia, &
- B. since atheism isn't a belief system, you can't make that claim.

Do you have any evidence at all to dispute this fact?

Of course I do. You wouldn't listen anyways. Hitler wasn't an atheist, you mook. Mussolini was. Hitler youth had to swear an oath to your 'Judeo/Christian' deity, they had belt buckles that said 'Gott Mitt Uns', & Mein Kampf is shot thru w/Christian scripture & statements. It'd be nice if you knew wtf you were talking about.

I've brought this up in all of my posts and thus far it appears to be something you atheists prefer to sweep under the carpet.

Yeah, don't break your arm patting yourself on the back. We've all heard it before. It's horseshit, plain & simple. People do what people do, regardless of what they believe. It's the biology, not the ideology.

Which you'd know, if you did any deep thinking & research on the topic.

Al Stefanelli says:





I was wondering how long it would take you to invoke Godwin's law. Your arguments have been debunked over and over again by me and those much better at it than me. Have a nice day.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Comala666 says:

September 17, 2011 at 09:02



@JV: It's disbelief, not denial. I'm atheist. I don't have a belief system. I lack a belief in gods. It's that simple. However, I'm always in search of the Talking Snake. Until the chatty creature is Fedexed to my house, I shall continue to lack belief. If you insist on metaphor, then we can certainly haul the Dead-Guy-On-A-Stick down the same road as the Talking Snake. I don't accept violence because enough violence was done to me as a child of Mexican Opus Dei parents in the name of the Bearded Guy, his Brat and the Pigeon. You never forget the images.

ju says:

September 17, 2011 at 13:57



In response to just a few of the comments here.

Yes it is true that Hitler seems to have payed lip service to Christianity like a lot of modern politicians. But in private conversation it was understood that he was anything but. Now there are those who will dispute it but we also have the evidence. 6 million Jews killed in the gas chambers, 10s of thousands of Christian clergy thrown into death camps. This was a regime that was clearly at war with God. And if Hitler worshipped any God at all, it was himself. That said the argument stands. The atheist and statist regimes of 20th century stand as a constant reminder what can happen when a state adopts a relativistic moral philosophy. As they clearly demonstrate there is no end to how low we humans can degrade under such systems. This is not to say that on an individual level an atheist cannot be moral. They can. But when atheism become's the official (or unofficial in the case of the 3rd Reich) platform of the state the results are disastrous.

Moving on to one last item. I firmly reject the idea that a statement has to be falsifiable in order to be meaningful. There are plenty of incidences in life that are known with certainty that are not falsifiable. And while it is quite true that there can never be an empirical proof for the existence of God. It is possible to know that God exists as millions can attest, even though they have no falsifiable statements to confirm it. Beyond this though there are falsifiable statements that can invoked in an attempt to prove the existiecne of God. That booklet I suggested earlier is one of them. But given the closed mindedness I've seen demonstrated in this website, my guess is there is no one here that is interested. You all have your minds made up and anyone who disagrees or claims that they can prove otherwise is a simpleton or a jerk.

Krystalline Apostate says:

September 17, 2011 at 15:12



Yes it is true that Hitler seems to have payed lip service to Christianity like a lot of modern politicians. But in private conversation it was understood that he was anything but.

Yeah, we've heard all about the 'table talk' crap. He wasn't an atheist. Atheists don't wander around w/belt buckles that say "god is with us". They don't include oaths to gawd in their rites of passage for children. They don't PUT IT IN WRITING.

Now there are those who will dispute it but we also have the evidence.

Dispute what?

6 million Jews killed in the gas chambers, 10s of thousands of Christian clergy thrown into death camps. This was a regime that was clearly at war with God.

1st off, the Jewry being killed is a direct Christian legacy. Martin Luther was AH's hero (but you'd know that if you did anything resembling research) - it's the blood libel. 2nd, you clearly have no evidence that your deity exists.

And if Hitler worshipped any God at all, it was himself. That said the argument stands.

What argument? That he was an atheist? You wonder why people treat you w/such contempt on an atheist blog? You clearly don't have a clue.

The atheist and statist regimes of 20th century stand as a constant reminder what can happen when a state adopts a relativistic moral philosophy.

You don't even know what moral relativism is, do you? Or that it's not the default -ism for atheists. Those statist regimes were just that: statist. Blaming the ideology is stupid. People performed these acts, like they did in Bosnia, or the WTC towers. People just need an excuse.

As they clearly demonstrate there is no end to how low we humans can degrade under such systems.

Oh, that's right - because historically, Christianity is such a shining example. [/sarcasm off]
Oh but wait: you have excuses for all that blood shed.

This is not to say that on an individual level an atheist cannot be moral. They can.

Oh, that's mighty white of you.

But when atheism become's the official (or unofficial in the case of the 3rd Reich) platform of the state the results are disastrous.

Really, how fucking stupid are you? They BANNED ATHEIST GROUPS! They paraded about claiming god was on THEIR SIDE! AH was no atheist, nor was he an xtian. He was a madman who wandered about borrowing whatever he felt like from wherever he liked. I might note, that under a materialistic viewpoint, crazies like Jones, Manson, Hitler, & numerous other republican serial killers would've been incarcerated, instead of being granted a free pass 'cause they're 'religious'.

Moving on to one last item. I firmly reject the idea that a statement has to be falsifiable in order to be meaningful.

Falsifiability:

*Falsifiability or refutability is the logical possibility that an assertion can be contradicted by an observation or the outcome of a physical experiment. That something is "falsifiable" **does not mean it is false**; rather, that if it is false, then some observation or experiment will produce a reproducible result that is in conflict with it.*

There are plenty of incidences in life that are known with certainty that are not falsifiable.

Duh.

It is possible to know that God exists as millions can attest, even though they have no falsifiable statements to confirm it.

Oh yes, because we all know that the masses NEVER indulge in wishful thinking.

Beyond this though there are falsifiable statements that can invoked in an attempt to prove the existiecne of God.

None of which has been invoked here.

But given the closed mindedness I've seen demonstrated in this website, my guess is there is no one here that is interested.

Dawkins: "It's all right to have an open mind, just not so open that your brains spill out."
I'm interested. Just not 4\$ worth of interested.

You all have your minds made up and anyone who disagrees or claims that they can prove otherwise is a simpleton or a jerk.

Claiming that Naziism was an atheist regime **when all the historical data contradicts that** puts you squarely in both camps.

Having an opinion is insubstantial without evidence.

CPT_BRUMBL3Z says:

September 17, 2011 at 15:43



1. The only reason Christian fundamentalists are not flying planes into buildings (though there are a handful of doctor assassinations, arson against completely legal buildings housing completely legal practices, extreme criminal neglect of children, protected pedophilia, numerous scams that prey on the faith people hold, and I'm sure I could come up with more given the time) is because Christianity has been living in cultures and societies of stable governments with secular laws for (depending on your factors going into it) a dozen or so decades or a handful of centuries. And, said cultures have been the hubs of education, science, and human integrity and advancement. Islam is prominent in countries that haven't had stable governments in centuries, and we've seen just in the past two or three years what, 3 or 4 successful or inevitable government over throws and nearly ten or more all together?

2. If you want to make a compelling argument, you'll first need to not use points that have been debunked extensively. Hitler was religious, Christian in particular, and his attempted genocide was born of his theistic faith. The rest are names of tyrants and despots many atheists would be the first to decry for what they did, openly, and even more openly against those atheists that would support their horrible regimes (a vast

difference between us and yourselves, we won't be silent bystanders against our own). The problem is with dogma and it's not unique to religion. Stalin, for example, created a Nationalist government, the secular equivalent to a fundamentalist theocracy, much like ones we see in the Middle East today. Nationalism (at least in this context) is where the state -is- the religion, but it's dogma that makes it that way, just like it's dogma that tells you to argue against Atheists rather than publicly decry your own zealous fringe.

3. Then you were never an Atheist. Atheists cannot be angry at something that isn't real. Sure, we can feel emotion over fiction we partake in like anyone else. We feel Emperor Palpatine of Star Wars fame is evil incarnate, just as you do, and we hate him. But we hate in the context of fiction. We know he's not a real person. You, however, always believed. You were never an Atheist, but were a disenfranchised believer. Let me repeat that: -You- -Were- -Never- -An- -ATHEIST-

4. Until you convey the points made by this 2/3rds thing, I couldn't give a damn (and I bet I speak for most all of us there), because like how every other argument supported by apologetics and the religious in general for God's existence have consistently fallen short we expect this one will be no different. It's like telling someone you won't get electrocuted the next time they stick a metal fork into an electrified socket if we hold it differently. We're not lemmings and won't waste our time with it until we know it's actually worth checking.

[Log in to Reply](#)

jmcg1213 says:

September 17, 2011 at 21:50



This is one truly long, boring non informative posting.
When you brought up Hitler you lost all credibility. You are so anti religion, you have only your little minds idea of what a Christian is.
And Hitler was not one, regardless of what religion he was born into.

[Log in to Reply](#)

Krystalline Apostate says:

September 18, 2011 at 02:50



This is one truly long, boring non informative posting.

You know, your whinging on about posts being too long (too much content is straining your brain, more likely) is getting far more boring than the posts you complain about.
I'm guessing you're what? 14? 14 and a 1/2?

[Log in to Reply](#)

jmcg1213 says:

September 18, 2011 at 23:12



How does mentioning something once become construed in your brain as whinging, or as I prefer whining on?
This is the only post I had a complaint about, because with all the words, there is no substance.
That is with the exception of your posts, which not only have no substance, you pride yourself on the lack of any.
All you do is give bitter commentary to other people's opinions.
And you do it in a most boring way.

Krystalline Apostate says:

September 19, 2011 at 10:08



How does mentioning something once become construed in your brain as whinging, or as I prefer whining on?

I meant in terms of annoying, not persistent.

That is with the exception of your posts, which not only have no substance, you pride yourself on the lack of any.

Wrong & wrong, but no surprise.

All you do is give bitter commentary to other people's opinions.

Pot.kettle.black.

And you do it in a most boring way.

I'm crushed. (yawn)

jmcg1213 says:

September 19, 2011 at 18:17



Krystaiine
What you said was "your whinging ON".

That denotes persistence.

If as you say, I'm wrong & wrong, please point out anything you have said of substance on this entire page.

Krystalline Apostate says:

September 19, 2011 at 23:44



That denotes persistence.

& you prove my point by continuing to respond.

If as you say, I'm wrong & wrong, please point out anything you have said of substance on this entire page.

Terribly sorry old chap, if I'm not spoon-feeding you your usual pabulum, but your lack of comprehension isn't my lookout.

jmcg1213 says:

September 21, 2011 at 21:16



Krystalline

When I asked you how mentioning something once is construed in your brain as "whinging on", you replied, "I meant in terms of annoying, not persistent."

I pointed out that whining "on" denotes persistence.

Now you say I proved your point.

Which point would that be?

Your first lie when after one short remark, you claimed I was whining on, your second lie when you claimed to mean it as annoying, not persistent, or this lie, which takes us back to your first?

When I ask you a very easy thing to do, if it existed, show me one thing of substance you have said on this entire page.

What's your response?

You choose to insult me rather than provide one example.

You say you have been posting here for six years, and I see why.

You could never hold your own on a forum that was not slanted to your point of view.

Krystalline Apostate says:

September 22, 2011 at 11:01



When I asked you how mentioning something once is construed in your brain as "whinging on", you replied, "I meant in terms of annoying, not persistent."

I pointed out that whining "on" denotes persistence.

My, you certainly are...PERSISTENT about this.

Now you say I proved your point.

Hoo boy.

Which point would that be?

Irony fail.

Your first lie when after one short remark, you claimed I was whining on, your second lie when you claimed to mean it as annoying, not persistent, or this lie, which takes us back to your first?

I wasn't lying: & your personal attacks are pretty lame.

When I ask you a very easy thing to do, if it existed, show me one thing of substance you have said on this entire page.

Do your own homework.

You choose to insult me rather than provide one example.

I say I've provided ample substance.

You say you have been posting here for six years, and I see why.
You could never hold your own on a forum that was not slanted to your point of view.

Gee Dr. Phil, you've found me out! GASP! Oh, whatever shall I do? (clutches pearls, faints onto couch)

Anyways, over it already.

jmcg1213 says:

September 22, 2011 at 19:40

Game, set, match.
Loser.



Krystalline Apostate says:

September 22, 2011 at 23:24

Game, set, match.
Loser.

WOW. I mean...WOW. How substantial. How...persistent.
You're about as intellectually challenging as arm-wrestling a toddler.
YAWN.



CPT_BRUMBL3Z says:

September 18, 2011 at 15:06

Are you replying to me or the person I replied to?

Either way, fail troll is fail. At least the nincompoop that KA always wailed into a year or so back tried making points instead of just flame bait.

[Log in to Reply](#)



jmcg1213 says:

September 18, 2011 at 23:13

I was replying to you.



CPT_BRUMBL3Z says:

September 19, 2011 at 16:16

Then I reiterate: Fail troll is fail.



jmcg1213 says:

September 19, 2011 at 18:19

Fail at what?



Al Stefanelli says:

