
Subject: Any chance Congress will step up to stomp this activist judge?

Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sat, 28 May 2005 14:02:26 GMT

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

Unbelievable

Anybody remember personal freedom?

Subject: Re: Any chance Congress will step up to stomp this activist judge?

Posted by [colinhester](#) on Sat, 28 May 2005 14:17:36 GMT

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

Geez, What ever happened to the separation of Church and State?

Subject: Be afraid, little fella' - be very afraid.

Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sat, 28 May 2005 17:16:36 GMT

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

And people wonder why the Muslims think we're leading the new Crusades.

Subject: Re: Any chance Congress will step up to stomp this activist judge?

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 28 May 2005 18:45:25 GMT

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

Hey; remmember the guy in Atlanta with the ten commandments? I have to ask here and I hope it is not taken wrong but; lets say you are a PHD in physics but you still have all these religious beliefs and they require that you act contrary to your native intelligence. Does that dumb down your natural abilities? Or are you just a very bright guy who happens to have been mentally sidetracked and it does not impact on your natural capabilities?

Subject: Some experience there....

Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sat, 28 May 2005 21:53:29 GMT

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

I've worked with some very good engineers and scientists who, despite their reliance on science to make a living, still find themselves in church praying to a big daddy in the sky. To a man/woman, they find a way to only accept naturalistic explanations in their work - though I often tease them when there's a particularly intractable problem with "maybe Jesus wants it that way".

Subject: Re: Some experience there....

Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sat, 28 May 2005 22:19:17 GMT

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

It is a real conundrum to me. I can't see how you turn off your mind at will.

Subject: Re: Some experience there....

Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 29 May 2005 09:42:35 GMT

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

I can't see why engineering/science and belief in God are two opposite things? Many great scientists were and are believers; science wants to explain the order of things in and out of our world. And there's a difference between religion and cult. Maybe in this particular case the judge evaluated that occult rituals and magic practices are not in the interest of the child?!

Subject: Not to start a fight, honestly

Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sun, 29 May 2005 11:56:14 GMT

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

But belief in a god and science are two completely antithetical things – exact polar opposites. Gods require belief – belief by definition is without foundation, un-testable, not subject to logical scrutiny. Beliefs and gods cannot be refuted. Science does not require, in fact shuns, belief. A claim (hypothesis or theory) in science must be testable, must withstand logical scrutiny, and must be revised when the evidence indicates that it doesn't hold up. As far as Wicca goes, how can it possibly be different than any other belief? What's a magical practice? Praying that you find your car keys or that the universe will make an exception in your mother's case and remove a Stage IV cancer? Transubstantiation? That people spontaneously rise up from the dead and bodily ascent into the sky without mechanical aid? That Thor throws lightning bolts? If you went to an auto mechanic to have your car fixed and he returned it in the same condition saying "Jesus wants it that way", would you accept that? I bet not. So why would you accept that the reason for anything in the natural world has a god behind it? How can you draw a rational line between what interests a god and what doesn't? Had the judge ruled that it wasn't in the child's best interest to inoculate his thinking with religious

belief of any kind I could by that. For the judge to discriminate between kinds of belief is unconscionable (not to mention unconstitutional).

Subject: Re: Not to start a fight, honestly
Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 29 May 2005 12:41:30 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

You just exposed your beliefs and your logic/education/background. I can only smile a little on your "arguments", but for yourself. I don't want any public or private arguments about my religion with atheists who must prove their shallow "rational" beliefs. Automechanics "arguments"? It wouldn't work even on automechanics, they are bright people:-). I lived in "atheistic" and "socialist" country where many politicians and philosophers (well educated in their politics and marxists/rational philosophy) for 45 years constantly explain to the people through all the medias, by any way imagined, even force - the same atheistic/materialistic philosophy/beliefs. The results? About 80% of the population are Catholics today.

Subject: Re: Not to start a fight, honestly
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 29 May 2005 13:20:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

But Damir; what does that prove; people are not different from what they have been for ten thousand yrs. They need to think that there is a life beyond the grave. Tell me this. The Catholic religion says that if a child is not baptised they go to hell; even if they die before they can be baptised. So is that a good belief? Every major religion states clearly that anyone who does not believe in "Their God", will suffer eternally. Is that sensible? My son attends Catholic school and they tell him that no matter how good a person is they cannot get into heaven if they are not Catholic. Atheists do not have to prove anything because they do not have anything to prove. The believers must prove that their beliefs are the true beliefs and any who don't believe will not be favored by god. I love when there is a tragedy and people die; whoever survives will always say, "God was watching over me," which basically says he didn't watch over those people that died. I guess they were not holy enough to watch over; and so they died.

Subject: Re: Not to start a fight, honestly
Posted by [Damir](#) on Sun, 29 May 2005 15:04:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

No, that's not theologically true. And I don't want/need to argue/prove anything about religion on Audio forums. Atheists can have their rights not to believe in God or right and wrong, etc. I can

only feel pity for them. If you really want good arguments against religion and Gods existence, see Feuerbach, Marx, Freud, Nietzsche...Automechanics, school, "science", etc. anecdotal "evidences" about most fundamental questions of our existence are IMO - frivolous. And for your last part : "I love when there`s a tragedy... etc." I can only say a frivolous saying: "There are no Atheists in the trench." Anecdotal frivolous "evidence" - I like to hear a story by my friend - in a shallow trench, and 155mm grenades falling around... and everybody is praying "Holly Marry, Mother of God...". Maybe someone lost his life, but saved his soul? And for you "science believers" - what do you think about religious beliefs of Alfred Einstein, for example? Must go now to holly mass, it`s Sunday, you know.

Subject: Re: Not to start a fight, honestly
Posted by [Manualblock](#) on Sun, 29 May 2005 15:44:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Well; you're a good and generous guy so whatever you want to believe is fine by me. I just want to say I don't dictate to anyone what is right, just offer my observations.

Subject: Jiminy Cricket!
Posted by [wunhuanglo](#) on Sun, 29 May 2005 16:25:25 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Now you went and hurt my feeling. I was saving that one for a special occasion
