

I like alot of what you say here. Like this part: " You fail to distinguish having an opinion and acting on it...What the problem is is when those people go out into the world and take actions against those people they don't like"

Now I could apply that same statement to the various governments dealings with Christians say in the first 3 centuries, particularly under the Roman Empire. They weren't forcing their beliefs on anyone, they harmed noone, if anything, they went out into the world helping people, and yet simply for having their opinion they were brutally suppressed. Man, all the logic is intact in your arguments about the evidence and knowing the truth etc, etc... But seriously, how can you say that what you profess is what the evidence shows? There is an absolute ton of evidence that shows the contrary. I don't even know where to start, or if it's really any point...Theres Roman records after Roman records, decrees that anyone professing the Faith will die in province after province. Under the Emporers Maximian, Diocletian, Nero... There are even so many records of Martyrs testimonies before they were killed, such as Justin Martyrs famous "Apologia" where he explains the early Christians practices before they killed him.

I don't even know why I argue the point. It's like there is just a huge void in your understanding of what went down...but despite that, you insist on arguing the point. I don't know. Read some Eusebius writings he lived right through it..or even read Byzantium history books, its impossible to seperate or scrub that history clean of religious content. The problem with my viw is that I DO follow the available evidence, and its plenty. So much, in fact, that after years of studying it, I feel that I have not even scratched the surface. I hate to even mention the personal details of any of the martyrs cause the sheer volume of their numbers and innocence can't even be adequately addressed in single examples. But for example, take Sts Primus and Felician beheaded on June 9, 286. They were both brothers, both citizens of Rome. They would give their wealth to the poor and one of their cheif ocupations was to visit the Christians in prison and assisting those who were to die for the Faith. They slipped by for so long but then under the joint emporers Maximian and Diocletian they were arrested scourged and sent to Nomentum 12 miles from Rome to a judge named Promotus. He tortured tem together then seperately trying to force them to sacrifice to the gods of Rome... finally they were both beheaded

Theres just so much proof of all this that I don't even see how you can argue the point.

I like arguing, not debating, but with you sometimes kits like we're on two different realities, It's been prophesied that Europe would fall to Bolshevism, man I never would have believed how completely they could have rewritten history over there and erased God from the minds of the people. I really am glad that I talked to you, by

the way. In fact, I think that it must have been quite providential. Cause I am being absolutely honest with you when I tell you that I never in a million years would have believed that a people could have become so indoctrinated as you are. It's sick, and it's sad, but it's also eye opening.

Eh, don't worry about it. I'm so used to being called racist that it no longer acts as a coercive tool to make me conform my beliefs to the people who yield it in an attempt to get me to abandon an unfavorable position. Usually the most racist people are the ones that society thinks ain't. I guess if I defined racism as the West defines racism, then I would have to admit I was racist, however, our definitions are just completely different, so I actually don't define myself as such. I actually like a lot of different cultures and races of man and study their history. I've been studying the Arabs lately, I really like their whole Islamic culture. I can talk to you for hours about them...but I won't.

I don't care that it's called racist when I also point out the glories of European civilization, and the people. If I said something like I am proud that I am Black, or Hispanic, or Asian and I am proud of the cultural achievements of my people. I love our history and see it as vital that we come together to protect our people from unjust attacks or oppression. Well, no one would say that is racist.

But if I said I am White, and proud of the cultural achievements of my people etc etc and see it as necessary that we come together,...well you get the point, I'd be a racist. I don't care.

A coward, in my opinion, would say they didn't see the hypocrisy simply because they feared the social stigma, or violence, that would result from speaking a truth they clearly believed in. That's cowardice. Some people conform to the majority out of cowardice. Of course, unlike the slanderers, I don't attribute all my opponents' motivations simply to fear as you seem to do. I understand that some people simply fail to see the contradiction in their definitions of racism.

Racist doesn't bother me. Bigot, however, does. A bigot is someone who bases their beliefs on a lack of knowledge. That's a bigot. You can call me a racist, but at the same time, it would not be a bigoted racism, cause I can explain to you in specific detail why I think like I do. I really like evidence. I have just not heard any convincing enough yet to refute the existence of race. I've heard all the pseudo science babble of the last 60 years, it just fails to convince, not only me, but also various peoples throughout the world, though, I admit, seems to be popular in the West. The Mexicans here in America seem to believe that there is such a thing as race, they identify with a larger group and organize groups accordingly. Maybe someone hasn't informed them of the non-existence of Race. Maybe groups such as National Council of La Raza (the Race) will dissolve overnight?? or the National Black Caucus, or the Arab American civil rights division?? I could argue this boring point indefinitely. It's too obvious even to expound point after point after point.

I mean you would have to destroy years and years of science and entire scientific fields. I mean, Genetics, for example. Can you fail to see that not only are physical characteristics inheritable, but also various behavioral predispositions? Emotions? Likes/dislikes, fears, attractions, aversions? and if you just admit that obvious point. well, if genes run in families like that, can't you see how certain traits are more concentrated in a family than in that family's extended family? and that certain traits and characteristics would be more concentrated in that extended family than in the larger society at large? and on up...in a tribal group, that they would share more characteristics than another tribal group? and the accumulation of tribal groups that have been intermingling in a specific geographic location would have more in common genetically than people from a further region...

How long before the absurdity stops? If you don't like the word race, that's fine call them groups, or whatever else to mean exactly the same thing.

Yeah, I don't particularly care about your sexual preference...nor see any correlation between passivity and bisexuality. I've had quite a few bisexual female friends and some were passive some were not...I guess it would depend more on if you were the 'woman' in the deal, or the 'dude'...ha! whatever. Really one of my best homegirls out there was this Mexican chick named Jeannie Tamez. I guess she was the dude, she was really the shot caller I guess you'd say...but she wasn't manly, she was real pretty, and feminine cool. Do you ever go onto MYSPACE? If so, go to 'Ziggy the damned ole Evil White Devil' that's my page. She's on the front page somewhere. if you even care...

Ha Ha! just rereading your remarks! ...accept that I do discriminate against people on the basis of religion. Yeah right. you discriminate more than I do. You berate organized religious movements in almost every argument you make. You profess a somewhat misguided belief that people who pick and choose bits and pieces of beliefs are somehow superior to people who follow organized religions. that's sorta bigotted, in a way.

I've been studying Shiite Islam lately too. I really like their beliefs more than any of the like 7 fiques (schools) of Sunni Islam. Obviously, as a Catholic, there's just some stuff that I completely disagree with, but they do have an in depth understanding of certain principles we both have in common that I am able to learn from a different perspective describing the same phenomena.

I write a sheik from Pakistan who also lived in Iran for awhile. He's pretty brilliant actually, and he's even met the Supreme leader Ayatollah Khomeini at his home in Iran when he lived there...had two kids born in Iran. He's a Shiite. Anyways, I speak pretty openly with him, and if I'm so discriminatory, I guess he fails to notice it. I guarantee you he would have more in common with me and my beliefs than with you and yours...for all the non-bigotry rhetoric you profess.

I have to tell you, even though I am a bigotted racist, I sure like that Mahmoud Ahmadianajb from Iran. I know he is scheduled to be replaced soon if he has not been already, but I think he has more integrity and grit than most of 'my' leaders do.

You see why I cant bring myself to view myself as the racist that I'm condemned as? Its just cause I dont believe it. The Iranians, by the way, of the Persian (not Arab) Race, are descended from one of the Aryan tribes that conquered northern Indi back in the day, and they too are quite proud of their race, as indeed they should be. I am convinced they would reject your theory of no such thing as race too. In fact, I know they would.

Well, I'm gonna get off this topic. Its nothing personal, I've just argued this whole racial crap for so many years that its kinda boring to me. I just see the truth off my position after having argued and argued it but se bhat the opposition is never gonna admit its truth even though have the stuff that comes out there mouths corroborates excatly what I say.!

Anyways. Take it easy Buhogrunon. By the way, what you said about the staement of mine that I had a high opinion of you but my words suggest otherwise..nah, its not that, I can have a high opinion of someone and have a low opinion of a particular viewpojnt that they have. there is a distinction. You can draw just about any conclusion you want if you isoltae particular staements to the exclusion of others...you gotta take some stufff in context. Don't get all sensitive on me, I could play the hurt and insulted part too. But in th end, who really gives a damn if people have a high opinion of us?

Alright...hope your out there enjoying your day Lady.... Ziggy