
Subject: Secular democracy
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 17 Jan 2010 02:43:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Specifically talking about Britain here. I'd love to know why we still have an established religion here, given that most of us have generally come to the conclusion that democracy is a good thing (and, of course, it was set up at a time when the king's word was the beginning and the end of the argument).

Its current leader Rowan Williams is, I believe, a lot more sinister than most people think he is... most see him as a bubble-headed fool. He says atheists aren't fully human, he has come out in support of "some aspects of sharia law" (we now have sharia law courts operating in Britain, and I'm not sure why we haven't had any riots are about that yet), he continually chides us about "materialism". This from a man who has two palaces, insists on tax breaks, he's the head of a company that's one of the biggest landowners around, has dozens of automatic seats in parliament, and most revolting of all, has control over thousands of schools.

So why do we still have it? We occasionally get a rather feeble question brought up and debated on the monarchy, such as: should we repeat the ban on catholics becoming the monarch, should we give women on the same level as men where succession is concerned... I say feeble because it ignores the fact we shouldn't have a monarchy at all, nor an established church.

To summarise. We could use a constitution like the US's. Separate church and state. You're free to believe whatever the fuck you like, but here's the line in the sand.

Religion should not be tax exempt.

Religion should not be an excuse to avoid following a law everyone else is subject to.

Religion should have no power to make laws that's denied the rest of us... laws must be determined democratically (we've never had this in the UK)

Religion does not deserve automatic seats in parliament.

Religion should not have the power to brainwash kids and call it education.

any objections?

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Sun, 17 Jan 2010 05:36:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

If I lived in England, I'd be in full support of this. I'm sick of the bullshit religion-induced vomiting we've had to suffer through here as it is, and it seems like you guys have it a bit worse.

This coming from a man who still does believe that there's a God and etc- but I think organized religion has way overstayed its welcome.

It's like a guy that you invited over to your house decides to sell his house, stays at your house, and does nothing but sit on the couch eating potato chips and drinking beer. And then starts running the house. And if you try to kick him out, the police bursts through your door and says you can't do that.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sun, 17 Jan 2010 05:45:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

"Religion should not be tax exempt."

Agreed.

"Religion should not be an excuse to avoid following a law everyone else is subject to."

Mostly agreed. There are some cases that I'd accept although they're more of the "law says you can but religion says no" variety, like abortion.

"Religion should have no power to make laws that's denied the rest of us... laws must be determined democratically (we've never had this in the UK)"

Agreed.

"Religion does not deserve automatic seats in parliament."

Agreed.

"Religion should not have the power to brainwash kids and call it education."

If you mean mandatory teachings, then agreed. We invite people to our church and try talking to people about us, but if they don't want to listen, we don't majorly press the point. (Maybe some follow-up visits or so, but that's it, really.)

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sun, 17 Jan 2010 07:24:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Religion is a personal decision. It has absolutely no place in policy- no matter how the laws are written, or who writes them, or why. Period. IMHO, the most sacred right a person has is that of self-determination- the right to choose what to believe and how to lead their life. It is the foundation of numerous other critical freedoms like the rights to free speech, privacy, self-defense, property... Government sponsorship of a religion- any religion- infringes on that right by codifying a particular belief structure and all of the subjective morality that goes with it.

Most governments were founded during a time when it was unthinkable to not belong to the dominant religion in that part of the world, so naturally their laws reflect whichever religion that happened to be. Many people still have some difficulty separating morality from religion, and hold the (mistaken) belief that without some element of religious guidance society would break down. However, humanity has accepted the same common threads of morality across the entire globe for longer than any single religion has existed; we do not require the input of churches or priests and what have you to tell right from wrong.

Note that I am not claiming as fact that there is no God. The choice of whether or not to believe in God, gods, or the Flying Spaghetti Monster is up to the individual. If you believe that we derive our morality from the power that created us, that is fine. However, it is part of our being as the social creatures that we are- no matter what faith a person does or does not follow, they will learn morality so long as they are raised by other human beings who accept a common rule of law (be it written or unwritten).

Governments are secular creations, and they ought only to have secular powers. Religious laws should only be applied to followers of that same religion, and no one else at all.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 17 Jan 2010 15:03:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Nukelt15 wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 01:24 Religion is a personal decision. It has absolutely no place in policy- no matter how the laws are written, or who writes them, or why. Period. IMHO, the most sacred right a person has is that of self-determination- the right to choose what to believe and how to lead their life. It is the foundation of numerous other critical freedoms like the rights to free speech, privacy, self-defense, property... Government sponsorship of a religion- any religion- infringes on that right by codifying a particular belief structure and all of the subjective morality that goes with it.

You use the word sacred. A few people have actually remarked upon the fact I - an atheist - have used the word myself to describe concepts like freedom of speech, freedom of thought etc. I can see why they'd be surprised... I don't mean sacred as in "given by a god", I simply mean that they have worth beyond description.

Quote:Most governments were founded during a time when it was unthinkable to not belong to the dominant religion in that part of the world

That's certainly true. You keep hearing from the religious that, for example, christianity must be a good thing because look at all these great scientists, artists, composers etc throughout the ages who were religious. A quick look at the period usually shows you that it was a fucking good idea to at least pretend to be a christian at the time.

Quote:Many people still have some difficulty separating morality from religion, and hold the (mistaken) belief that without some element of religious guidance society would break down. However, humanity has accepted the same common threads of morality across the entire globe for longer than any single religion has existed; we do not require the input of churches or priests and what have you to tell right from wrong.
mmhmm

but even if this wasn't so, an established church is still a terrible idea. most religious people ought to be agreeing with me here and speaking in favour of secularism. historically, when you give one religion power, every other religion (and atheists and agnostics, of course) - is worse off for it. it always persecutes non-believers. sometimes in quite a mild way - i wouldn't claim that the

situation in Britain is anything like as evil as in the hardcore Islamic states, for example, but it's the same principle.

Quote: Note that I am not claiming as fact that there is no God. The choice of whether or not to believe in God, gods, or the Flying Spaghetti Monster is up to the individual.
I'm not claiming as fact that there's no "god" either, simply saying two things. Firstly nobody's ever, ever come up with a convincing argument - never mind evidence - that there is such a being LET ALONE that they know the details (and religions don't just say "there's a really powerful entity that made the universe" - i.e. deism - they say things like "and I can tell you that he's interested in you, he listens to your prayers, he will judge you when you die, he has firm views about your sex life....")

Secondly even if you proved to me that for example Christianity was true, I'd still be making this thread, I'd still be arguing in favour of secular democracy. After all, the monotheistic concept is the most ultimate dictatorship ever conceived (which is why it puzzles me why so many Americans want to implement it)

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [archerman](#) on Sun, 17 Jan 2010 15:51:13 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 04:43: any objections?

no. I totally agree.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 04:43: Religion does not deserve automatic seats in parliament.
Religion should not have the power to brainwash kids and call it education.

I strongly agree with this one. My country has been suffering from this since the early '50's.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [SPIKDUM](#) on Sun, 17 Jan 2010 18:47:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I'm from the Netherlands so it's pretty obvious I fully agree, and from what I see everywhere so does the majority of our country.
However our politicians don't, and those who do are the ones who need bodyguards.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Sean](#) on Sun, 17 Jan 2010 22:48:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

archerman wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 09:51Spoony wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 04:43any objections?

no. I totally agree.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 04:43Religion does not deserve automatic seats in parliament.

Religion should not have the power to brainwash kids and call it education.

I strongly agree with this one. my country has been suffering from this since the early '50's.

^That

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 01:26:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

everything that was said so far in this topic was entirely reasonable

i'm willing to bet anyone that would object is an unreasonable person

where's that Muadib15 dude?

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 01:27:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

liquidv2 wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 19:26everything that was said so far in this topic was entirely reasonable

i'm willing to bet anyone that would object is an unreasonable person

where's that Muadib15 dude?

Muadib15 is Republican, not ridiculously Christian IIRC.

yes, contrary to constant jokes that get old after the 800th time, Republicans and religious nuts aren't always the same

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 01:50:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

i know he's a rush limbaugh worshipper but for some reason i thought he was also a very religious

dude
didn't connect the two at all, two different things entirely

chill

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 04:07:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

archerman wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 07:51I strongly agree with this one. my country has been suffering from this since the 1500's.

Fixed.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 04:16:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 22:07archerman wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 07:51I strongly agree with this one. my country has been suffering from this since the 1500's.

Fixed.

Um, since Kemal Ataturk's huuuuuuuge reforms, Turkey's been really non-secular (almost ferociously so), and continues to be today. I'd say its less secular than the United States.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 04:41:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

people call turkey secular, it's only secular when you compare it to the middle east. it's halfway between europe and the middle east both geographically and culturally.

spikdum wroteHowever our politicians don't, and those who do are the ones who need bodyguards.

mmhmm. what's disgraceful is that our politicians portray him (if you mean who i think you mean) as the troublemaker, the criminal... rather than the people who are intent on killing him. but it's always the way... eg during the salman rushdie affair, most of our religious leaders sided with the ayatollah. (more recently when he was considered for a knighthood, people repeated the argument that salman was the villian of the piece). during the danish cartoon affair, all the condemnation was directed at the cartoonists and media outlets who showed them, rather than the baying mobs who were murdering innocent bystanders and burning embassies, or the imams who deliberately and dishonestly whipped them up.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Canadacdn](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 04:48:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

As long as religion exists, it will get mixed up in politics. It's unavoidable, bro.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 06:25:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

it'd be avoidable if we had a US-style constitution and actually stuck to it.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Dover](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 11:18:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 22:25and actually stuck to it.

This is the hard part.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 13:35:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

That's the part that is probably impossible, not just "hard".

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [ChewML](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 15:02:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Now WITHOUT discussing if we personally believe in The Bible, God, or w/e... I will add a few things that I have picked up on.

The funny part of mainstream Christianity mixing with politics is... The Bible teaches against it. So if you claim to be a Christian, you should not be into politics as far as voting/campaigning/running for office. The idea that it teaches is "Pay Ceasar's things to Ceasar and God's things to God"... Which is commonly understood to mean, pay your taxes and follow the laws of the land as long as they do not contradict the laws God has given you.

Here in America if you can prove your conviction/beliefs well enough, they won't send you to war, even in the middle of a draft. Some think that is BS, well I am not discussing it in depth, just

stating the fact. I would say this came with the freedom of religion part, which is supposed to be like half the reason America came to be.

Short summary timeline of how the Earth has been ruled, according to The Bible.

1. Earth was perfect, ruled by God
2. Earth lost perfection, Men ruled, some with God others without
3. Earth still not perfect, Men ruling all by themselves
4. Earth restored to perfection, God as ruler again

That is what The Bible says anyways, so we would be in step 3, step 4 is of course is in the future.

Remember all of this is NOT to start a debate about if The Bible is true or false. I just said all of this, because Christians believe in The Bible... but yet they still get into politics.

I agree that they should be seperate, but accept the fact that they can't at the moment.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [archerman](#) on Mon, 18 Jan 2010 16:09:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Mon, 18 January 2010 06:07archerman wrote on Sun, 17 January 2010 07:51I strongly agree with this one. my country has been suffering from this since the 1950's.

Fixed.
Fixed.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 18 January 2010 06:41people call turkey secular, it's only secular when you compare it to the middle east. it's halfway between europe and the middle east both geographically and culturally.

can you give any reasons for this statement?

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 19 Jan 2010 03:11:49 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

is it complicated? turkey is often called "secular", but it's only "secular" when you compare it to the hardcore islamic states in the middle east, countries like saudi arabia where islam really does have it all its own way. compared to the rest of europe, turkey is by no means secular.

Chew wrote on Mon, 18 January 2010 09:02The funny part of mainstream Christianity mixing with politics is... The Bible teaches against it. So if you claim to be a Christian, you should not be into politics as far as voting/campaigning/running for office. The idea that it teaches is "Pay Ceasar's

things to Ceasar and God's things to God"... Which is commonly understood to mean, pay your taxes and follow the laws of the land as long as they do not contradict the laws God has given you.

well, i've always found the render unto caesar concept rather irrelevant. after all (if i don't go into the truth or untruth question either), caesar was a theocratic dictator, as is god.

the concept was used in that manhattan declaration thingy, usual persecution-complex drivell from christians. what was it the document said? "we'll gladly render unto caesar those things that are caesar's, but under no circumstances will we render unto caesar those things that are God's". referring to matters like abortion, tolerance of homosexuals etc.

there are two glaring flaws with this assertion.

1. as i said, caesar was a theocratic dictator. america is a democracy. when you hear an american whingeing about how his system would be so much better if we just submitted to the dictator (god, not caesar) i feel like giving him a good shake and telling him to appreciate what he's got.
2. it's a useless statement until anybody can prove god this even exists, let alone that matters relating to e.g. homosexuality belong to him and are unassailable by silly things like democracy. (and even if this god did exist and did indeed have stern views on these things, i'd still be telling him to fuck off and let us have our democracy instead)

Quote:Here in America if you can prove your conviction/beliefs well enough, they won't send you to war, even in the middle of a draft. Some think that is BS, well I am not discussing it in depth, just stating the fact.

i'll not discuss it in depth either and simply say that conscription is immoral.

Quote:Short summary timeline of how the Earth has been ruled, according to The Bible.

1. Earth was perfect, ruled by God
2. Earth lost perfection, Men ruled, some with God others without
3. Earth still not perfect, Men ruling all by themselves
4. Earth restored to perfection, God as ruler again

That is what The Bible says anyways, so we would be in step 3, step 4 is of course is in the future.

Remember all of this is NOT to start a debate about if The Bible is true or false.

well, unfortunately i have to say that until its truth is verified, please don't be disappointed if you aren't taken seriously on the subject. and if the day comes when its truth is verified, prepare for my objections to intensify.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy

Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Tue, 19 Jan 2010 04:17:55 GMT

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

Its kinda ridiculous that sharia courts are operating in the UK as well as any religious courts or panels. Such parallel legal systems greatly undermine the authority of government law...in this case British law. There should only be ONE law in the land and ONE administrator to enforce it, i.e, government.

I thought we are supposed to be going towards cutting the unnecessary people who hold power and consolidating into one system that makes everyone happy. I guess this is where we can blame the failed concept that is called "diversity" and see for ourselves how dangerous and premature it is to create a "multicultural" environment where every barbarian is allowed to run untamed.

People bitch about diversity and the need for integration. Integration of all peoples is fine by me BUT in no way should it compete with any native law. You want to live in the UK, fine but you leave your garbage behind and start off new under the new system. That is true integration. Creating parallel legal systems to bypass more secular native laws (that are actually MORE fair) is ridiculous and should not be allowed. Accommodation will never be integration. (what is the point of a photo id if your face is covered by a veil?)

Complacency in this matter will only be exploited by the Islamic extremists who are hell-bent on "conquest" of Europe by Islam. Perhaps that's why I am a bit supportive of and applaud the recent Swiss vote to ban minarets from being built in Switzerland. Its a baby step in the right direction. Sometimes you just have to show who's boss...even if it tarnishes the image.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Tue, 19 Jan 2010 12:26:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Integration -> People living together.

Seperate legal systems -> Seperation of people based on culture.

Therefore Integration and Seperate legal systems are mutually exclusive.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Dover](#) on Tue, 19 Jan 2010 14:18:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzzzz wrote on Mon, 18 January 2010 20:17Perhaps that's why I am a bit supportive of and applaud the recent Swiss vote to ban minarets from being built in Switzerland.

lol.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Tue, 19 Jan 2010 14:45:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzzzz wrote on Mon, 18 January 2010 22:17

Complacency in this matter will only be exploited by the Islamic extremists who are hell-bent on "conquest" of Europe by Islam. Perhaps that's why I am a bit supportive of and applaud the recent Swiss vote to ban minarets from being built in Switzerland. Its a baby step in the right direction. Sometimes you just have to show who's boss...even if it tarnishes the image. Thats not being secular, thats denying people their freedom of religion. the ban on minarets was wrong, and obviously so.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Starbuzzz](#) on Tue, 19 Jan 2010 17:49:09 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

surth? / surth! wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 08:45Starbuzzz wrote on Mon, 18 January 2010 22:17

Complacency in this matter will only be exploited by the Islamic extremists who are hell-bent on "conquest" of Europe by Islam. Perhaps that's why I am a bit supportive of and applaud the recent Swiss vote to ban minarets from being built in Switzerland. Its a baby step in the right direction. Sometimes you just have to show who's boss...even if it tarnishes the image. Thats not being secular, thats denying people their freedom of religion. the ban on minarets was wrong, and obviously so.

You are very correct there. By banning minarets, I agree that we are denying their freedom of religion and it shouldn't happen in a true secular society. But imo there is a bigger issue...

I am saying it is too early to push for a secular society...when religion is still strong. Religion seeks to only divide people and always wants more power. Always. Their quest for power will only stop/slow the progress towards a secular environment.

If they want to build minarets then fine yes. But let's remember that this is the same group of people that cannot understand freedom of speech and expression and throw a violent protest everytime a cartoon is drawn; no one should be making any compromises to satisfy them and put up with their requirements. I am just trying to point out that in the secularists eager bid to create a equal environment for everybody they are ending up creating a society that is divided into many tribes which in turn are afraid of offending each other/extra sensitive to each other. That imho is not a secular society.

We have all the secular freedoms listed down...but everyone must recognize these freedoms and respect them in a secular society and respect the right of everyone to use these freedoms within this secular society. So when someone draws a cartoon of a religious figure, there shouldn't be protesting in the streets and death threats to the cartoonist or attempts to kill the cartoonist (this happens all the time). All what this does is hurt the society's chances of being purely secular. We are ending up with a weak society.

So when you give them even more "localized" power (like sharia courts), then we are only making this gap bigger. We are only further strengthening the various tribes inside a society and the secularists end up in a deeper hole than they were in before.

I will put it in another way; for example because there are Muslims and Christians in a biology classroom, the teacher has to be extra sensitive to not offend them (and their creationist tales) while doing his/her job. This shouldn't be the case.

Every group within a society should be tolerant of each other; not just 1 group sucking up, appeasing, and trying to please and accomodate another vicious group. That imo is not secularism.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Tue, 19 Jan 2010 18:06:46 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 17:49I will put it in another way; for example because there are Muslims and Christians in a biology classroom, the teacher has to be extra sensitive to not offend them (and their creationist tales) while doing his/her job. This shouldn't be the case.

wtf. Is that mandated by your school system, or is your teacher just afraid they'll bitch? Tell your teacher that they shouldn't be making accommodations for people based on their religion because that just hampers your own pursuit of knowledge. The minority should NOT be dictating the wants and needs of the majority and you can start in the classroom.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 19 Jan 2010 22:00:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

firstly, switzerland. it's a far less tolerant country than it's often portrayed to be, for example it was surprisingly recently they actually gave women the vote...

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 11:49I am saying it is too early to push for a secular society...when religion is still strong. Religion seeks to only divide people and always wants more power. Always. Their quest for power will only stop/slow the progress towards a secular environment.

i would argue that this is why we're arguing in favour of secularism not too early, but far too late. well, not "too" late, but later than we should.

Quote:If they want to build minarets then fine yes. But let's remember that this is the same group of people that cannot understand freedom of speech and expression and throw a violent protest everytime a cartoon is drawn; no one should be making any compromises to satisfy them and put up with their requirements.

I agree with not being forced to make compromises, but letting them build their own religious temples really isn't a compromise.

Quote:I am just trying to point out that in the secularists eager bid to create a equal environment for everybody they are ending up creating a society that is divided into many tribes which in turn

are afraid of offending each other/extra sensitive to each other. That imho is not a secular society. now you've lost me.... "the secularists eager bid to create an equal environment for everybody"? you'll have to explain this a bit more clearly for me, i.e. who are you talking about and what are they doing?

Quote:Every group within a society should be tolerant of each other; not just 1 group sucking up, appeasing, and trying to please and accomodate another vicious group. That imo is not secularism.
of course it isn't secularism.

nikki, off topic slightly but on the subject of education in britain, two things worth knowing.

1. daily prayer is compulsory (usually of a christian nature although we now have a load of islamic faith schools too)
2. the stupid bible myths are taught with the same level of certainty as what we were taught in history, geography, maths etc

by all means we should teach kids about religion for the same reason we should teach them about politics. but i've said before and i'll say again: it's immoral to do so dishonestly. for example, if you're teaching christianity to a kid, you'd better be telling him the bad points as well as the "good", e.g. the complete lack of evidence for its truthfulness, its indescribably evil track record throughout history etc

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [ChewML](#) on Tue, 19 Jan 2010 22:47:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

nikki6ixx wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 12:06Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 17:49I will put it in another way; for example because there are Muslims and Christians in a biology classroom, the teacher has to be extra sensitive to not offend them (and their creationist tales) while doing his/her job. This shouldn't be the case.

wtf. Is that mandated by your school system, or is your teacher just afraid they'll bitch? Tell your teacher that they shouldn't be making accommodations for people based on their religion because that just hampers your own pursuit of knowledge. The minority should NOT be dictating the wants and needs of the majority and you can start in the classroom.

Yes, I am pretty sure American teachers are required to be very careful when it comes to anything someone could throw a shit fit about. Which is normally religion related when it comes to schools from what I have read in the local news.

The only thing America has going for it is the illusion of democracy. I am by no means racist/prejudice of any sort against any group of people. But the way all this "minority" BS is handled is just plain stupid.

I only think that people born in Africa and later move to America should qualify as African-American. If you were born in America, you are fucking American. Same goes for any

other mix of races people come up with.

But no... this is how it is here.

My girlfriend has worked her ass off all through school, because she wanted to go to college from the moment she heard of it.

She had perfect attendance up until the middle of her high school time (when she realized she could miss a lot of school and still get A's).

She had the highest grade point average possible (5.0), including weighted "honors" classes.

Never got in any trouble in school, or out for that matter.

When the time came to go to college, she got a full ride scholarship, and some extra money for books each semester. To keep it she has to keep a pretty high grade point average.

But her friend from high school, who had a lower grade average, and didn't work nearly as hard to get to college... also got a full ride scholarship, but nearly twice as much extra money each semester for expenses, and only has to keep a grade point average that is the equivalent of C's and D's... Why? Because she was Mexican... even though she was born and raised in America.

The minority rules here in America.

I say we are all equal, there are no race cards to be played. You reap what you sow. Granted some are born in wealthier families, they can lose it all. As can a person born into poverty find a way to become rich.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [SPIKDUM](#) on Tue, 19 Jan 2010 23:10:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 11:49surth? / surth! wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 08:45Starbuzz wrote on Mon, 18 January 2010 22:17

Complacency in this matter will only be exploited by the Islamic extremists who are hell-bent on "conquest" of Europe by Islam. Perhaps that's why I am a bit supportive of and applaud the recent Swiss vote to ban minarets from being built in Switzerland. Its a baby step in the right direction. Sometimes you just have to show who's boss...even if it tarnishes the image. Thats not being secular, thats denying people their freedom of religion. the ban on minarets was wrong, and obviously so.

You are very correct there. By banning minarets, I agree that we are denying their freedom of religion and it shouldn't happen in a true secular society. But imo there is a bigger issue...

I am saying it is too early to push for a secular society...when religion is still strong. Religion seeks to only divide people and always wants more power. Always. Their quest for power will only stop/slow the progress towards a secular environment.

If they want to build minarets then fine yes. But let's remember that this is the same group of people that cannot understand freedom of speech and expression and throw a violent protest everytime a cartoon is drawn; no one should be making any compromises to satisfy them and put up with their requirements. I am just trying to point out that in the secularists eager bid to create a equal environment for everybody they are ending up creating a society that is divided into many tribes which in turn are afraid of offending each other/extra sensitive to each other. That imho is not a secular society.

We have all the secular freedoms listed down...but everyone must recognize these freedoms and respect them in a secular society and respect the right of everyone to use these freedoms within this secular society. So when someone draws a cartoon of a religious figure, there shouldn't be protesting in the streets and death threats to the cartoonist or attempts to kill the cartoonist (this happens all the time). All what this does is hurt the society's chances of being purely secular. We are ending up with a weak society.

So when you give them even more "localized" power (like sharia courts), then we are only making this gap bigger. We are only further strengthening the various tribes inside a society and the secularists end up in a deeper hole than they were in before.

I will put it in another way; for example because there are Muslims and Christians in a biology classroom, the teacher has to be extra sensitive to not offend them (and their creationist tales) while doing his/her job. This shouldn't be the case.

Every group within a society should be tolerant of each other; not just 1 group sucking up, appeasing, and trying to please and accomodate another vicious group. That imo is not secularism.

Churches are not allowed whatsoever in saudi-arabia for instance, but they finance the construction of mosques in europe.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [archerman](#) on Tue, 19 Jan 2010 23:35:21 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 05:11 is it complicated? turkey is often called "secular", but it's only "secular" when you compare it to the hardcore islamic states in the middle east, countries like saudi arabia where islam really does have it all its own way. compared to the rest of europe, turkey is by no means secular.

give some examples, like "turkey is doing this but x european country is doing that so turkey is less secular".

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 01:05:50 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

archerman wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 17:35Spoony wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 05:11is it complicated? turkey is often called "secular", but it's only "secular" when you compare it to the hardcore islamic states in the middle east, countries like saudi arabia where islam really does have it all its own way. compared to the rest of europe, turkey is by no means secular.

give some examples, like "turkey is doing this but x european country is doing that so turkey is less secular".

blocking internet websites?

<http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE60H2WJ20100118?type=technologyNews>

^ Doesn't happen in Europe.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 01:25:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Chew wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 16:47words

Fucking agreed. The minority dictates so much shit here it's ridiculous. The 1920's are over, we're not going to be lynching blacks all of a sudden because they're not getting a free fucking scholarship when they did nothing in school.

I get what you mean Spoony by a "constitution" and such, and I support it a lot- but even America, the ones that you're referencing for such an idea, has just as much retarded minority controlling the majority mentality. Something more needs to be done to knock this shit off.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 16:00

by all means we should teach kids about religion for the same reason we should teach them about politics. but i've said before and i'll say again: it's immoral to do so dishonestly. for example, if you're teaching christianity to a kid, you'd better be telling him the bad points as well as the "good", e.g. the complete lack of evidence for its truthfulness, its indescribably evil track record throughout history etc

Agreed, I don't mind people teaching about religion. But when they're shoving it down your throat without really giving any history lessons on the evils it's done to this world, you're not helping anything...

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 02:37:33 GMT

Spoony wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 16:00

now you've lost me.... "the secularists eager bid to create an equal environment for everybody"? you'll have to explain this a bit more clearly for me, i.e. who are you talking about and what are they doing?

I am talking about the folks in the political circles here that are behind the "diversity" agenda. They write the policies that encourage and promote diversity and aid in the process of imposing the double standard. They love to tell you "how America's strength is its rich multicultural diversity." They don't realize that all they are doing is creating a society that has more walls crisscrossing inside it.

Perhaps I shouldn't have referred to them as secularists in my previous post.

@ nikki:

Basically what Chew said; race and religion is always a hot topic here. As far as the biology classroom, this is one of the maddest things that happened in recent times:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kitzmiller_v._Dover_Area_School_District

There is a constant struggle here as christian powerbrokers come up with new ways to get morning prayer, 10 commandments and creationism introduced back into the school system.

Hell, it is so bad that NASCAR racing has mandatory televised public prayers before each race.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy

Posted by [ChewML](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 04:02:43 GMT

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

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 19:25Spoony wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 16:00

by all means we should teach kids about religion for the same reason we should teach them about politics. but i've said before and i'll say again: it's immoral to do so dishonestly. for example, if you're teaching christianity to a kid, you'd better be telling him the bad points as well as the "good", e.g. the complete lack of evidence for its truthfulness, its indescribably evil track record throughout history etc

Agreed, I don't mind people teaching about religion. But when they're shoving it down your throat without really giving any history lessons on the evils it's done to this world, you're not helping anything...

One thing I will give credit to my girlfriend's college for is, when she took a couple of religion classes they said they would cover the bigger religions evenly across the board... discussing the good, bad, and raising questions about the truthfulness in all of them. And from what she told me, her teacher actually did a fair job. But that is just one classroom among many here.

Edit: Also imagine this shit storm if you can... we have a black history month in America... why not a white history month?

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [archerman](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 14:20:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 20 January 2010 03:05archerman wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 17:35Spoony wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 05:11is it complicated? turkey is often called "secular", but it's only "secular" when you compare it to the hardcore islamic states in the middle east, countries like saudi arabia where islam really does have it all its own way. compared to the rest of europe, turkey is by no means secular.

give some examples, like "turkey is doing this but x european country is doing that so turkey is less secular".

blocking internet websites?

<http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE60H2WJ20100118?type=technologyNews>

^ Doesn't happen in Europe.

this is not related to secularity.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 14:42:17 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SPIKDUM wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 17:10Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 11:49surth? / surth! wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 08:45Starbuzz wrote on Mon, 18 January 2010 22:17

Complacency in this matter will only be exploited by the Islamic extremists who are hell-bent on "conquest" of Europe by Islam. Perhaps that's why I am a bit supportive of and applaud the recent Swiss vote to ban minarets from being built in Switzerland. Its a baby step in the right direction. Sometimes you just have to show who's boss...even if it tarnishes the image. Thats not being secular, thats denying people their freedom of religion. the ban on minarets was wrong, and obviously so.

You are very correct there. By banning minarets, I agree that we are denying their freedom of religion and it shouldn't happen in a true secular society. But imo there is a bigger issue...

I am saying it is too early to push for a secular society...when religion is still strong. Religion seeks to only divide people and always wants more power. Always. Their quest for power will only

stop/slow the progress towards a secular environment.

If they want to build minarets then fine yes. But let's remember that this is the same group of people that cannot understand freedom of speech and expression and throw a violent protest everytime a cartoon is drawn; no one should be making any compromises to satisfy them and put up with their requirements. I am just trying to point out that in the secularists eager bid to create a equal environment for everybody they are ending up creating a society that is divided into many tribes which in turn are afraid of offending each other/extra sensitive to each other. That imho is not a secular society.

We have all the secular freedoms listed down...but everyone must recognize these freedoms and respect them in a secular society and respect the right of everyone to use these freedoms within this secular society. So when someone draws a cartoon of a religious figure, there shouldn't be protesting in the streets and death threats to the cartoonist or attempts to kill the cartoonist (this happens all the time). All what this does is hurt the society's chances of being purely secular. We are ending up with a weak society.

So when you give them even more "localized" power (like sharia courts), then we are only making this gap bigger. We are only further strenghting the various tribes inside a society and the secularists end up in a deeper hole than they were in before.

I will put it in another way; for example because there are Muslims and Christians in a biology classroom, the teacher has to be extra sensitive to not offend them (and their creationist tales) while doing his/her job. This shouldn't be the case.

Every group within a society should be tolerant of each other; not just 1 group sucking up, appeasing, and trying to please and accomodate another vicious group. That imo is not secularism.

Churches are not allowed whatsoever in saudi-arabia for instance, but they finance the construction of mosques in europe.

You didnt vote for Geert Wilders, did you?

just trollin'

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 15:39:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

archerman wrote on Wed, 20 January 2010 15:20Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 20 January 2010 03:05archerman wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 17:35Spoony wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 05:11is it complicated? turkey is often called "secular", but it's only "secular" when you compare it to the hardcore islamic states in the middle east, countries like saudi arabia where islam really does have it all its own way. compared to the rest of europe, turkey is by no means secular.

give some examples, like "turkey is doing this but x european country is doing that so turkey is

less secular".

blocking internet websites?

<http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE60H2WJ20100118?type=technologyNews>

^ Doesn't happen in Europe.

this is not related to secularity.

Try making a blog saying "Islam is a shitty religion, seriously. Also, eating meat is awesome.".

See how long it takes for it to get shut down. That is, if you can even access any blog making sites.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [SPIKDUM](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 16:02:37 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

surth? / surth! wrote on Wed, 20 January 2010 08:42SPIKDUM wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 17:10Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 11:49surth? / surth! wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 08:45Starbuzz wrote on Mon, 18 January 2010 22:17

Complacency in this matter will only be exploited by the Islamic extremists who are hell-bent on "conquest" of Europe by Islam. Perhaps that's why I am a bit supportive of and applaud the recent Swiss vote to ban minarets from being built in Switzerland. Its a baby step in the right direction. Sometimes you just have to show who's boss...even if it tarnishes the image.

Thats not being secular, thats denying people their freedom of religion. the ban on minarets was wrong, and obviously so.

You are very correct there. By banning minarets, I agree that we are denying their freedom of religion and it shouldn't happen in a true secular society. But imo there is a bigger issue...

I am saying it is too early to push for a secular society...when religion is still strong. Religion seeks to only divide people and always wants more power. Always. Their quest for power will only stop/slow the progress towards a secular environment.

If they want to build minarets then fine yes. But let's remember that this is the same group of people that cannot understand freedom of speech and expression and throw a violent protest everytime a cartoon is drawn; no one should be making any compromises to satisfy them and put up with their requirements. I am just trying to point out that in the secularists eager bid to create a equal environment for everybody they are ending up creating a society that is divided into many tribes which in turn are afraid of offending each other/extra sensitive to each other. That imho is not a secular society.

We have all the secular freedoms listed down...but everyone must recognize these freedoms and respect them in a secular society and respect the right of everyone to use these freedoms within

this secular society. So when someone draws a cartoon of a religious figure, there shouldn't be protesting in the streets and death threats to the cartoonist or attempts to kill the cartoonist (this happens all the time). All what this does is hurt the society's chances of being purely secular. We are ending up with a weak society.

So when you give them even more "localized" power (like sharia courts), then we are only making this gap bigger. We are only further strengthening the various tribes inside a society and the secularists end up in a deeper hole than they were in before.

I will put it in another way; for example because there are Muslims and Christians in a biology classroom, the teacher has to be extra sensitive to not offend them (and their creationist tales) while doing his/her job. This shouldn't be the case.

Every group within a society should be tolerant of each other; not just 1 group sucking up, appeasing, and trying to please and accomodate another vicious group. That imo is not secularism.

Churches are not allowed whatsoever in saudi-arabia for instance, but they finance the construction of mosques in europe.

You didnt vote for Geert Wilders, did you?

just trollin'

Naw, Rita Verdonk, she's like a Geert Wilders "Light". I'll probably vote for him this year though, considering he's nr 1 in the polls he can actually get something done now.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 16:07:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SPIKDUM wrote on Wed, 20 January 2010 10:02surth? / surth! wrote on Wed, 20 January 2010 08:42SPIKDUM wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 17:10Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 11:49surth? / surth! wrote on Tue, 19 January 2010 08:45Starbuzz wrote on Mon, 18 January 2010 22:17

Complacency in this matter will only be exploited by the Islamic extremists who are hell-bent on "conquest" of Europe by Islam. Perhaps that's why I am a bit supportive of and applaud the recent Swiss vote to ban minarets from being built in Switzerland. Its a baby step in the right direction. Sometimes you just have to show who's boss...even if it tarnishes the image. Thats not being secular, thats denying people their freedom of religion. the ban on minarets was wrong, and obviously so.

You are very correct there. By banning minarets, I agree that we are denying their freedom of religion and it shouldn't happen in a true secular society. But imo there is a bigger issue...

I am saying it is too early to push for a secular society...when religion is still strong. Religion seeks to only divide people and always wants more power. Always. Their quest for power will only stop/slow the progress towards a secular environment.

If they want to build minarets then fine yes. But let's remember that this is the same group of people that cannot understand freedom of speech and expression and throw a violent protest everytime a cartoon is drawn; no one should be making any compromises to satisfy them and put up with their requirements. I am just trying to point out that in the secularists eager bid to create a equal environment for everybody they are ending up creating a society that is divided into many tribes which in turn are afraid of offending each other/extra sensitive to each other. That imho is not a secular society.

We have all the secular freedoms listed down...but everyone must recognize these freedoms and respect them in a secular society and respect the right of everyone to use these freedoms within this secular society. So when someone draws a cartoon of a religious figure, there shouldn't be protesting in the streets and death threats to the cartoonist or attempts to kill the cartoonist (this happens all the time). All what this does is hurt the society's chances of being purely secular. We are ending up with a weak society.

So when you give them even more "localized" power (like sharia courts), then we are only making this gap bigger. We are only further strengthening the various tribes inside a society and the secularists end up in a deeper hole than they were in before.

I will put it in another way; for example because there are Muslims and Christians in a biology classroom, the teacher has to be extra sensitive to not offend them (and their creationist tales) while doing his/her job. This shouldn't be the case.

Every group within a society should be tolerant of each other; not just 1 group sucking up, appeasing, and trying to please and accomodate another vicious group. That imo is not secularism.

Churches are not allowed whatsoever in saudi-arabia for instance, but they finance the construction of mosques in europe.

You didnt vote for Geert Wilders, did you?

just trollin'

Naw, Rita Verdonk, she's like a Geert Wilders "Light". I'll probably vote for him this year though, considering he's nr 1 in the polls he can actually get something done now.
Hah!

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [archerman](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 20:52:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Wed, 20 January 2010 17:39Try making a blog saying "Islam is a shitty religion, seriously. Also, eating meat is awesome.".

See how long it takes for it to get shut down. That is, if you can even access any blog making sites.

no, the state wont do anything in such a case. I highly doubt you will find an example for this. at least I never heard of such a thing.

I am asking for a solid example. not a groundless assumption.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 20:54:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Please go right ahead and make such a blog then.

We're sure nothing will happen to you either.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [archerman](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 21:11:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Wed, 20 January 2010 22:54Please go right ahead and make such a blog then.

We're sure nothing will happen to you either.

qft

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 21:24:41 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I think you missed my sarcasm.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [archerman](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 21:27:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Wed, 20 January 2010 23:24I think you missed my sarcasm.

I dont think, but know that you have no clue about the political dynamics over here.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 21:34:08 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

BBC - 10/12/09

Unless you're going to accuse my state media of lying (which I can at least do...)

No free media, no YouTube - I reckon they'd more than happily interpret the hypothetical "Islam Sucks" blog as an insult to the state... (If only to keep the peace, but hardly a peace - see the quote by Ben Franklin (IIRC) about liberty and security)

Edit - (Probably) less biased - Wikipedia on human rights in Turkey

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [archerman](#) on Wed, 20 Jan 2010 21:48:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Wed, 20 January 2010 23:34I reckon they'd more than happily interpret the hypothetical "Islam Sucks" blog as an insult to the state.
are you drunk? you have no idea about what you are talking about. if you really think that this is the way how things work over here, you must be really ignorant. please stop posting groundless assumptions.

this is an example of a website you mentioned. and it is still there. I really wonder what kind of irrelevant links will you post here.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 21 Jan 2010 00:18:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There's also all the atrocities your government denies.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Thu, 21 Jan 2010 09:37:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dover wrote on Thu, 21 January 2010 00:18There's also all the atrocities your government denies.

Yep, no response to the fact youtube is blocked (or was as of 10/12/09) and all (and there's a lot of them) the human rights issues in the Wikipedia article...

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Dover](#) on Thu, 21 Jan 2010 10:48:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Unless archerman really believes the Armenian genocide never happened.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [JohnDoe](#) on Thu, 21 Jan 2010 13:12:58 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Turkey is doomed...it's days as a secular state are numbered as the military doesn't have enough support amongst the people to overthrow the government while the latter pisses on Atatürk's grave.

Applaud the Swiss for not giving a fuck about political correctness when it comes to Islam. Any chance of Cameron having the balls to put an end to this appeasement madness? Of all the grand European parties, the Tories should in theory be at the forefront of doing something...it's really puzzling how the situation is worse in the UK than in the supposedly pacifist, dastard Germany.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [SPIKDUM](#) on Thu, 21 Jan 2010 13:39:04 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

http://freethoughtpedia.com/wiki/Laws_and_other_rules_against_atheists_and_agnos_tics

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [slosha](#) on Fri, 22 Jan 2010 18:33:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SPIKDUM wrote on Thu, 21 January 2010 07:39
http://freethoughtpedia.com/wiki/Laws_and_other_rules_against_atheists_and_agnos_tics
It's strange how many of those American laws were established in the first place.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [nikki6ixx](#) on Fri, 22 Jan 2010 18:53:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Ireland has become the latest in the list of countries that have passed stricter

anti-blasphemy legislation in the recent past. In June of 2009, new blasphemy legislation was smuggled into the Irish legal system under the guise of defamation law reform.

Under this proposed law, if a person expresses one belief about gods, and other people think that this insults a different belief about gods, then these people can become outraged, and this outrage can make it illegal for the first person to express his or her beliefs. [13]

Jesus Tap Dancing Christ, are they serious?...

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [CarrierII](#) on Fri, 22 Jan 2010 19:04:14 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Many of them stem from a time where it was more acceptable. A lot of laws are not repealed. I remember reading a case where someone offered to settle a dispute (In the UK) via a "Trial by combat", an old right that is exactly as it sounds.

At any rate, before anyone is led astray - I'm a leader with the Scout Association, and in the UK (And thus it should be the case globally) that there is no such rule preventing athiests becoming Scouts - the guidance reads simply that "Scouts should be aware that there is a spiritual side to life".

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 22 Jan 2010 19:35:36 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

CarrierII wrote on Fri, 22 January 2010 13:04Many of them stem from a time where it was more acceptable.

"more acceptable" as far as religion is concerned, since it was much more powerful at the time and could get away with pretty much anything. thankfully it's lost a lot of its power.

Quote:A lot of laws are not repealed. I remember reading a case where someone offered to settle a dispute (In the UK) via a "Trial by combat", an old right that is exactly as it sounds.
look up the chancel repair law tbh

Quote:At any rate, before anyone is led astray - I'm a leader with the Scout Association, and in the UK (And thus it should be the case globally) that there is no such rule preventing athiests becoming Scouts - the guidance reads simply that "Scouts should be aware that there is a spiritual side to life".
yeah, it's really just in the states. the penn and teller bullshit episode on boyscouts is worth watching imho.

nikki wroteJesus Tap Dancing Christ, are they serious?...

yep. if i may roughly quote pat condell. ireland is a country that has been literally raped by religion, and now they've made a law saying you can't criticise it. talk about stockholm syndrome.

free speech be damned... now the person being spoken to can just decide they're offended and boom, law broken.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [GEORGE ZIMMER](#) on Fri, 22 Jan 2010 19:49:22 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Glock~ wrote on Fri, 22 January 2010 19:33SPIKDUM wrote on Thu, 21 January 2010 07:39
http://freethoughtpedia.com/wiki/Laws_and_other_rules_against_atheists_and_agnostics
It's strange how any of those American laws were established in the first place.
What's hilarious is that they're still in heavily Democrat states (you know, the ones that are apparently not religious nazis, unlike those evil nasty Republicans)

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [slosha](#) on Fri, 22 Jan 2010 20:22:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)


GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 22 January 2010 13:49Glock~ wrote on Fri, 22 January 2010 19:33SPIKDUM wrote on Thu, 21 January 2010 07:39
http://freethoughtpedia.com/wiki/Laws_and_other_rules_against_atheists_and_agnostics
It's strange how any of those American laws were established in the first place.
What's hilarious is that they're still in heavily Democrat states (you know, the ones that are apparently not religious nazis, unlike those evil nasty Republicans)

FreeThoughtAll laws against atheists holding office were ruled unconstitutional and unenforceable by the 1961 Supreme Court case Torcaso v. Watkins on a first amendment basis

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [SPIKDUM](#) on Fri, 22 Jan 2010 22:02:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

File Attachments

1) [1264085759168.png](#), downloaded 404 times



Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Dover](#) on Sat, 23 Jan 2010 08:30:56 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

GEORGE ZIMMER wrote on Fri, 22 January 2010 11:49Glock~ wrote on Fri, 22 January 2010 19:33SPIKDUM wrote on Thu, 21 January 2010 07:39

http://freethoughtpedia.com/wiki/Laws_and_other_rules_against_atheists_and_agnostics

It's strange how many of those American laws were established in the first place.

What's hilarious is that they're still in heavily Democrat states (you know, the ones that are apparently not religious nazis, unlike those evil nasty Republicans)

Apart from Texas, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Arkansas (All very heavy Republican states), the others are all amongst the original 13 colonies, which means the laws likely originated from a time before either party existed, and every politician was an evil nasty religious nut by today's standards. I don't see what you're trying to observe here.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 23 Jan 2010 17:44:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Anybody care to look up the figures on elected officials who are atheists or agnostics... or, for that matter, anything besides Christians or Jews? Up until only a few decades ago, even Jewish politicians would have been in for a hell of a fight trying to get elected anywhere in the US. If anybody's taken their history lessons on this side of the pond, they'll recall that John F Kennedy's religion (Catholic) was a major issue during his election. Plenty of people opposed the guy just because he wasn't a Protestant Christian.

Good luck ever putting a non-Christian of any flavor in the Oval Office. Religion is a heavy unwritten requirement to hold the office of President. Should it be? Fuck no. Yet there are enough people out there who would oppose any non-religious candidate on the grounds that he (or she, to be fair) would "destroy the moral fabric of the nation." The US doesn't have an established religion, huh? Please. We just don't have it in (Federal) writing. What do our elected officials swear on when they take office? A Bible. What do witnesses swear on before testifying in court? A Bible. Just in the past century, "In God We Trust" was put on all our currency. The Pledge of Allegiance was rewritten to include "under God." When somebody makes a public stink and asks for either to be changed back, the media reports the issue as if the way it is now is the way it has always been.

Bottom line, religious freedom in the US is marginal at best. You're free to believe what you want, but unless you believe what the majority wants you'll never be elected, and you'd better not have a problem with swearing to God either. With regards to any essential freedom, the freedom from something is just as important as the freedom to it. If the majority decides not to elect a politician on the basis of their beliefs, that is their right (which doesn't make it right that they do so, but that's a different thread). However, all too often the politicians who do get elected then go on to write policies and laws which favor one religion over another, and that simply isn't right.

Rant done. I'm outta this thread before the real flaming starts.

Subject: Re: Secular democracy
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 23 Jan 2010 18:44:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

SS wroteAny chance of Cameron having the balls to put an end to this appeasement madness? Of all the grand European parties, the tories should in theory be at the forefront of doing something...

no, the only notable british political party who takes islam seriously is the BNP, who are a racist party. i did consider voting for them in the past - their policies are better than labour and the tories' - but i can't bring myself to.

Quote:it's really puzzling how the situation is worse in the UK than in the supposedly pacifist, dastard Germany.

well, seems like modern german politicians would do anything they could to avoid thinking that they're persecuting a religious minority.

Nukelt15 wrote on Sat, 23 January 2010 11:44 Anybody care to look up the figures on elected officials who are atheists or agnostics... or, for that matter, anything besides Christians or Jews? i remember reading a while ago that there was a grand total of one man in congress (california i think) who is openly atheist.

Quote:Up until only a few decades ago, even Jewish politicians would have been in for a hell of a fight trying to get elected anywhere in the US. If anybody's taken their history lessons on this side of the pond, they'll recall that John F Kennedy's religion (Catholic) was a major issue during his election. Plenty of people opposed the guy just because he wasn't a Protestant Christian.
yeah, i knew that.

Quote:Good luck ever putting a non-Christian of any flavor in the Oval Office. Religion is a heavy unwritten requirement to hold the office of President. Should it be? Fuck no. Yet there are enough people out there who would oppose any non-religious candidate on the grounds that he (or she, to be fair) would "destroy the moral fabric of the nation." The US doesn't have an established religion, huh? Please. We just don't have it in (Federal) writing. What do our elected officials swear on when they take office? A Bible. What do witnesses swear on before testifying in court? A Bible. Just in the past century, "In God We Trust" was put on all our currency. The Pledge of Allegiance was rewritten to include "under God." When somebody makes a public stink and asks for either to be changed back, the media reports the issue as if the way it is now is the way it has always been.
entirely true; i've said all this myself.

Quote:and you'd better not have a problem with swearing to God either.
there was a british guy, an atheist - i forget his name - elected to the house of commons who objected to taking the british MP oath since it swears to the christian god. he was basically told that he had to say it. i find this rather ridiculous... religious people would rather have an atheist swear an oath he doesn't mean, than make an honest oath.

i keep hearing about british politicians saying how they must always remember that they're accountable to a "higher power" (usually when they're caught fucking up, e.g. expenses scandal). i feel like slapping them. yes, they are answerable to a power that put them there... their constituents.
