

Re: TOBS: WDDK

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.anthropology.paleo/2004-10/0254.html>

From: Spartacus (*J_at_rogers.com*)

Date: 10/05/04

Date: Tue, 5 Oct 2004 04:58:26 -0400

>
> *No, but the lens on a camera my age still work through a full range
> of focus, while the lenses in my eyes do not and require correction
> with auxiliary lenses.*

I too need correctional lenses... Your eyes distinguish depth preception via a three dimensional image. Cameras produce a flat two dimensional rendition. Technology comes from our copying or duplicating (where possible) things that occure naturally but not always as efficiantly. i.e. birds don't need air ports or runways... Those with eye afflictions don't represent the average. Film has a specific ISO rating. Your eyes adapt over a wide range of ISO to accomodate fpr either light or darkness.

>
> > *I'm on to your snake pit tactics*
> > *anyway... Whatever I say will be wrong so you may be right,*
>
> *No, you can be right too.*
> *You haven't bothered to be so far, but you have the choice.*

That's cuz you don't facts when they're presented to you! Why would I lie? Plus you make hasty decisions about what kind of person you think I am.

>
> > *at the expence*
> > *of others, naturally! You're not hear to enlighten anyone but to argue
your
> > own, private, case*
>
> *Private case? I argue for truth. I post majority opinions here.*
> *It is you who argue for the nut fringe!*

The "nut fringe" line seems to vary from time to time. I came here to have my belief in God and His son reconfirmed and established, in good faith! It's not enough that Winesses and Ex-Witnesses might argue amongst themselves, but you have to

further compound the issue by slopping all over The Bible! I haven't been allotted the time to banter indefinitely... Or maybe I just don't value being so right all the time as consistently as you do. At least I don't go to a Mechanic and tell him I have Drywall experience! I look for reasons to bring people together. You look for reasons to divide and separate them. I'd encourage but you belittle. Start tayloring your posts in the appropriate NGs and then talk to me about nut fringes...

>

> > *as some Internet vigil anti seeking to dominate and destroy!*

>

> *Well it is an internet vigil in a way. I'm a vigilante against*

> *Creationist lies and fundamentalist theology.*

Knowing the fundamentals can get you places. That's a step up from blind acceptance!
It's not what's taught in The Bible that's at question here. It's how the GB uses it against its own people... Some of the best minds today stand by creationism in unlocking secrets they were incapable of understanding unless they "do" look at it that way...
I'm all for innovation and progress, but the unknown produces fear and apprehension that do tend to impede these things necessary for our greater understanding.
The road to your future is costly as well and paved with better intentions than arguing over who owns the grappling hook...

>

> > *But one more : "Latch Key Kid" seeking power from outside your building...*

>

> *Your metaphor escapes me.*

Does it really? There are boundaries everywhere! If you wish to voice anything contrary, the majority must understand you fully conceive the full picture and apparently you do not.
Probably because you've never been a Witness and are coming from way off in left field!
This isn't an anti-creationism NG... That's not what we're here to discuss...

>

> > *Only your arrogance precedes the poison someone will one day serve you*

> > *with your coffee... I have very little time for young Nazis from the skin*

- > *> head club or your kind of slop, crossposted from various other holes spitting out*
- > *> square pegs... Obviously, you and your worm collection are in the wrong*
- > *> place!*
- >
- > *Invective makes for inadequate rebuttal.*
- > *Try addressing the points I made instead of blustering.*

I don't have to do anything you tell me to do... I'm over 18 and make my own decisions.
You speak of Man made conclusions you draw from Man made theories passed down to other men who also seek to further intrench them, in an NG that should be devoted to spiritual refinements... Hello? You're in the wrong NG!

- >
- > *> This isn't : "The Daily Planet!" Do you suspect you or your big group of*
- > *> cycle sluts and juveniles will ever grow up? That would be like trying to*
- > *get a*
- > *> horse to squat on a toilet.... You wanna come from Apes? You proved it*
- > *to me!*
- >
- > *When things are proven to you, as in the previous posts, you resort to*
- > *libel and invective. That's hardly encouragement for honest debate.*

I'm not "resorting"... I'm purposefully going there! Honestly, I don't want to debate death by natural selection as an alternative to death by disfellowshipping. It would negate my reasons for coming here in the first place. We're talking about issues between people and your talking about issues between hip bones and think this gives president for debate?

- >
- > *But that's OK, I've provoked you into showing your true colors. When*
- > *defeated in argument, cuss and insult, that's your style.*

"slop" isn't a cuss or an insult in the context I used it... I left it undefined in your case. My style?
Who's claiming victory for an arguement that isn't being waged? Who's drawing all kinds of conclusions about what I believe or do not before they even know me? Who generalizes about all Witnesses that learned good intentions that come from The Bible, misapplied to them and those shunned by such generalizations? What about what they've been through or are going through that has little to do with large, bipedal hips? "Oh, I know! I'll tell them we come from Apes and The Bible really sucks! That should convince them!" You couldn't be farther

from your : "truth"
if you busied yourself throwing stones at ocean liners. Fact is, apes will
be apes and humans will
be humans though huh? "Hey Witnesses! Look over here at us Apostates tellin
you the Bible's
full of #@\$&!" Great approach John... I can see you really thought this
out...

>

> ## *Controversy is only dreaded by the advocates of error.*

This assumes if something were correct, it would spur no controversy which
can over turn something
whether it's correct or not, or we wouldn't pollute our air and water...
Being correct isn't always the
point then. We see the same words via different perspectives suitable to our
particular pursuits in life.
That doesn't make it right or wrong, only suitable for the user. It's what
we believe that becomes
reality. What we call "the present" is strictly a transitory state mutable
to a positive future by those
willing to share a combined and co-ordinated effort toward its inception.
Most findings are widely
publized on The Internet right now. If they're there, why do you need to
prove them? Why aren't
you looking for what's right about what people believe for a practice
application instead of always
trying to reinvent the wheel? Where's the spiritual application of what you
advocate?

>