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WE KILL CHILDREN

(HIS WEB SITE IS "WEKILLCHILDREN.ORG")

THIS EMAIL CAME AS A RESPONSE TO ONE THAT I SENT, WHERE I HAD MADE A COUPLE OF CRITICISMS OF A WEB SITE THAT I HAD MEANT TO BE TAKEN AS "CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISM." AS YOU WILL SEE, HE DIDN'T TAKE IT IN THE SPIRIT IN WHICH IT WAS INTENDED. AS YOU WILL ALSO SEE ... NEITHER DID I.

HIS REPLY BEGINS:

Hello Neo,

Thank you for the comments.

Much appreciated.

Regarding this:

The same is true of your pictures.

An honest presentation would show the collection of cells as they are

at the time of most abortions.

In those cases, they wouldn't appear human

and therefore would not evoke the emotional response you are looking for.

That is called "Appeal to Emotion."

Though the first picture looks pretty young, the next two look like full-term.

They look like little kids huddled up inside the womb.

Since those kinds of abortions are rare,

and usually only done when the mother's life is in jeopardy,

it is misleading to give readers the impression that they represent abortion.

Well... to begin:

http://sites.google.com/site/wekillchildren/yes-it-should-be-legal-to-kill-children/up-to-4th-week

You suggest this is not an "honest presentation". I find this highly interesting. There can be nothing on that page that I can see as dishonest.

(JEFF, AS I SAID, I DIDN'T EXPECT YOU TO AGREE).

Further, your suggesting that I'm appealing to emotion and that this is bad is worth discussing. I'm showing actual factual images of the developmental stages of the children that are being killed.

(JEFF, AS I STATED, THE "ACTUAL FACTUAL IMAGES" OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL STAGES OF THE FETUSES THAT ARE BEING KILLED HAVE BEEN SELECTIVELY CHOSEN ON YOUR HOME PAGE TO FOCUS ON NEARLY FULL-TERM FETUSES. I SEE NO PICTURES OF FETUSES IN THE EARLY STAGES OF DEVELOPMENT WHEN MOST ABORTIONS ARE PERFORMED.

THEY DO APPEAR ON ANOTHER PAGE AT YOUR SITE, BUT CASUAL VISITORS ARE NOT LIKELY TO SEARCH YOUR ENTIRE SITE TO FIND THEM AND I THINK YOU KNOW THIS.

SINCE YOU CONTINUE TO AVOID THAT ISSUE, IT IS CLEAR THAT YOU HAVE NO ANSWER FOR IT; AND THE REASON YOU HAVE NO ANSWER FOR IT IS BECAUSE IT IS TRUE ... AS PROVEN BY YOUR HOME PAGE).

How is this an "appeal to emotion" in the logically fallacious sense?

See: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Appeal\_to\_emotion

(THANKS FOR THE LINK JEFF, I'LL MAKE SURE TO CHECK IT OUT SOMETIME.

I ALREADY EXPLAINED TO YOU WHY YOUR SITE RELIES ON "APPEAL TO EMOTION." IF YOU NEED TO REFRESH YOUR MEMORY, YOU CAN REREAD MY FIRST EMAIL).

I find this interesting. Very interesting actually. Showing images of what we are discussing is an appeal to emotion?

(JEFF, SHOWING IMAGES, BY THEMSELVES, DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN APPEAL TO EMOTION; IT IS YOUR CHOICE OF IMAGES THAT YOU INCLUDED, IN COMBINATION WITH THE ONES YOU CHOSE NOT TO INCLUDE, THAT MAKES YOUR SITE RELIANT ON AN APPEAL TO EMOTION).

If I were to claim, "It is wrong to stick a large metal skewer through Neo's head and kill him" would it be an appeal to emotion to show a picture of a rock, a cockroach, a dog, and Neo and simply point to you and say, "This one is Neo"???

Hmmmm.... so very interesting.

(ACTUALLY NO JEFF. THAT WASN'T INTERESTING, JUST CHILDISH.

IT IS OBVIOUS THAT YOU ARE A VERY YOUNG PERSON;

ONE WHO THINKS THAT HE IS MUCH SMARTER THAN HE REALLY IS).

Regarding "those kinds of abortions are rare", this is awfully heartless in my opinion given the context.

(JEFF, THAT'S YOUR ARGUMENT?

WHEN YOU HAVEN'T GOT AN ANSWER, THE BEST YOU CAN DO IS ATTACK THE OTHER PERSON AS - HEARTLESS?

SINCE YOU HAVE DEMONSTRATED THAT YOU DO KNOW WHERE TO FIND LOGICAL FALLACIES ON THE WEB, I SUGGEST YOU GO BACK TO THAT SITE AND LOOK UP THE "RED HERRING" FALLACY. IT IS A DISTRACTION TECHNIQUE USED BY THOSE WHO CANNOT DEFEND A POSITION, AND SO THEY ATTEMPT TO DRAW ATTENTION ELSEWHERE; FOR INSTANCE, BY ACCUSING SOMEONE OF A MORAL LACK - AS YOU HAVE JUST DONE).

Defining whether something is right or wrong based upon numerical comparisons may be a natural knee jerk reaction, but I don't believe it is sound reasoning.

(JEFF, THEN MAYBE YOU SHOULDN'T HAVE USED IT FROM THE TOP, ALL THE WAY DOWN TO THE BOTTOM OF YOUR WEB PAGE; SEE:

"HTTP://WEKILLCHILDREN.ORG" CLICK ON "UP-TO-4TH-WEEK."

I COUNT AT LEAST 10 INSTANCES WHERE YOU RELY ON NUMERICAL COMPARISONS TO SUPPORT YOUR POSITION.

THAT'S AN AWFUL LOT OF KNEE-JERKING, DUDE).

Again using the "large metal skewer through Neo's head" example, sticking a skewer through a guy named Neo's head would certainly be a rare thing, 1 in 6,000,000,000 plus people actually. So, I guess it is insignificant. Yes or no? I venture to say you'd say this rare event is of great importance despite its numerical insignificance.

(JEFF, I REALLY HOPE YOU ARE VERY YOUNG BECAUSE AT LEAST THEN YOU WOULD HAVE AN EXCUSE FOR YOUR CHILDISHNESS. THE SCARY THING IS THAT YOU MIGHT ACTUALLY BE AN OLD DUDE WHO JUST NEVER GREW UP).

Pointing out numbers is a trap many fall into.

(YOU SHOULD KNOW JEFF; SEE:

"HTTP://WEKILLCHILDREN.ORG" CLICK ON "UP-TO-4TH-WEEK."

YOU'RE NOT EVEN AWARE WHEN YOU CROSS YOURSELF UP, ARE YOU?

I'M SURE YOU HAVE A NIFTY LITTLE EXCUSE FOR WHY IT'S OKAY FOR YOU TO DO, WHAT YOU CRITICIZE OTHERS FOR DOING).

Facts are facts, and important to talk about, thus my website info.

(WELL JEFF, HERE'S ANOTHER FACT THAT YOU DON'T WANT TO FACE:

YOU GOT KICKED OFF BLOGTALK, MOST LIKELY BECAUSE OF YOUR BLATANT APPEALS TO EMOTION. THOUGH SKEPTICS BELIEVE THAT EVEN PEOPLE LIKE YOU SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO SPEW YOUR BELIEFS, THE PEOPLE WHO RUN BLOGTALK APPARENTLY DON'T.

SO I'M NOT THE ONLY ONE WHO SEES A PROBLEM WITH YOUR ONE-SIDED PRESENTATION.

NOW YOU CAN ALSO LOOK UP "IN DENIAL").

But, rightness/wrongness by the numbers seems odd.

(JEFF, YOU DIDN'T THINK IT WAS SO ODD WHEN YOU CREATED YOUR WEBPAGE; SEE:

"HTTP://WEKILLCHILDREN.ORG" CLICK ON "UP-TO-4TH-WEEK.").

The good news: You may already be in agreement with me regarding this sad state of affairs... So... sorry if I'm bombarding you. Please don't take this wrong. It is the way I communicate. Many find the way I dialogue unacceptable and refuse to continue. Given your background, I'm guessing we don't have to be soft with each other.

(AS YOU MAY HAVE NOTICED JEFF, SOFT ISN'T MY STYLE).

Lastly, you say this: "those kinds of abortions are rare, and usually only done when the mother's life is in jeopardy" this is your claim, so I'd like to see you support it.

(JEFF, MANY SITES PROVIDE STATISTICS THAT SHOW THAT ABORTION AFTER 21 WEEKS IS THE RAREST OF ALL ABORTIONS (1.4%). IF YOU WISH TO ARGUE OVER THE MEANING OF THE WORD "RARE" - BE MY GUEST.

AS FOR THE MOTHER'S LIFE BEING IN JEOPARDY, THAT WAS ONE OF THE REASONS WHY LATE TERM ABORTION IS DONE, BUT YOU ARE CORRECT IN THAT IT IS NOT THE ONLY ONE).

Please give a link to a study on children killed late in the pregnancy where the majority are for the reason you claim. I know of none, so I'd be interested.

(JEFF, NOW THAT IS INTERESTING. YOU ARE HEAVILY INVOLVED IN RESEARCHING ABORTION AND YET YOU CLAIM TO KNOW OF NO CASE WHERE A WOMAN HAS HAD AN ABORTION IN ORDER TO SAVE HER LIFE?

ALL YOU HAVE TO DO IS GO BACK A FEW WEEKS AND LOOK UP THE STORY OF THE NUN WHO WAS FIRED FOR PERMITTING AN ABORTION IN ORDER TO SAVE THE MOTHER'S LIFE AT A CATHOLIC HOSPITAL (GOOGLE: "NUN FIRED ABORTION"). YOU OF ALL PEOPLE SHOULD HAVE BEEN AWARE OF THAT STORY.

IT'S HARD FOR ME TO BELIEVE THAT YOU 1) DIDN'T KNOW ABOUT IT, OR 2) DON'T KNOW OF ANY CASES WHERE THAT HAS HAPPENED.

IN FACT, I AM SO SURE THAT YOU COULD NOT POSSIBLY BE AS IGNORANT AS YOU ARE PRETENDING TO BE - THAT I AM GOING TO CALL YOU A LIAR).

I've only come across studies that say otherwise.

(JEFF, THAT'S CALLED "CONFIRMATION BIAS" (AND YES, IT IS ANOTHER LOGICAL FALLACY). YOU CAN FIND IT A FEW ENTRIES BEFORE "APPEAL TO EMOTION."

YOU KNOW JEFF, YOUR LOGIC COULD MELT THE EARS OFF MR. SPOCK).

Looking forward to that information. Something which verifies something approximately like "those kinds" are "usually" done when "the mother's life is in jeopardy".

(JEFF, WE COULD TRADE "LINKS" BACK AND FORTH ALL DAY LONG AND IT WOULDN'T DO ANY GOOD. PEOPLE LIKE YOU ONLY ACCEPT DATA THAT AGREES WITH WHAT YOU ALREADY BELIEVE. ANY EVIDENCE WHICH CONTRADICTS WHAT YOU WANT TO BE TRUE IS SIMPLY DISCARDED. THAT IS PROVEN BY YOUR CLAIM TO HAVE NEVER HEARD OF AN ABORTION DONE TO SAVE THE LIFE OF THE MOTHER.

JEFF,

I ONLY WANTED TO FIND OUT WHY YOU LEFT TALKSHOE.

TRADING LOGIC WITH SOMEONE LIKE YOU, WHO IS UNARMED, WHILE FUN, IS TIME CONSUMING. AS MUCH AS I ENJOYED LAYING WASTE TO YOUR FEEBLE ATTEMPTS TO JOUST USING LOGIC SKILLS YOU DO NOT POSSESS, I'M AFRAID I SIMPLY HAVE TOO MANY OTHER FISH TO FRY).

neo.

NOTE FOR THE AUDIENCE:

IF YOU GO TO HIS WEBSITE "WEKILLCHILDREN.ORG," YOU WILL SEE THAT JEFF DEVOTES MUCH OF HIS HOMEPAGE TO TRY TO CONVINCE VISITORS THAT FETUSES SHOULD BE THOUGHT OF AS "CHILDREN."

HE LISTS HALF A DOZEN DEFINITIONS FOR THE WORD "CHILD." WHY DOES HE DO THAT WHEN ONE DEFINITION IS WHAT ANY NORMAL PERSON WOULD HAVE WRITTEN? WELL LET'S LOOK AT HIS LIST AND THE REASON WHY HE DID THIS SHOULD BECOME OBVIOUS.

YOU'LL NOTICE THAT HIS FIRST 4 DEFINITIONS REFER ALMOST ENTIRELY TO FETUSES. HAVING FIRMLY PLANTED IN YOUR MIND, THROUGH REPETITION, THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE WORDS 'FETUS' AND 'CHILD', HE THEN GIVES 2 DEFINITIONS FOR 'CHILD' THAT REFER ONLY TO YOUNG HUMANS: NOW HIS MANIPULATION IS COMPLETE.

SEE HOW SLICK IT WAS: A = B AND B = C THEREFORE A = C (FETUSES = YOUNG HUMANS).

HIS GOAL IS TO GET VISITORS TO VIEW FETUSES AS LAUGHING, PLAYING, LOVING LITTLE BOYS AND GIRLS (WHICH IS WHAT THEY COULD BECOME) RATHER THAN FETUSES (WHICH IS WHAT THEY ACTUALLY ARE).

THESE KINDS OF NAZI BRAINWASHING TECHNIQUES WORK WELL ON THE DEVOUTLY RELIGIOUS AND THE TERMINALLY IGNORANT. THEY DON'T WORK SO WELL ON CRITICAL THINKERS TRAINED TO SPOT THESE DISHONEST KINDS OF TACTICS.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

THE SCIENCE SEGMENT

LARGE STUDY SHOWS FEMALES ARE EQUAL TO MALES IN MATH SKILLS

THE MATHEMATICAL SKILLS OF BOYS AND GIRLS, AS WELL AS MEN AND WOMEN, ARE SUBSTANTIALLY EQUAL, ACCORDING TO A NEW EXAMINATION OF EXISTING STUDIES IN THE CURRENT ONLINE EDITION OF JOURNAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL BULLETIN.

CHIEF AUTHOR JANET HYDE, A PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY AND WOMEN'S STUDIES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN AT MADISON SAYS ONE PORTION OF THE NEW STUDY LOOKED SYSTEMATICALLY AT 242 ARTICLES THAT ASSESSED THE MATH SKILLS OF 1,286,350 PEOPLE.

THESE STUDIES, ALL PUBLISHED IN ENGLISH BETWEEN 1990 AND 2007, LOOKED AT PEOPLE FROM GRADE SCHOOL TO COLLEGE AND BEYOND. A SECOND PORTION OF THE NEW STUDY EXAMINED THE RESULTS OF SEVERAL LARGE, LONG-TERM SCIENTIFIC STUDIES, INCLUDING THE NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS.

IN BOTH CASES, HYDE SAYS, THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE TWO SEXES WAS SO CLOSE AS TO BE MEANINGLESS.

SARA LINDBERG, NOW A POSTDOCTORAL FELLOW IN WOMEN'S HEALTH AT THE UNIVERSITY WISCONSIN AT MADISON SCHOOL OF MEDICINE AND PUBLIC HEALTH, WAS THE PRIMARY AUTHOR OF THE META-ANALYSIS IN PSYCHOLOGICAL BULLETIN.

HYDE ADDS THAT THE IDEA THAT BOTH GENDERS HAVE EQUAL MATH ABILITIES IS WIDELY ACCEPTED AMONG SOCIAL SCIENTISTS, BUT WORD HAS BEEN SLOW TO REACH TEACHERS AND PARENTS, WHO CAN PLAY A NEGATIVE ROLE BY GUIDING GIRLS AWAY FROM MATH-HEAVY SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING. HYDE SAID, "ONE REASON I AM STILL SPENDING TIME ON THIS IS BECAUSE PARENTS AND TEACHERS CONTINUE TO HOLD STEREOTYPES THAT BOYS ARE BETTER IN MATH, AND THAT CAN HAVE A TREMENDOUS IMPACT ON INDIVIDUAL GIRLS WHO ARE TOLD TO STAY AWAY FROM ENGINEERING OR THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES BECAUSE 'GIRLS CAN'T DO THE MATH.'"

SCIENTISTS NOW KNOW THAT STEREOTYPES AFFECT PERFORMANCE. HYDE SAID, "THERE IS LOTS OF EVIDENCE THAT WHAT WE CALL 'STEREOTYPE THREAT' CAN HOLD WOMEN BACK IN MATH. IF, BEFORE A TEST, YOU IMPLY THAT THE WOMEN SHOULD EXPECT TO DO A LITTLE WORSE THAN THE MEN, THAT HURTS PERFORMANCE. IT'S A SELF-FULFILLING PROPHECY.

(JANET: IF WOMEN'S PERFORMANCE HAS BEEN NEGATIVELY AFFECTED BY STEREOTYPE THREAT, WHY THEN DO THEY PERFORM AT A LEVEL EQUAL TO MEN?).

HYDE SAID, "PARENTS AND TEACHERS GIVE LITTLE IMPLICIT MESSAGES ABOUT HOW GOOD THEY EXPECT KIDS TO BE AT DIFFERENT SUBJECTS, AND THAT POWERFULLY AFFECTS THEIR SELF-CONCEPT OF THEIR ABILITY. WHEN YOU ARE DECIDING ABOUT A MAJOR IN PHYSICS, THIS CAN BECOME A HUGE FACTOR."

(JANET: AND YET THAT FACTOR DID NOT SHOW UP IN THE DATA, AND AS YOU HAVE POINTED OUT, WOMEN PERFORMED AS WELL AS MEN).

HYDE HOPES THE NEW RESULTS WILL SLOW THE TREND TOWARD SINGLE-SEX SCHOOLS, WHICH ARE SOMETIMES JUSTIFIED ON THE BASIS OF DIFFERENTIAL MATH SKILLS. IT MAY ALSO AFFECT STANDARDIZED TESTS, WHICH GAINED CLOUT WITH THE PASSAGE OF NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND, AND TEND TO EMPHASIZE LOWER-LEVEL MATH SKILLS SUCH AS MULTIPLICATION. HIGH-STAKES TESTING REALLY NEEDS TO INCLUDE HIGHER-LEVEL PROBLEM-SOLVING, WHICH TENDS TO BE MORE IMPORTANT IN JOBS THAT REQUIRE MATH SKILLS. BUT BECAUSE MANY TEACHERS TEACH TO THE TEST, THEY WILL NOT TEACH HIGHER REASONING UNLESS THE TESTS START TO INCLUDE IT.

THE NEW FINDINGS REINFORCE A RECENT STUDY THAT RANKED GENDER DEAD LAST AMONG NINE FACTORS, INCLUDING PARENTAL EDUCATION, FAMILY INCOME, AND SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS, IN INFLUENCING THE MATH PERFORMANCE OF 10-YEAR-OLDS.

HYDE ACKNOWLEDGES THAT WOMEN HAVE MADE SIGNIFICANT ADVANCES IN TECHNICAL FIELDS. HALF OF MEDICAL SCHOOL STUDENTS ARE FEMALE, AS ARE 48 PERCENT OF UNDERGRADUATE MATH MAJORS AND SHE ASKS, "IF WOMEN CAN'T DO MATH, HOW ARE THEY GETTING THESE MAJORS?"

(AND A BIGGER QUESTION JANET, IS, HOW ARE THEY DOING IT WHEN THE STEREOTYPE THREAT YOU MENTIONED SHOULD BE KEEPING THEM DOWN?).

HYDE SAID, BECAUSE PROGRESS IN PHYSICS AND ENGINEERING IS MUCH SLOWER, WE HAVE LOTS OF WORK TO DO. "THIS PERSISTENT STEREOTYPING DISADVANTAGES GIRLS.

(JANET, NOT ACCORDING TO THE CONCLUSION OF YOUR META ANALYSIS.

IT WOULD ONLY BE DISADVANTAGING THEM IF YOU COULD SHOW THAT WITHOUT STEREOTYPING THEY WOULD HAVE OUTPERFORMED MALES).

MY MESSAGE TO PARENTS IS THAT THEY SHOULD HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THEIR DAUGHTER'S MATH PERFORMANCE. THEY NEED TO REALIZE THAT WOMEN CAN DO MATH JUST AS WELL AS MEN. THESE CHANGES WILL ENCOURAGE WOMEN TO PURSUE OCCUPATIONS THAT REQUIRE LOTS OF MATH."

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

RELIGION

TO: JEREMY BAILEY

FROM: NEO

Free speech..free will, I'm big on it all.

(JEREMY, YOUR STATEMENT,

"PLEASE LEAVE YOUR IGNORANT IDEAS TO YOURSELF IN THE FUTURE!"

IS THE PROOF THAT YOU ONLY GRANT THE RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH TO YOURSELF - NOT TO OTHERS.

IF YOU ARE A CHRISTIAN YOU COULD NOT POSSIBLY BELIEVE IN FREE WILL. SINCE YOU BELIEVE THAT GOD KNOWS EVERYTHING THAT IS EVER GOING TO HAPPEN, ANY CHOICE YOU THINK YOU ARE MAKING HAS ALREADY BEEN DECIDED; THEREFORE, YOUR CHOICE IS MERELY AN ILLUSION.

IN ADDITION, IF YOU ACTUALLY OPENED YOUR BIBLE AND READ WHAT IT SAYS YOU MIGHT STUMBLE UPON THESE VERSES IN EPHESIANS 1:

4 "ACCORDING AS HE HATH CHOSEN US IN HIM BEFORE THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD, THAT WE SHOULD BE HOLY AND WITHOUT BLAME BEFORE HIM IN LOVE:

5 HAVING PREDESTINATED US UNTO THE ADOPTION OF CHILDREN BY JESUS CHRIST TO HIMSELF, ACCORDING TO THE GOOD PLEASURE OF HIS WILL,"

BY THE WAY, THERE ARE A DOZEN MORE VERSES SCATTERED THROUGHOUT THE BIBLE JUST LIKE THESE. NO CHRISTIAN BELIEVES IN FREE WILL AND THE PROOF IS IN YOUR OWN SCRIPTURES.

THAT MAKES 2 DISHONEST CLAIMS JUST IN YOUR OPENING STATEMENT).

As for me, I am not living in fear, so you saying that makes no sense.

(JEREMY, SINCE YOU BELIEVE THAT DISBELIEF WILL RESULT IN ETERNAL TORTURE, THAT PROVES YOU ARE LIVING IN FEAR. THE FACT THAT YOU REFUSE TO ADMIT IT - IS IRRELEVANT.

NO HUMAN ON EARTH COULD NOT BE AFRAID OF TORTURE - NOT EVEN FOR ONE MINUTE, MUCH LESS AN ETERNITY.

3 FOR 3. YOU ARE BATTING 1.000 IN THE DISHONESTY DEPARTMENT).

You must be scared that you are not in control.

(JEREMY, HOW DO YOU FIGURE YOU ARE IN CONTROL OF ANYTHING WHEN EVERY MOVE YOU MAKE IS CONTROLLED BY AN INVISIBLE GHOST?)

Its okay to be scared, and perfectly natural.

(JEREMY, I WOULDN'T KNOW. I DON'T HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT INVISIBLE, IMAGINARY GHOSTS FOLLOWING ME EVERYWHERE, WAITING FOR ME TO MAKE A MISTAKE SO THEY CAN TORTURE ME FOREVER. BUT IT IS EASY TO SEE WHY YOU ARE).

I don't know what your little temper tantrum about a condom was about, but lets not type things that we wouldnt say to each others faces. I think face to face would be a regrettable experience for you.

(JEREMY, YOU GHOST-WORSHIPPERS ALWAYS RESORT TO THREATS: HOW PREDICTIBLE.

INTERNET CREEPS, LIKE YOU, WHO BRAG ABOUT HOW TOUGH THEY ARE, ALWAYS TURN OUT TO BE ABOUT 135 POUNDS OF PIMPLES AND ADAM'S APPLE. BUT THREATS ARE ALL YOU CHRISTIANS HAVE SINCE YOU DON'T HAVE A SINGLE SHRED OF EVIDENCE FOR ANYTHING YOU BELIEVE).

By the way, my ghost in the sky is Alive and well!

(JEREMY, THAT MUST BE WHY WE HAVEN'T HEARD FROM HIM IN 2,000 YEARS. HE USED TO HAVE THE ENERGY TO APPEAR AS A BURNING BUSH - NOW HE CAN BARELY MANAGE TO SHOW HIMSELF IN A BOWL OF CHEERIOS).

How happy can your life possibly be?

(JEREMY, THAT IS SOMETHING YOU WILL NEVER KNOW. PEOPLE WHO ARE TERRIFIED OF INVISIBLE GHOSTS WHO THEY BELIEVE ARE CAPABLE OF INHUMAN TORTURE, COULD NOT EVEN CONCEIVE OF WHAT IT IS LIKE TO LIVE WITHOUT THAT FEAR. I WOULD HAVE MORE LUCK EXPLAINING ALGEBRA TO MY CAT THAN TRYING TO GET YOU TO UNDERSTAND THE FREEDOM AND HAPPINESS THAT NONBELIEVERS EXPERIENCE).

No faith, you know that in the back of your mind you aren't fullfilled or happy.

(JEREMY, FAITH IS BELIEF IN THE ABSENCE OF EVIDENCE. IF I BELIEVED ANYTHING ON FAITH - THEN - THE BACK OF MY MIND WOULD BE UNHAPPY. WHAT MAKES ME HAPPY IS KNOWING THAT EVERYTHING I BELIEVE IS BASED ON EVIDENCE - IN YOUR CASE, NOTHING IS).

I suppose your rebuttal will be aggrivated.

(JEREMY, YOU WILL TAKE MY REBUTTAL ANY WAY YOU WANT; JUST LIKE YOU UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE TO MEAN ANYTHING YOU WANT IT TO MEAN. HERE IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE RATIONAL MIND (THAT WOULD BE ME) AND THE IRRATIONAL (THAT WOULD BE YOU):

RATIONAL MIND:

"HERE ARE THE FACTS - WHAT CONCLUSION CAN I DRAW FROM THEM?"

IRRATIONAL MIND:

"I HAVE THE CONCLUSION - WHAT FACTS CAN I FIND TO SUPPORT IT?").

Do you believe in extinction, evolution, global warming?

(JEREMY, THOSE ARE ALL PROVEN FACTS. MY BELIEF IN THEM IS BASED ON THE SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS, WHICH IN TURN, IS BASED UPON THE EVIDENCE. THE FACT THAT RELIGIOUS FANATICS REFUSE TO ACCEPT FACTS WHICH CONTRADICT THEIR ANCIENT HOLY SCRIPTURES IS IRRELEVANT TO REALITY.

STAY IN YOUR LITTLE DREAM WORLD AND TELL YOURSELF THAT ALL YOUR BELIEFS ARE TRUE BECAUSE YOU DESPERATELY WANT THEM TO BE. MEANWHILE, THOSE OF US WHO LIVE IN THE REAL WORLD WILL DEAL WITH THE PROBLEMS YOU MENTIONED ABOVE LIKE EXTINCTION AND GLOBAL WARMING. YOUR ASSISTANCE IS NOT NEEDED).

Let me know your thoughts.

(JEREMY, I THINK YOU'VE HEARD ENOUGH. BESIDES, NOT ONE THING I'VE SAID WILL ACTUALLY GET THROUGH TO YOU BECAUSE FACTS AND REALITY ARE NO MATCH FOR THE FEAR OF ETERNAL PUNISHMENT.

INSTEAD OF ARROGANTLY SPOUTING RELIGIOUS HATE ON ATHEIST WEBSITES, IT'S TOO BAD THAT YOU ARE TOO IGNORANT TO REALIZE JUST HOW MUCH DROMEDARY HUMP HAS TO OFFER YOU.

THAT'S THE PRICE YOU PAY FOR A MIND THAT HAS BEEN CLOSED SHUT BY RELIGION).

God bless!

(JEREMY, THREATS ONE MINUTE - AND LOVING SALUTATIONS THE NEXT. COULD YOU POSSIBLY BE MORE SCREWED UP?).

JEREMY'S FINAL EMAIL WAS A THREAT TO PURSUE LEGAL ACTION IF HE RECEIVED ANY MORE EMAILS. SINCE I ONLY SENT HIM EMAILS IN RESPONSE TO THOSE HE SENT OUT - THIS WAS NOT A PROBLEM).

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

FAMOUS QUOTES

THOMAS ALVA EDISON (1847 –1931) 84 YEARS.

HE WAS AN AMERICAN INVENTOR, SCIENTIST, AND BUSINESSMAN WHO DEVELOPED MANY DEVICES THAT GREATLY INFLUENCED LIFE AROUND THE WORLD, INCLUDING THE PHONOGRAPH, THE MOTION PICTURE CAMERA, AND A LONG-LASTING, PRACTICAL ELECTRIC LIGHT BULB. DUBBED "THE WIZARD OF MENLO PARK" (NOW EDISON, NEW JERSEY), HE WAS ONE OF THE FIRST INVENTORS TO APPLY THE PRINCIPLES OF MASS PRODUCTION AND LARGE TEAMWORK TO THE PROCESS OF INVENTION, AND THEREFORE IS OFTEN CREDITED WITH THE CREATION OF THE FIRST INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH LABORATORY.

"I HAVE NEVER SEEN THE SLIGHTEST SCIENTIFIC PROOF

OF THE RELIGIOUS IDEAS OF HEAVEN AND HELL,

OF FUTURE LIFE OF INDIVIDUALS,

OR OF A PERSONAL GOD."

"RELIGION IS ALL BUNK."