

## My Most Recent Twitter Comments in Full:

> *"It's factually incorrect to say acts like these can be seen in many species.*

*Also even if that were true it wouldn't matter humans have sex/procreate by choice & for pleasure other species by instinct it's apples & oranges"*

I see you have taken the bait. The statement that non-human animals don't engage in homosexuality is just ludicrous. Anyone with internet access who believes that is dumb on purpose. Examples are present in other species exemplify gay presence and relations outside of humanity to strengthen bonds of loyalty and engage in the activities out of preference. Has been observed so it would be ignorant and arrogant to refute them as *"factually incorrect"*. See: <http://docdro.id/E4bX2CZ>

You say that humans have sex for pleasure but non-human animals have it by instinct; but that is just a rephrasing of the same statement. Humans don't choose to magically transform sex into something pleasurable, it already was. As seen [here](#):

*"Likewise, sexual behaviour can be wholly enjoyable while also emerging from a deeper developmental or evolutionary origin. It is precisely because reproduction is so important to the survival of a species that evolution made it so pleasurable that animals – both human and non-human – are motivated to seek it out even when conception is undesirable or impossible."*

> *"It is intellectually dishonest to pretend by rejecting creation atheists are not staking out the position that life began on its own. It's one or the other, if had a third choice you'd have offered up by now. But there simply isn't one. It's A or B no highway option"*

Move the goalposts much? Not believing A does not mean you believe in not A. It doesn't even mean that you believe in B or X or anything. It just means you don't accept A. You are saying if one doesn't hold attitude X they must hold attitude Y. This is fallacious black and white thinking. I do not know how simpler one can make it. The same logic still applies when the two positions being posited are not equivalent. Not accepting one claim does not commit one to accepting its opposite or counter-claim. Address: <http://docdro.id/6r5nwvo> and <http://docdro.id/34pMf7b>

I see your argument from ignorance and raise you my objection to your strawman and fallacy of composition. Atheism is a lack of belief in god/s. It's not a position on how life began. You're also equivocating again and using these terms interchangeably. *"Began on its own"* is not the same as to *"spontaneously sprang from nothing"*. Your use of semantics is pitiless.

The third choice is one you keep avoiding - *"I don't know"* and/or abiogenesis. Address that and maybe we can have an honest discussion. You don't get to jam in your unproven myth to fill that space. By saying *"i don't believe you"* we're not saying *"You're wrong"*. We're saying *"we don't believe you, pending evidence"*.

Besides, this has nothing to do with atheism. Atheism itself isn't predicated necessarily on science, science literacy, or anything other than a nonbelief in a deity. It's almost moot to attack abiogenesis (*or whatever you think we believe about how life began*) or even atheists collectively in the first place. Atheism is not a position on how life began, thus your premise for your made up definition is a strawman and tu quoque argument one that misrepresents not only the atheist position but science as a whole. There is no scientific claim that the process via which life came about has been worked out? There are a number of possibilities consistent with known chemistry and biology, but to outline and flesh out a possibility is not to make the claim that it necessarily happened that way. To propose a possibility without claiming that this is necessarily what actually did happen is not a statement of faith.

This not at all forgetting you yourself have made some outrageous claims and thus the onus is on you. The most obvious ones being that we are limited to two choices, and that something can come from nothing, that it is very possible that life was created, that both of these (*including abiogenesis*) are equal in their claims, atheism means what you claim, that all atheists have faith in life "*spontaneously sprang from nothing*", and all atheists are all guilty of "*demonization of people of faith*". You have simply assert these of course with no evidence. I'm guessing the irony of your last sentence is wasted on you. Your rather cliched attempts to reverse the burden of proof to the rejection of a claim is fooling no one who knows what they are talking about.

> "a) no it's not I'm not forcing the position I'm merely observing that they've taken it b) intentionally and unnecessarily using long words to try make your statement seem more intelligent just makes you look like a pompous ass. Or maybe it's not the words."

a) You're indeed putting that position on us. Telling us our positions instead of asking & ignoring what we say when we tell you our position. Atheists aren't adamant that life was not created by a creator. They merely have not accepted the claim because it hasn't met its burden of proof. Furthermore, you're making a false dichotomy. Your entire false premise is constructed in order to mock one position based on an incorrect explanation of it while promoting the other. It is expressly designed to take sides.

b) Personal Incredulity. Which unnecessary long words are you referring to? Could it be said your are also doing the same. You've used some not so common words to that could've been replaced for a more relatable word. One could also argue saying this (*and especially "Or maybe it's not the words"*) and other such ad *hominems* by a hasty generalization no less makes YOU look like a pompous ass. Address: <http://docdro.id/6r5nwvo> and <http://docdro.id/34pMf7b>

It seems as if you agree with uptheante99 by not only coming to his defence but liking his tweet. So I shall add these in as an extra.

> *"THIS is what I mean about atheists being ignorant. You should learn about God before you reject Him."*

I would not say that. While some atheists could be ignorant, just as some Christians can be ignorant about atheism and science more specifically abiogenesis and also homosexuality (as *evidently seen here*). My point is that many atheists actually do know about God, Christianity and the bible, in fact many [atheists know more about religion than the religious do](#). You do realise most unbelievers grew up religious, in a religious family and community and went to church, went to bible study. The probability an ex-christian knows about christianity is higher than a christian who knows about atheism.

*"Properly read, the bible is the most potent force for atheism ever conceived."* – Isaac Asimov

Now you use the word *"reject"*. This is inaccurate. There is a difference between rejecting the belief in Gods, of which I do, and rejecting God, meaning if there was proportional evidence for extraordinary claim that God exists, I would reconsider and believe. There's no plausible or convincing reason, certainly no evidential one, to believe that there is such an entity, and that all observable phenomena including the cosmological ones... are explicable without the hypothesis; you don't need the assumption. I don't reject the idea of a deity any more than I reject the idea of a leprechaun. I lack belief in these things because no one's ever given me a convincing reason to do anything else. So I don't deny or reject the possibility of a gods existence, I haven't found any evidence to prove they do exist, and i find a great deal of conflicting evidence on whose god is real. It's more skepticism rather than rejection. You are the one who feel rejected not this deity (*Gloria*) -> Take this video as an example: [The Real God: An Epiphany](#).

> *"He doesn't hate Gays, he hates the act b/c it's abnormal & immoral."*

Now what about homosexuality activity is abnormal and immoral... well if taken into account that *'normal'* defined by an average rather than a distribution one would have to take asexuality to be abnormal too. Homosexuality, however, is in [fact common in nature](#). It has been observed in over [200 species of mammals](#). Also considering in modern society, homosexuality is generally accepted as part of the normal spectrum of behavior. No one thinks that homosexuality is as common as heterosexuality, but people today are sophisticated enough to recognize the distinction between *"uncommon"* and *"abnormal"*. Science has established that humans encompass a spectrum of behaviors that are normal for the species. What people consider abnormal depends on the times. You have the burden of not only proving that it is abnormal but also that people now consider homosexually outside of the range that is natural and normal.

Address: <http://docdro.id/E4bX2CZ>

Immoral? I would record this to mean a threat or harm to people and society. As to immoral, sin requires a victim. Right? Who are consenting gays victimizing? Discriminating and denigrating gays without a just cause *is* immoral. Show the just cause or be seen as immoral.

Homosexuality is no threat to society as a whole. It is possible that homosexuality is a benefit to society as a whole by serving as a mechanism for population control (*or generating a wild card for the species*), triggered by pre-natal stress. There is some [evidence](#) of that. Also, it seems you made a claim to know God's mind and what he thinks is moral or not. While you assert that being gay is immoral because God says so, you offer no evidence to support your assertion so it gets can be rejected without evidence as it was presented without any. The simple fact is that homosexuality is a natural normal derivative of human adult sexual desire, and between consenting adults it harms no one. I can't imagine why any form of consensual sex between adults would be unethical by any sort of logical or humanist standard, but just because something isn't unethical doesn't mean there aren't risks involved.

One could argue on the presupposition that God exists and that he created humans the way they are that fact that God has placed the penis and the male anus in complementary positions with respect to the male human body suggests that homosexuality is natural. There is an argument that everything is natural. Everything that happens always happens because God wants it to happen. If a person is gay, God wants him to be gay. Thus, if a person is gay, then he is naturally gay, in the sense that everything that God has true is naturally true. As to homosexual activity being icky, as is often the bottom line of why people oppose it, homosexuality can to the contrary be very appealing. Some men like to have anal sex with women, so it doesn't seem that nasty or unnatural that some men like to have anal sex with other men. Some men even like having sex with animals that are not humans. There is an argument that everything is natural.

**If one were to make a summary of my refutation of your argument it might go something like this:**

Your problem is that first, you define what everybody thinks and then state that they believe and say what you defined. You don't offer ANY proof whatsoever that that is the fact. You don't get to define what atheists believe or don't believe, with one exception. Atheists don't believe in a deity or deities. I don't have any faith. I have an understanding of the FACTS. That isn't a faith. I'll mock anyone I desire to mock so as far as that is concerned you can go fuck yourself! But I tend not to. You may think that you have the authority to define what other people think and or believe, but you don't and you're wrong in the first place.

1) You have made many assumptions and claims, therefore much of the onus probandi is on you. Namely, you constricted how life began to two options. You need to explain why that is the case and only case and why each option is even worth considering. You keep asserting it had to be either created by magic or originated by pure chance from nothing. You also claimed "*all atheist*" believe this and are all "*demonizing people of faith*". You created your own definition of me and my co-thinkers. Those sound like claims to knowledge to me. Demonstrate them.

2) Claiming atheists "*believe*" something is a non-starter. Atheists simply don't believe in a god/s. You don't speak for atheists, no one does. No one can. Unlike the religious that bind together under one general belief, atheists don't have a central unified "*belief*" system. It is not a position on how life started. One can be an atheist (*i.e. lack a belief in any god*) without being adamant or absolutely positive about anything. Your post is therefore a complete strawman argument - you are attacking a position that people do not in fact adopt. Therefore your whole premise is a fallacy.

3) I don't know how life began. I don't make any claims regarding the origin of life other than personal ignorance. You can withhold judgement and not believe either.

4) You presented a false dichotomy. There are other possibilities. I have given support for these.

- I don't know (*aka rational skepticism*).
- Gradually arose through chemical processes by creatio ex materia.
- Something else not yet known.

5) The two choices you gave are essentially the same anyway. It's one choice.

6) The most likely explanation, abiogenesis, is not "*life springing from nothing*". It's life slowly emerging from a very specific environment over a long period of time. In other words, the hypothesis of abiogenesis proposes that life arose from pre-life self-replicating chemicals, not from nothing. Here are just a couple of the possibilities suggested:

- [New Szostak protocell is closest approximation to origin of life and Darwinian evolution so far.](#)
- [Evidence suggests life on Earth started after meteorites splashed into warm little ponds.](#)
- [Researchers may have solved origin-of-life conundrum.](#)

6) There is empirical evidence for abiogenesis. There is no evidence for creation. The fundamentals of abiogenesis is testable, falsifiable and observable. Creation is not.

7) Faith is a specific type of belief. Faith is belief without sufficient evidence. Faith is belief in spite of, even perhaps because of, the lack of evidence. Faith is the surrender of reason and skepticism. We have reasonable beliefs based on the best available evidence (*as I demonstrated*).

8) While there are [some good models](#), remember I'm honest enough to say that I just don't know, that I am open to other suggestions that may come up in the future. If they do, I will look into these claims and see if they pass the muster. Until then, I still don't know or believe anything to be absolute truth.

9) To be an atheist one doesn't have to have a belief about how life began (*no faith required*). If they do consider abiogenesis (*which has some amount of evidence*) as a viable explanation as scientists also think but in no way claim it as truth or fully proven (*This again, means we have no faith*). In other words, I don't have faith, I have good reason to believe, based on evidence for this. So this would abolish your claim that we are "*hypocritical*" for the "*demonization of people of faith*" for their faith. Your statement becomes moot once again.

10) I don't demonize people of faith. Many atheists don't either. To say all atheists do this is to fall into illogical thinking that inferring that something is true of the *whole* from the fact that it is true of some *part* of the whole. I don't intentionally go out and offend people of faith but if they do get offended, it's not my problem. i.e there may be atheists who do demonize people of faith but you have not provided any evidence that all atheists do this, not in any way to make it a part of the group as a whole. The reason why you may see more people of faith cry out "*that's offensive*" is merely because there are more of them and also the fact that it seems the mildest form of criticism of religion is also the biggest. Also it's not like theist/christians have not demonised atheist too. There are bad apples in both groups. To imply one side is solely doing the "*demonizing*" is to be intellectually dishonest.