

| Navigation |



<b>Home</b>
<a href="#">Login/Register</a>
<b>General</b>
<a href="#">Rants</a>
<a href="#">Neuron Snaps</a>
<a href="#">American Propaganda</a>
<a href="#">Jesus B. H. Christ</a>
<a href="#">OBL's Dispatches</a>
<a href="#">Photoshoppery</a>
<a href="#">The Red Pen</a>
<a href="#">NO STRING</a>
<a href="#">Misc Interest</a>
<a href="#">Philosophy</a>
<a href="#">Site Info</a>
<a href="#">Random</a>
<a href="#">Forum Junk</a>
<a href="#">Art</a>
<a href="#">Reviews</a>
<a href="#">Caption This!</a>
<b>Dissections</b>
<a href="#">Chick</a>
<a href="#">Gonterman</a>
<b>Comics</b>
<a href="#">Horus</a>
<a href="#">Incessant Screaming</a>
<a href="#">Hitler</a>
<a href="#">Election 2k4</a>
<a href="#">PMD</a>
<a href="#">Bush's Brain</a>
<b>Galleries</b>
<a href="#">Hand-Drawn</a>
<b>Info</b>
<a href="#">About/Bio/Contact</a>

| Links |

<b>Words</b>
<a href="#">Desperance</a>
<a href="#">FireDogLake</a>
<a href="#">Infidel753</a>
<a href="#">Nicest Girl and Destroyer of Planets</a>
<a href="#">Wet Machine</a>
<a href="#">Crooks &amp; Liars</a>
<a href="#">GeekDroppings</a>
<a href="#">Curmudgette</a>
<a href="#">RudePundit</a>
<a href="#">Suspect Device</a>
<a href="#">Plato's Playground</a>
<a href="#">Comics Curmudgeon</a>
<a href="#">The Lovable Atomic Mongrel</a>
<a href="#">Jon Swift</a>

## Chick Dissection | Birds and the Bees

— Jabberwock | 5/31/2005 @ 9:48 pm | Filed under:

### Jack Chick Dissections

Just... utterly revolting. No wonder Jack Chick hates gay people—he has *absolutely no idea* what they're really like. And if he thinks *tolerance* is being pushed in schools, when kids like that little six- or seven-year-old in Louisiana are sent home from school for saying the word "lesbian" when describing why he has two moms, he's even more... erm, well, we've already established how out of touch with reality he is, and how enormous an idiot, so... right.

Bah. Fucking hate-mongering, appalling bullshit. What *would* Jesus do? Certainly not this.




Careful, everyone—this one's like Jedi Lightning.



What the hell is she wearing? Is she on shore leave or something? These kids are *extremely* easily impressed. Who says "Oh, wow!" before they even see what the surprise is? For all they know, it could be the Spanish Inquisition. That's *always* a surprise, because nobody ever expects it.

Aww, the guy on the right brought his cat. And the guy on the left brought his... uh... breathing apparatus of some sort?

Man, these people are hideous. I'll explain why later.



...oops!, wife?

Erm, nope. Not buying this, Jack. Fuck, you can't even get the *terminology* right. "Wife?" "Wife?" I'd say "partner" or "husband" is *far* more likely. He'd probably

Ad space now available for purchase. Contact me for further information.

Like the site? Have disposable income? Please send money - the gift everyone needs!



Those who have helped keep this site going through direct financial contribution:

- Cindy Smith
- Eric Watt
- Randy Kopycinski
- Kevin Turner

Thank you very much to all who have donated.

- Deeply Blasphemous
- MediainTrouble
- Les Said, the Better
- Hullabaloo
- Red Hair, Black Leather
- Polyester Bride
- Thosw
- LaughingWild
- AnneJumps
- Kitty Sneezes
- Rook's Rant
- Slacktivist
- Rob's Blog
- Jimpharo
- Frippy
- Joey's Blog
- Shakesville
- Pharyngula
- Pandagon
- Spinwebe
- Sadly, No!
- Comics
- Achewood
- SlowWave
- Jerkcity
- Leisuretown
- Wondermark
- The Perry Bible Fellowship
- MNFTIU/GYWO
- Other
- RiffTrax
- Meat Beetles
- TMBO
- Wishlist
- link to me.

Are you already linking to me? Let me know and I'll link back.


Please report any broken or incorrect links.

**Archives**

- [July 2007](#)
- [June 2007](#)
- [May 2007](#)
- [April 2007](#)
- [March 2007](#)
- [February 2007](#)
- [January 2007](#)
- [November 2006](#)
- [October 2006](#)
- [September 2006](#)
- [August 2006](#)
- [July 2006](#)
- [June 2006](#)
- [May 2006](#)
- [April 2006](#)
- [March 2006](#)
- [February 2006](#)
- [January 2006](#)
- [December 2005](#)
- [November 2005](#)
- [October 2005](#)
- [September 2005](#)
- [August 2005](#)
- [July 2005](#)
- [June 2005](#)
- [May 2005](#)
- [April 2005](#)
- [March 2005](#)
- [February 2005](#)
- [January 2005](#)
- [December 2004](#)
- [November 2004](#)
- [October 2004](#)
- [September 2004](#)
- [December 2003](#)

only call him his "wife" if he was a heterosexual who was somehow bamboozled into thinking he's been having sex with a very masculine woman named Charles who just happens, for whatever reason, to have a penis.

Aww, lookit the widdle demons. Those are probably the cutest things Chick's ever drawn. They sure beat his disproportionate, bug-eyed, repulsive monster children.



God expects a **man** to marry a **woman** and have children. Any **other** way is forbidden by God. (Gen. 2:24; Lev. 18:22; Rom. 1:26-27)

Gah, her face is *melting*. What is that?

You know, I've *never* heard of a teacher just randomly springing a "surprise" gay couple on a class for no real reason. I did a pretty thorough Google search, even, and couldn't turn anything up at all. I'm willing to bet, in fact, that if I had a LexisNexis account, I wouldn't find anything there, either. Want to know why? Because it's **fucking stupid**, and we don't hire people with sub-50 IQs to teach in public classrooms. It's almost like: "Okay, kids—we have a surprise today! Here's a heterosexual couple. Yep. They have sex with each other on a regular basis. Figured I'd... uh... bring 'em in here. Just wanted to show you. No real reason."

Nobody. Acts. Like. This.

By the way, Genesis 2:24 says:

Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh.

Nothing about "no fags" there. And as far as Leviticus is concerned, let's make sure to kill everyone who has ever gotten a divorce for reasons other than unfaithfulness, then, as well. Oh, and God hates shrimp, apparently, too. God *forbid* you eat shellfish, because, well, God forbade you eat shellfish. Let's not forget that there are large portions of rules in *many* religions, Christianity especially, that existed *at the time, thousands of years ago*, for the sole purpose of maintaining hygiene and health.

Guess what Leviticus *also* says? I can own SLAVES! Well, as long as they're bought from a neighboring country. So watch out, Canada! Oh, and how could I forget the ever-important Lev. 19:27, thou shalt not shave. ALL OF THE CHARACTERS DEPICTED IN YOUR TRACTS ARE HAIR-TRIMMED ABOMINATIONS!

Oh, and I could go on for *hours* about the semantics of Romans 1:26-27. But instead, I'll just link to [THIS](#).

Oh, like she's never seen *Queer Eye*?

Jack *tries* for innocent, cute and endearing, but he ends up with simple-minded, chipmunk-like and obnoxiously saccharine.

Wait, so believing something is wrong makes it totally cool for you to use (apparently) offensive terminology? "Well, my dad said being gay is wrong, so it's okay if I call them 'pillow-biting, buttfucking faggots', right?"

*Nobody acts like this*. Seriously. Find me a gay person who sincerely believes a homophobe should be put in an insane asylum, Jack, and I'll give you a... well, I'll give you an especially skeptical look. You know, despite what you might think, what you believe is usually not somehow inversely reciprocated. Just because you think gays should be put in an asylum doesn't mean gays and people okay with homosexuality think homophobes should be.

- [November 2003](#)
- [September 2003](#)
- [August 2003](#)
- [November 2002](#)
- [September 2002](#)
- [May 2002](#)
- [April 2002](#)
- [March 2002](#)

July 2007

M T W T F S S

1  
 2 3 4 5 6 7 8  
 9 10 11 12 13 14 15  
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22  
 23 24 25 26 27 28 29  
 30 31  
 < Jun

**Search**


**Meta/RSS**
[RSS 2.0](#)
[Comments RSS 2.0](#)
[Valid XHTML](#)

You know, Jack, there's a perfectly good *actual* definition of the word "intolerant" available. We don't need your annotated Pseudo-Definitions For Children. Here's what Merriam-Webster says:

Main Entry: in-tol-er-ant  
 Pronunciation: -r&nt  
 Function: adjective  
 1 : unable or unwilling to endure  
 2 a : unwilling to grant equal freedom of expression especially in religious matters b : unwilling to grant or share social, political, or professional rights : BIGOTED  
 - in-tol-er-ant-ly adverb  
 - in-tol-er-ant-ness noun

Being intolerant of blacks, for instance, doesn't mean you "don't support" them. Yeah, brainwash some more innocent children into thinking being "intolerant" is somehow okay, and that the word itself is just a silly bit of tripe. Why do you hate America?

*o/` Darling, I don't know why I go to extremes. / Too high or too low, there ain't no in-betweens.*

Huh, how'd that get stuck in my head suddenly?

Yes, gay people want to put everyone in prison.

Oh, right—the disgusting appearances thing I mentioned earlier. Look at this guy. I've discussed this in earlier Dissections, but here's one of Jack's little illustration tricks: Because his arguments are so weak, he resorts to depicting characters on the other side of his arguments as hideous or even just subtly visually unappealing. I mean, yeah, there *is* his general lack of talent, but it doesn't fully account for the phenomenon illustrated by his, well, illustrations. Go through *any* of his tracts, and you'll see this classic cartoon-stlye "villains = ugly" pattern.

For some reason, I want to play Dr. Mario. I'm really not sure why.

Ah, hell. I sense a load of "You can't even *think* about God in school"—scented bullshit about to drop.

Is that someone else's hand over that kid's mouth, or does he just have a dislocated arm?

Stupid is as stupid draws.

Blah, blah, blah, filler panel.

Wait, "Gay"? With a capital "G"? Why? When did "gay" become a proper noun, other than as a surname or the name of a town?

And, yes, the Bible has all the answers for everything, especially when referenced from within the memory of an eight-year-old.

\*And that rhymes with "P", and that stands for "Pool".

I don't recall Jesus saying anything about homosexuality in the Bible. I DARE you—go ahead and find ONE THING that Jesus said about gays. ONE THING. And we've already covered some of the specific references to non-Gospel passages in the Bible a few panels ago, so go ahead—try that route again if you want to experience the sensations of what a swift punch to the throat feels like.

Another activity for you: Prove, without reference to the Bible itself or using mindless tautology, that "the Bible is *true*".

"The Bible shows us what's right and wrong. Here are some examples: Right - owning other human beings as slaves; burning animals in sacrifice; staying in an abusive marriage instead of getting a divorce. Wrong - eating shellfish; working on the Sabbath; planting two different crops in the same field; being at all effeminate, or treating a man as one would a woman (which is kind of ambiguous, but whatever, let's just say it's about the fags)."

Yeah, I want my kids learning *those* values.

You know what else they did years ago, little girl? Burned witches. Oh, and there were state religions in many European countries, and anyone who didn't subscribe was in danger of severe, sometimes fatal, punishment. Romans fed

many Christians to lions, because of religion. And many people were *tortured to death* because they didn't believe in Christianity. Yes, let's go back to THOSE times, you sniveling little shit.

Whenever the fuck did *this* ever happen? No, no, no. It's *absolutely fine*, as it *well should bloody be*, for you to bring a Bible to school, and pray, and talk about Jesus. It's *not* okay for teachers in a public institution to proselytize to children.

You PROVE to me, Jack—again without tautologies or reference to the Bible itself—that the Bible should become the school-taught religious system and not, say, the Quran, or beliefs of the Hopi tribe, or the writings of the Sumerians, or Celtic beliefs, or whatever. Go ahead and try.

While you're at it, I'll be over here drafting up some legislation to try to make sure you have to discuss alternative perspectives in your church sermons. Don't think there should be separation of church and state? Fine. But it can just as easily work from the government to the churches as it can the other way around. Instead of the church telling the government what to do, I want the *government* to tell the *churches* what to do. How do you feel about that?

And yes, yes, there's this just, like, MASSIVE conspiracy of public school teachers to get little kids to burn forever. Right. Want to know why nobody's told you about it, you gaping, dumb little twit? Because you go to school to learn how to *think*, not how to *believe*. Scientific theory and religious theory are two *very* different concepts. The former relies on repeatedly testing observable phenomenon to the point of almost ridiculous redundancy, whereas the latter relies on "it was written down by someone at some point, and then called 'The Word of God'". You know, why even fucking go to school at all if you're just going to *believe* in everything? Why learn anything at all if you can just chalk it all up to "God said so"? Want to learn about God instead of reality? Don't go to school, and just write in "because God" for every explanation to everything that ever happens. But don't expect to be taken seriously, then, either.

Okay, so what if none of these kids EVER told a lie? What then, huh, Susy? Huh?

I'll bet you could switch the head of the girl on the right onto one of Chick's adult female bodies and nobody would really be able to tell the difference. The black girl in the second panel isn't so much surprised or desperately curious as she is terrified by the girl on the left's HUGE, TERRIBLE EYES.

So all these kids, then, went home absolutely terrified that they were going to burn forever because they didn't tell their mom who broke the vase, or they told their dad they weren't getting him a tie for Father's Day. Christianity: The Faith of Fear.

"...so this is what he did. He gave everyone a message that was kind of ambiguous, and then allowed it to be tampered with by various monks and religious organizations that added their own bits to suit their own agendas, and just over two thousand years later, it's been translated so many times by so many different organizations, and is worded so ambiguously and contradictorily that it's really not very clear what to do or believe in order to be looked upon with favor by the eyes of God. So much for omnipotence, huh?"

Wasn't the whole "sending Jesus to Earth" thing really more of a symbolic gesture? If God is truly all-powerful, why go through the whole complicated process when you could just go "huzzah! Your sins are gone!" and be done with it quickly and easily? Or, better yet, just, y'know, modify the very fabric of reality so it's more in tune with your expectations.

So what if you believe in Jesus, but are gay? I mean, what if you're a man who has sex with other men, but you worship Jesus as your Lord and savior? That... doesn't *necessarily* contradict itself, you know.

**VERY SOON!** How soon? So soon, they've been predicting it for HUNDREDS OF YEARS.

Hey, wait a minute. What happened to those cute little Dr. Mario Virus Fag-Demons? Those things were adorable.

Oh, a silhouette. How creative, Jack. What's the matter, just didn't feel like actually drawing anything for this panel?

So God is a petty attention-whore, then? And, I mean, what constitutes belief? I'm willing to accept the idea that I may be wrong and maybe Jesus really *did* come here from God to die in some kind of elaborate "rescue" ritual—does that constitute belief? What about people who only *sort of* believe? Like, maybe they

have some doubts about all of it. Or how about people who believe solely out of fear of the potential consequences of not believing? Does their sort of "forced" belief still count?

"All three kids got saved"? What kind of cop-out shit is that? What, you had to include the redundant filler panels with the kids asking the girl if she reads the Bible, but you couldn't include them all falling onto the sidewalk and bawling? You could've had them on a hopscotch grid, maybe a basketball off to the side next to a discarded jump rope.

And if it's that bloody easy, then what's the point? What *is* it with all this ridiculous symbolism? "God is all-powerful, yet he has to do everything the absolute hardest and most contrived way imaginable."

Yes, the gay lifestyle depicted in the Bible is *exactly* like that of the gays living today. I'll admit, there's a part of the gay community involved in drugs and wild partying, but *the same can be said for just about any community*. That doesn't mean those communities as wholes are "evil". Yeah, there are a TON of college kids who fuck each other seemingly at random, get stoned and drunk out of their minds, and live in a kind of sad pseudo-hedonism, but that doesn't mean that every college student is disgusting and wicked.

And many translations of the Bible say "homosexual offenders" when depicting the citizens of Sodom. Like, you know, *sex* offenders. There's a difference between a homosexual, and a homosexual sex offender. It's the same as the difference between a heterosexual and a heterosexual sex offender. If you honestly believe, Jack, that gay people who have wild, abusive, hedonistic sex with each other (like those apparently depicted in Sodom) are the equivalent of what the Bible refers to when it says the bit about "lying with a woman" or "having the love for a man that one should have for a woman", then I have serious worries about your perspective on relationships with women.

Bahaha, possessions. Right. One of the many excuses for getting out of the responsibility of free will.

Why would God want to destroy them? He created them. And why destroy them? Why not, erm, heal them? Depossess them? He is, after all omnipotent. Or maybe he's not, if his solution to everything is "BURN IT TO THE GROUND".

Why the fuck didn't Lot just *move*? Or was he comfortable buying groceries from people who were apparently brutally raping each other behind the counter and having jizzfests in the food carts?

Hey, um, Jack? Jack? You, uh, missed a part. You know, the part where Lot offers his daughters up to be brutally raped by the townspeople?

5And they called unto Lot, and said unto him, Where are the men which came in to thee this night? bring them out unto us, that we may know them.

6And Lot went out at the door unto them, and shut the door after him,

7And said, I pray you, brethren, do not so wickedly.

8Behold now, I have two daughters which have not known man; let me, I pray you, bring them out unto you, and do ye to them as is good in your eyes: only unto these men do nothing; for therefore came they under the shadow of my roof.

I'm not sure if this is all something out of which you'd want to make a lesson in morality. That is, of course, unless your morals say it's okay to send your daughters out to be raped. But, yeah, there's no such thing as moral or ethical ambiguity, right?

Hah, "*back*"? You've obviously never heard of THE LAST SEVERAL THOUSAND YEARS. Rome? Riddled with fags. Greece? You couldn't toss a nickel without it dropping onto some boy-on-boy action. Homosexuality isn't just some current trend, you moron. It's just been kind of culturally closeted for a couple centuries. People have still been gay, they've just been terrified to come out about it. It is BIOLOGICAL, and doesn't just DISAPPEAR with prayer. If you think it's gone, it's really only just repressed. And what's better than repressed fags entering into

essentially loveless marriages with obnoxious, pissy women who are so religiously sexually repressed themselves that they won't even let you make love to them unless you're both in a dark room wearing blindfolds under four layers of bedding with a slab of particle board between you with a hole cut through it? YEAH, THAT'S PROGRESS.

Hey, Jude 7. Don't make it bad. Take a sad Psalm, and make it better.

You know, why should I take you seriously at all? Why should anyone listen to *anything* you have to say about sex? I mean, for fuck's sake, you people think *clitoral orgasms* are an abomination.

Oh, yes, all those laws that say Satan must destroy children. You know the ones.

Another dare for you, Jack—this time I *double* dare you: Find me ONE law that indicates in ANY WAY that teachers have to bring gay couples into classrooms. (Tip: You might want to opt for the Physical Challenge on this one.)

Who can MAKE someone be gay? How does that work? I've had gay people hit on me before. I've even had one guy offer to fly me out to his place if I felt like "experimenting". I turned them down, of course. Not because I believe in Jesus, but because I'M NOT GAY.

I think Jack is confusing gay people with rapists. See, Jack, here's the difference:

<p>You: I'm not gay. Gay person: Oh. Okay, sweetie. Plenty of fish in the sea.</p> <p>vs</p> <p>You: I'm not gay. Rapist: GRRARRRRRGGGHHH! *TEARS OFF YOUR CLOTHES, HOLDS YOU DOWN AND VIOLENTLY PENETRATES YOUR ANUS*</p>
--

I know it's *subtle*, but there *is* a difference.

By the way, Jack, it seems like you don't pay too close attention to Revelations:

<p>For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book. - Revelation 22:18-19, KJV</p>
---

So your little notations and taking things out of context and such? Not a good idea.

I, uh, think you're going to be pretty surprised when Jesus returns. Trust me on this one.

Huh, has Non-Susy, there, been *aging* throughout this tract? What is she, like, forty now?

Again, who can be "tricked into" being [g]ay? And WHERE OH WHERE did Jesus say ANYTHING about being [g]ay?

"When Jesus Christ returns to rule the world, **you'll** be on the winning side." Or so you think. You people are extremely assumptive about the mind and will of God, aren't you?

Pfft. "[D]evil's crowd".

Oh, it's a good thing he pointed out that we'd be saved "(from hell)". I was under the apparently mistaken impression that we'd be saved for later use, or for a rainy day, or posterity or something.

God looks really, really bored. He should conjure himself up a PlayStation3 or something. I'm sure he could make a pretty awesome screen on which to play it

as well. I mean, he *is*, after all, an **awesome** God.

So the moral is, apparently, "whatever Hell you feel awaits gay people after they die you should ensure is matched here on Earth". You know, God's Love and all that. It's okay to hate fags, as long as you hate with *love*!

**Because everyone else is doing it:**

## 29 Responses to "Chick Dissection | Birds and the Bees"

1. *Djur* Says:

[May 31st, 2005 at 11:55 pm](#)

"Don't be upset when the big mean faggot bullies pick on you.

Eventually, your Big Brother Jesus is going to come down and light their fucking asses on FIRE."

2. *Janet* Says:

[June 1st, 2005 at 10:25 am](#)

[Somewhere, we'll find it: the rainbow connection](#)

3. *Janet* Says:

[June 1st, 2005 at 10:28 am](#)

Hm. It's not letting me comment. Maybe not html?

4. *BtI* Says:

[June 2nd, 2005 at 10:44 am](#)

What did Jack Chick do during the war anyway? Was he an intern at Der Sturmer or something?

5. *Sean* Says:

[August 6th, 2005 at 3:01 pm](#)

I hate this "What Would Jesus Do?" bullshit. You know what Jesus would do about homosexuality? He would *rise from the dead and ascend into Heaven at the right hand of God the Father*. Jesus died for your sins, He didn't die for politics.

6. *Joel* Says:

[December 9th, 2005 at 3:42 pm](#)

It's a crying shame that ignorance isn't a crime. Excuse me, stupidity. I've read Jack Chick's little comics before, and they make me as sick to my soul now as they did then. I am a Christian, and I don't stand for this hate-mongering propaganda that he preaches. It's just WRONG. It's no wonder that there are so many former Christians in the world, if they have this man showing a false example.

7. *Terrible Tommy Murray* Says:

[February 7th, 2006 at 1:14 am](#)

I grew up on the Christianity from which Jack Chick sprung (hatched?) Thank the Gods I'm a Pagan, now. It is Pope Jack the Tripper whom we Heathen regard as REAL Christians—insults firmly intended. The rest of you penis-jockeys are just timid Zoroastrians!  
Praise Baal and Rock on!  
TT

8. *guero* Says:

[February 7th, 2006 at 11:46 am](#)

This is some pretty funny shit, however- It is also sad/infuriating etc.... We all know there are millions of... people who think just like this dumbass depicts in his tracts. Keep up the good fight, jabberwock! The more people like you we have in the world, the better.

9. *Ike* Says:

[February 16th, 2006 at 2:20 pm](#)

One thing: The Romans fed Christians to lions not because of what is necessarily a religious issue, but a political one. In ancient Rome, whenever the Romans conquered a new territory with a foreign religion, they would simply absorb the pantheon of the native religion into their own, which is reflected in the very obvious "plagiarism" of the Greek gods in Roman

mythology. The Christians refused to allow their god to be absorbed into the Roman pantheon, and were therefore seen as trying to undermine the faiths of the other Roman citizens and undermine the Empire itself. They were political martyrs, not religious ones.

10. *jheanell* Says:

[October 21st, 2006 at 11:07 pm](#)

Man, it's terrible that there are people who actually believe stuff like this. This is a comic obviously aimed at little kids, so don't be surprised if you hear about an increase of queer kids being beaten up in school, because apparently, it's ok and they are going to hell anyway. oh, well.

11. *Alejandro* Says:

[November 3rd, 2006 at 6:40 pm](#)

The whole thing about gay being different from rapists was hilarious. God bless your soul. You are wonderful person helping to destroy this hateful false teacher.

12. *Rarend* Says:

[January 7th, 2007 at 3:16 pm](#)

I'm not gay and even that tract pissed me off. It's obvious that it was written by a homophobic retard. If it was okay for God to destroy Sodom with fireballs than surely it's okay for us to KILL ALL GAYS!!!!!!!!!!!!!! Jack Chick also is notorious for depicting non-christians as ugly, immoral scum.

13. *Jake* Says:

[February 8th, 2007 at 4:06 pm](#)

Guest-authored by Fred Phelps. It's just wrong, to have a little girl saying such things. It's not the subject matter, it's that the girl is getting sex education that young OUTSIDE of school. And, speaking of "intolerance," we agnostics are not all prejudiced against Christians. True or not, "Judge not lest ye be judged" is a good point.

14. *Rarend* Says:

[February 10th, 2007 at 3:11 pm](#)

Those gay guys also remind me of Dr. Forester and TV's Frank. When you first see the little demons clinging too the gays, one of them looks kind of like a face hugger

15. *Jon* Says:

[February 11th, 2007 at 7:58 pm](#)

Actually, in class we recently read an article called the "Gay Learning Curve" which offers some interesting ideas on homosexuality in our culture. Basically, what the article says is that in their teens, gays hide their homosexuality to avoid embarrassment and ridicule. Later on, when they finally do come out of the closet, they are sexually immature and basically as a heterosexual would be 20 years ago. This accounts for the prevalence of drugs, etc. The author makes the point that religion takes the use of drugs and stuff and says it is a result of being gay. As you can probably see, it is a vicious cycle, that thinking makes people in the LGBT community wait longer, which accounts for more drug use and other problems. If society stops just worrying about it and is accepting, everything will be better.

16. *John Chance* Says:

[February 16th, 2007 at 11:22 am](#)

YOur dare is on-Jesus says he and the Father were one. He said he was I AM. He, the Father and HS were there at creation. He was the silent member of the Trinity. Scripture slowly revealed God and his plan, inc Trinity.

Since the God of the OT is the same as the NT and Christ is one w/Father and HS-yes folks, he destroyed Sodom too!

Jabber against displays his ignorance and sets up a division between OT and NT. One that does not exist.

Jesus came to bring the New Covenant and die for your sins. He was not:  
a revolutionary  
a rebel  
hip hipster  
nice guy, never condemning  
peace, love and fluff



Good talk on this:

[http://www.peterkreeft.com/audio/01\\_culture-war.htm](http://www.peterkreeft.com/audio/01_culture-war.htm)

Jabber the Manichean!!

BTW- Jude-an apostale of Jesus-condems gays in his short letter, so too does Apostale Paul, Peter.....

Get off the athiest cool aid fella

17. *John Chance* Says:

[February 16th, 2007 at 11:27 am](#)

Sas you teach your kids your rambling crap-your won sould may be damned and worse pinishment for failing your kids.

Right on dad!, good one.

Here is a far better-though less humorous-refutation of Chick:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20020812052603/net2.netacc.net/~mafg/jtchick>

18. *Jabberwock* Says:

[February 16th, 2007 at 1:26 pm](#)

So a person saying something makes it automatically true? What if I say that God and I are one?

If you read anything more recent about religion that I've written, you'll note that it's at the very least heavily implied that I don't believe atheism, either, and that the true path to secularism is agnosticism. Making any definite conclusions either way about anything undetectable, unobservable, and, thus, unprovable is completely unscientific and does not in any way represent reality.

Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence, and it's entirely possible God does, in fact, exist. However, until it can be observed, making definite claims or assumptions about it in either direction (e.g. he exists; he doesn't exist) is foolish and unrealistic.

There's no more evidence that anything depicted in the Bible is factual data than there is that a giant, omnipotent, undetectable bee in the center of the sun controls every atom with its infinite arms. Unless we're just taking "someone wrote something down thousands of years ago and said it was the word of God, and it even itself says it's the word of God" as "evidence". In which case, I hereby declare that everything here at EtJ is the word of God, inspired by His divine hand, and that he guides every word in order to set mankind on the right path again.

There - refute that. God and I are one, and my word is His. I came to bring the *New New Covenant*. To claim this is in any way incorrect is to undermine your entire argument about the Bible being "true because it is".

19. *Djur* Says:

[February 25th, 2007 at 1:16 am](#)

"Jesus came to bring the New Covenant and die for your sins."

I thought suicide was a sin. It's a weird system you have where an omnipotent being has to kill himself to keep himself from having to torture people. Seems more like an insane, violent man committing suicide so he never abuses his children again.

We're supposed to worship this sick fuck?

"yes folks, he destroyed Sodom too!"

You should ask the folks that you derived your religion from. They don't believe Sodom was destroyed for homosexuality. The text doesn't support it, either.

And I'm not even going to begin to address this pap about Jude and Paul. Learn some Greek or find a good side-by-side translation of the New Testament and take a look for yourself. Read up on Greek pederasty. Stop relying on inherently unreliable translations of inherently unreliable, non-original texts by inherently unreliable people *who didn't even know Jesus*.

Paul was as much an apostle of Jesus as I am — he never met the guy.

20. *Golan2072* Says:

[February 26th, 2007 at 2:08 pm](#)

Also, the Bible is true - I got laughing when I've read this tautology. I mean, if you really want to convince people to believe in your distorted version of religion, try a less laughable argument.

And, of course, this fascist homophobia must be stopped at its tracks - NO PASARAN!

21. *ScarletSword* Says:

[February 27th, 2007 at 4:47 am](#)

Methinks Jack Chick is also buddies with Fred Phelps and his family and the **freakin' Westboro Baptist Church**, judging from what it says in his homosexuality tracts.

22. *GrendelPrime* Says:

[March 28th, 2007 at 4:55 pm](#)

Quote: "Your dare is on-Jesus says he and the Father were one. He said he was I AM. He, the Father and HS were there at creation. He was the silent member of the Trinity. Scripture slowly revealed God and his plan, in Trinity.

Since the God of the OT is the same as the NT and Christ is one w/Father and HS-yes folks, he destroyed Sodom too!"

God said to stone an adulteress in the OT.

So the answer to the question "What Would Jesus Do?" is he would say "Stone her."

But.....I could swear he said something else. Something about "Let he who is without sin cast the first stone." Basically, "DON'T stone her."

So what then? If God and Jesus are the same, then why the two opposite messages? Is Jesus supposed to be the second personality of a schizophrenic god? Throw in Satan and suddenly God is Sybil.

23. *Randy* Says:

[March 28th, 2007 at 9:25 pm](#)

The John Chance issue may be moot now. I checked his site out; first thing I saw was he was angrily criticizing a Biblical scholar for being... get this... a... PROTESTANT!!! (Oh my stars and garters!)

I checked again, and his next blog post was a copied post condemning Jews for not agreeing with anti-Jewish comments. The post was copied wholesale from another source with a different name, and he added no annotations or comments to clarify what was going on.

So I'm somewhat suspicious that he isn't likely to use critical thinking about his own firmly held beliefs.

24. *Tom* Says:

[April 1st, 2007 at 8:19 am](#)

What's the obsession with cute little kids spewing fundamentalist rubbish. No child can talk like that and have half a clue what she's talking about. I used to, and I didn't know a damn thing.

It upsets me to think that, whereas I was brought up in a household where I was taught love, kindness and tolerance, there are kids from the Chick/Phelps clans who are growing up on a constant diet of hate and damnation.

Won't somebody please think of the children!?

25. *wmdkitty* Says:

[April 2nd, 2007 at 10:54 pm](#)

I giggled the whole way through this, and I thank Bast daily that I got away from that crazy shit! My ex-fiancee used CHICK publications as "evidence" that he was right, and there's a world-wide conspiracy with the Catholic Church, and the Illuminati \*snerk\* was out to get him. Puh-leeze! What I don't get is how Jack Chick ever got out of the asylum, he is obviously not well!

26. *Brian* Says:

[May 14th, 2007 at 11:54 am](#)

Apparently when you are gay you have an 18 inch long "demon" cockroach crawling around on your clothes. What the &\$#@ is that?

27. *Walter Lovecraft* Says:

[May 27th, 2007 at 11:01 am](#)

Call me crazy...but I don't see demons. Anywhere, anytime, near anyone. I think if I did, I'd be a little concerned.

Or is it that only little kids can see them? And all little kids, not just Christian ones, because the kids in the tract could see them and they thought Jesus was a type of fish. So maybe everyone is born with the Sight, and loses it and all memory of it the moment the hit puberty.

28. *Asuka Langley-Soryu* Says:  
[June 9th, 2007 at 12:39 pm](#)

How is it possible for someone to think he's Oh-so-Godly and still be this fucking STUPID about the teachings of his God? As a lesbian and a Christian, I really don't think I've ever been this offended.

29. *Cacaoatl* Says:  
[June 20th, 2007 at 6:51 pm](#)

I think it is interesting to note that the "homosexual" acts condemned in the Bible are not necessarily the same as the homosexual relationships we see today. In the ancient Mediterranean world and the ancient Near East, the forms of homosexual behavior that are known to have been widely practiced were pederasty, temple prostitution, and the humiliation of defeated kings and generals through anal rape. It is more likely that the Bible is condemning these behaviors rather than the kind of consensual and (usually)loving relationships we see today which seem to be much more recent phenomenon (An evolutionary development as a natural population control perhaps?).

### Leave a Reply

Name

Mail (will not be published)

Website

---

Powered by [WordPress](#)

---

[Previous](#)   [Archive](#)

---

Site best viewed with [Firefox](#) at **1024x768** with **medium text size**. Not intended for persons under 18 years of age, but if you won't tell, we won't tell.

---

### Unpaid Obligatory Advertisements:

**(Please see "Links", to the left, under the nav.)**

---

All content **Copyright 2007 J Crowley** unless otherwise noted, in which case said content under Copyright of its respective owner(s).

---

The views expressed by individual writers are not necessarily those of the site, nor are the views of the site necessarily those of the individual writers. Nor are the views of the individual writers necessarily those of the other writers.