

---

Subject: Re: Why did you vote for Obama?

Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Mon, 08 Dec 2008 13:18:16 GMT

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

---

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 02:27Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 November 2008 06:22pawkyfox wrote on Tue, 11 November 2008 21:09I have no problem with gays and their lifestyle. But gay marriage is not just an issue that affects only gays. It asks cooperation from the majority by urging them to change their value system.

No, it doesn't. It DOES NOT, repeat DOES NOT, affect you no matter how determined some people are to wish it did. You do not have to change your value system.

If we don't change, we are called bigots, fools, and homophobes. Christian marriage commisioners, police officers have lost their jobs for their religious views because obviously they are "discriminating." That's the new excuse to throw dirt at us.

We are forced to change our value system if we don't adapt. The progressives love to pout off like as we we are the ones being oppressive but they don't realise their own oppressive ways towards Christians.

You probably heard of eharmony.com (a dating service for men and women). Well, a homosexual man filed a lawsuit against them accusing them of discriminating because they rejected his homosexaul application. Guess what? The guy took them to court and eharmony settled the case paying for expensive changes to their service to include dating service for gays! Way to shove it down our throats. Still think we don't have to change?

eharmony is a business run by a Christian...not a public service. And if he chose not to settle the case and open up a newer site, he would have faced other lawsuits as well (that's how liberals operate; using the court system to shut down any opposing school of thought)...but I think he was a wimp for giving in.

Still think we don't have to change? They will file suits and sue us heavily for discriminating. And they have the huge monetary support to drag us to the courts.

Take the case of a homosexual pair that deliberately choose a New Jersey public (non-taxpaying) church to get married. The church refused and they were dragged to court...the court ordered that the church perform the marriage ceremony since they are public/don't pay taxes OR start paying taxes to avoid performing the homosexual marriage.

The church chose the latter; they decided to pay taxes. Of all the hundreds of other places nearby where this homosexual pair could have gotten married, they specifically choose this church knowing they will be refused so they can drag them to court.

This applies to each individual Christian. We are forced to hold our mouth while it is forcefully opened to stuff worldly views down our throat. And if we so much as raise our voice, we are instantly called "insert-next-popular-word-here."

But the moment we agree with them (in essence abandoning our faith), we have nothing to worry! So I would think my initial statement is correct; we are forced to change our values or face the

consequences; the latter of which many have chosen to do.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 November 2008 06:22pawkyfox wrote on Tue, 11 November 2008 21:09The reason? Not that the majority is being oppressive. It's far from that. I don't think it is appropriate to suggest that this is a case where a certain majority is oppressing the minority. It is also not too fair to suggest that this issue is comparable to the issue of women voters and Blacks. Women perhaps; you're dead wrong to say it's not comparable to racial intolerance. The reason your country is so backward in the field of equal rights on sexuality is pretty much exactly the same reason it took you so fucking disgracefully long to get equal rights on grounds of race. Namely religion.

The entire slave trade was fueled by greed. Of course, you have a point in bringing up religion. For the Bible does not condemn slavery...it provides instructions to govern slaves. But it was not racial slavery the Bible is talking about...back in the day, it was common practice for anybody to become a slave to pay off debts etc...then there were slaves captured during war.

As for racial slavery, the man most responsible for misguiding would be the god of evolution Darwin who shamelessly and wrongly said the following:

At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilized races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes ... will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilized state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian [aborigine] and the gorilla.

Makes the Bible look lightyears more tolerant regarding slaves compared to the ravings of a disillusioned freakster whose word most people believe to be true.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 November 2008 06:22pawkyfox wrote on Tue, 11 November 2008 21:09If you think this is the majority oppressing a minority, I would say it is merely a false illusion. It is more the case of the majority reacting to the threat of eventual subjugation by a minority in the near future.

As opposed to the subjugation that religion has imposed upon pretty much every society throughout history wherever and whenever it has the strength to be able to?

Including your country right now?

That is real subjugation. "Eventual subjugation" by a homosexual minority? You're crazy.

You can refer to the first part of this post to see why I am not crazy when I mentioned the threat of eventual subjugation by homosexuals...my fault I did not mention the gleeful progressives who stand behind homosexuals ready to jump on Christians at a moment's notice.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 November 2008 06:22pawkyfox wrote on Tue, 11 November 2008 21:09Christian parents want to impart Christian values to their kids. This applies to people of all faiths.

Yep, and the irony is the people who do this immoral action (indoctrination of children) are always the same dipshits who keep whining about homosexuality on "moral" grounds, even though there has never, ever been a convincing moral argument against homosexuality. It'd be funny if it wasn't so sad.

What indoctrination? I am Christian not a murderer. I won't be teaching my kid to kill, just to guide him/her in a way I know works and provides great stability and stay out of trouble.

Funniest part about homosexuality is that how unnatural it is.

A man and a woman are naturally capable of making love and have the external sexual organs to do so...homosexuals do not; they will end up with a swollen anus/rectum. If homosexuality was intended by "nature" I would think there would be a provision for homosexuals to show love on a physical level as a male and female are capable of.

But we don't see it...other than falling into a close friendship and forcing everyone around them (with money/bashing expertise/court costs help from 21st century progressives) to acknowledge their love as natural, homosexuals have nothing else naturally going for them that even comes close to convincing.

Not to mention that if every child being born on this planet from this minute onwards is naturally homosexual, we will be looking at the end of the human race due to inability to reproduce. Quite unnatural isn't it?

Of course, they are free to do what they please (I can't stop it and don't want to) but I won't acknowledge/approve their act. Homosexuals want a kind of approval Christians cannot give...hence the increased attacks/nitpicking on our Scripture in attempts to undermine it.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 November 2008 06:22pawkyfox wrote on Tue, 11 November 2008 21:09When in the future (if gay marriages are "legalized"), their kid asks them why one of his friends has 2 dads or 2 moms, what the heck are they going to say? You have got to be quite bigoted and indifferent if you do not see the conflict of ideals there.

As opposed to someone asking me why my parents think the world was made in a week by a celestial superbeing 6000 years ago? I personally think it would be far less embarrassing to have two dads.

A celestial superbeing making everything is far less embarrassing then saying we are products of a mighty big bangin' celestial fart...a theory that still has to come out with it's golden gun. Trust me, my kids won't lose face.

Plus it explains ghostly phenomenon, NDE's, and OBE's and our advanced design of our bodies which are valid credible arguments to the existence of a supernatural being and the afterlife and which Science carefully avoids since they are not observable and so they can't be possibly true.

Ghosts sound kind of "dumb" in these "modern times" don't they?But I don't care speaking my mind. I had one ghostly experience involving one of my deceased family members that is solid proof for me to believe that all that we see is not all that there is. Label me as you will.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 November 2008 06:22pawkyfox wrote on Tue, 11 November 2008 21:09Sure it is inferred but they do not want to impose anything...they just will not cooperate with gay marriage and amend their lifestyle to accept it because it severely compromises their value system.

I'll just repeat the fact that it does not "compromise" your value system, no matter how hard you have convinced yourself it does. You do not even have to "accept" it if you want...

My above explanation covers this. And just to repeat myself, if we don't accept, we are put into a corner and are tightly crushed to pulp and if we do accept, we are left alone.

If you are against thoughtcrime, you would understand.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 November 2008 06:22pawkyfox wrote on Tue, 11 November 2008 21:09I probably won't cooperate either. I could care less if you lived right next to my house and played with a dick the night before but then when you bring your kid along with his other dad to the bustop in the morning, I don't want to be anywhere nearby with MY kid.

I hear you, I don't particularly want to be around intolerant religious nutcases either; difference is you don't see me saying that it "compromises my value system" when a Christian walks past.

Since when did every Christian come at you with a Bible? Heck you dont even know if a person is Christian or not unless you ask him/her. I don't see how an unknown person walks by you and suddenly radiates a "Christian glow" and intrudes on your value system.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 November 2008 06:22

You stone people to death for working on the Sabbath?

We Christians follow the teachings of Christ Who created a new covenant...it does not render the old completely useless though. Jesus worked on a Sabbath to cause an uproar among the Pharisees who wanted to punish him. He also sat and ate with sinners. Christ is all about second chances...there won't be any second chances if the person is punished instantly.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 November 2008 06:22You think envy belongs in the 10 Commandments shortlist, but rape and slavery and cruelty to children don't?

The 10 Commandments are not the only commandments...every other commandment is as important as the ones in the 10 Commandments.

It is envy allright and the misuse of wanting. Desire is not bad as God promises blessings (But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.Matt 6:33).

But abusing desire and feeling jealous and trying to get other's people's belongings (like how King Ahab took Naboth's vineyard) is what the 10th Commandment addresses against.

Bible also tells to not to provoke your children.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 November 2008 06:22You think someone can be punished for a crime committed by someone else?

You think the path to forgiveness is the torture and execution of someone else?

Not just someone, Spooky...Jesus Christ the Son of God and that's was a one-time only deal.

We had no choice...if it was just someone or anybody could sacrifice themselves anytime to get forgiveness to others, then there would be no point and you can call it a joke. But it was Jesus Christ and it was not by our will but God's that He paid the price.

It makes the sacrifice of Jesus all the more important to us.

---

So Spooky, why does it bother you that we practice our Christian faith and bring up our children the same way? And what we believe? Aren't you against thoughtcrime? Why then try to endlessly counter us in these forums?

I do appreciate it you being respectable about it.

Logical fallacies, check! Out-of-context quote, check! Loaded questions, check!

Nice way to keep up with the stereotype. fyi the full quote is:

"The great break in the organic chain between man and his nearest allies, which cannot be bridged over by any extinct or living species, has often been advanced as a grave objection to the belief that man is descended from some lower form; but this objection will not appear of much weight to those who, from general reasons, believe in the general principle of evolution. Breaks often occur in all parts of the series, some being wide, sharp and defined, others less so in various degrees; as between the orang and its nearest allies -- between the Tarsius and the other Lemuridae -- between the elephant, and in a more striking manner between the Ornithorhynchus or Echidna, and all other mammals. But these breaks depend merely on the number of related forms which have become extinct. At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilised races of man will almost certainly xterminate, and replace, the savage races throughout the world. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes, as Professor Schaaffhausen has remarked, will no doubt be exterminated. The break between man and his nearest allies will then be wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilised state, as we may hope, even than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as now between the negro or Australian and the gorilla." (Darwin, The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex. 2nd edn., London, John Murray, 1882, p. 156)

Spooky should quit trying to speak some sense in these people.