
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 18 Mar 2010 22:53:53 GMT

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

reborn wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 13:41Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 11:40
as for whether it's justified, well, it would be difficult to know in advance for sure how your parents would react if you told them you were gay. i wonder how much thought your brother put into it before telling you and your parents?

My parents made a point of letting us both know they would love us no matter what we chose. This I believe was in part because they knew (or suspected) my Brother was homosexual from a young age, and felt it would make it easier for him. However, my Brother still felt he could only tell my Mum, and asked her to let me and my Dad know, he didn't want to talk about it because he was embarrassed. I however felt it was important to tell him I loved him and broke the ice immediately. I think it was the right thing to do. This only further strengthens your argument about just how many people tell their parents. My brother and I was fortunate to be raised in such a loving environment, and he still struggled with it. yeah, exactly. he was fortunate to have understanding parents and a great brother. you say he suffered a lot over his sexuality - imagine how much worse it would have been for him if his family, the only people in the world who you ought to be able to expect to love you for who you are, had been less tolerant of homosexuality.

i'm sure a lot of people aren't so lucky.

there are a distressing number of parents, particularly christians in the US (though it happens here too) who think that homosexuality ought to be and can be cured through counselling, and send their kids there. i think that this is the worst thing a parent can do in the situation. the kid knows he's gay and isn't going to magically become straight, and in response to all the bullying he may have suffered from ignorant kids at school, he's basically getting the message that: you're tempted to an immoral lifestyle, you're the one here who needs to change your ways, not the pricks who pick on you.

sure, the parents probably have good intentions but i still think it's the last thing the child needs to hear.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 11:40

i must admit i think i should be having an easier time refuting it.

Well, I suppose it's logical in terms or maths, statistics or whatever. But emotionally and in terms of depth of character it's a pretty dumb argument. Avoiding enlightenment purposefully? lol... just saying that your argument wasn't really any different than the one put forward earlier, i.e. the only real objection is that the kid is more likely to be picked on. my initial reaction to it was basically that we just need to combat homophobia (and you don't do that by taking the child aside and saying these bullies are basically justified in having a go at you every day), and that kids bully each other for all sorts of reasons. it wasn't until you gave a very moving example that it gave me pause.

CarrierII wroteAs to whether homosexuality may beget more homosexuality:

In my experience, which when it comes to people who've been abused, which is regrettably extensive, as well as with people who've had happier lives, I've found that sexuality cannot be "learned", enforced, or changed. It is most definately innate.

no shit. the quickest response to anybody who is confused as to whether sexuality is a choice or not is to tell them simply to ask a gay person, preferably one who's your friend already so you don't come across as hostile.

Quote:@WubWub:

As to being made fun of for having same-sex parents, children at school are made fun of for any reason whatsoever. That's a sad fact of life. My repsonse (to bullies in general) often used to relate to how my parents were still in a happy marriage. School includes a pointless game of one-up-manship, it's nothing new.

Good one. Quite cheap, but it's a good response.

R315r4z0r wrote

No, their beliefs still should not be considered. If you start disallowing services to people of certain groups or beliefs, then you are:

1. Doing the exact same thing that Christians are doing against homosexuals.
2. Giving Christians ammunition for arguments concerning why their way of thinking is correct.

It does not matter what group or party or orientation the would-be parents are. If you take another look at the list of priorities I made, you will notice that I said that the child's safety and future should be made first priority. If said organization is indeed into such heinous acts against children, then it stands to reason that they wont meet the qualifications for the first priority that I laid out. it was basically a rhetorical answer. the real issue is that this condemnation of homosexuality in regards to the welfare of children is coming from an organisation whose policy and track record of the children in its care is about as bad as it gets. i wasn't really talking about a catholic couple being about to adopt a kid; that should be fine. i'm talking about the fact that a catholic group (an adoption agency, a school) ought to be given authority over kids' welfare at all should be quite alarming, and yet it has enormous control.

Altzan wroteNicely written summary... I think that's way too much involvement in government. I wish you didn't have to put up with that every day.

I don't really have any other comment here, unless you want one.

i'm curious to hear your response to what i said about religions having control over schools.

Quote:We teach our Children the faith, yes - that's how I was taught - but we don't go overboard with it, although I suppose the term is open to interpretation. That Jesus camp video posted awhile ago - We'd never do anything like that. My parents took me to church and taught me the religion and that's basically it. I could stop going right now if I wanted to and they probably wouldn't put up much of a fight, maybe a discussion at most.

That's what I thought. How objectively did they "teach you the faith"? For example, did they teach it as though it were revealed truth? Did they tell you right from the start that there's no evidence at all that the judeo-christian/islamic god even exists, let alone that this book and this religion is a reflection on what he expects of us? Did they point out to you that the book itself can't even get its own story straight? Did they tell you right from the start that there are all these other religions, as well as the possibility of living your life without one? (They probably had to say that two particular

religions - Islam and Mormonism - are specifically untrue, because if they were true then you can't really avoid converting to them away from Christianity). Did they tell you the absolutely incalculable damage that the various flavours of Christianity have caused? Just off the top of my head... persecution of other religions every time it thought it could get away with it, two thousand years of horrific anti-semitism and anti-gay people, violently standing in the way of scientific progress, the crusades, the inquisition, willing tool of imperialism and of a huge list of dictators throughout the ages, enthusiastic ally of fascism in Europe, and the enormous death toll it's helped to rack up by assisting the spread of AIDS by absurd rules on condoms, especially in Africa?

if they didn't tell you all that, then you weren't taught fairly.

and here's something that you may have been taught: were you at any point told that "faith" is a good thing?

Quote:What do you mean by blasphemy being prohibited? If I'm reading you right, then I see no problem if someone mouths off about Christianity - I can't make them believe, and I wouldn't badmouth atheism or other back at the person.

when I say blasphemy is prohibited, I refer to the stern warnings in the Bible that your God isn't going to put up with it. The death penalty is mentioned a few times. This would appear to be a "sin", then (as is worshipping a different God, or having doubts about your God)

Quote:It's hard to explain. Abortion might be a good example... when abortion was legalized in some states of the US, we fought the passage of the law because we don't believe abortion is right. But I would not physically attempt to stop someone from getting an abortion, neither would I attack the clinic, as I've heard some do before.

actually, abortion isn't a good example of what I meant, because there are genuine arguments against abortion. when I say genuine argument I mean something better than "God doesn't want this happening", which is a totally meaningless statement until you've proven that -a- your God exists, -b- he does indeed feel that way, and then you still have to make the case that what he wants is more important than democracy.

no, I'm talking about things like homosexuality, blasphemy, dietary requirements etc, for which the genuine secular case against them has yet to be made. if these are things that your religion doesn't like, then you avoid doing them yourself, leave the rest of us alone and the town is big enough for the both of us, hmmm?

sadly that's not the case with so many religious people, and your statement implied that it's the same sort of thing with you... i.e. if it's a "sin" then you ought to fight to keep it banned.
