

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sat, 20 Mar 2010 02:37:53 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 23:57there's no need so long as you acknowledge that christianity does have a bad side. i expect that even if you aren't convinced of everything on my list, you're probably nodding at a couple of them. and if you're really teaching someone about the religion, it's only fair to include the bad bits as well as the good, the way the religion behaved when it really had power.

But I still want to know why it's Christianity's fault for most of these - take a look at what happened, what these people did, and I'll see if there's anyplace in the Bible where they were commanded to do them. And I'm talking New Testament here, not the fools who think the Old Testament is still in power and sacrifices are still demanded and whatnot.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 23:57I thought you'd say that. I have no idea why people can't see what a really, really stupid sentence it is.

Evidence simply means seen, something observable to support a claim. It's a completely nonsensical statement.

I generally hear faith to mean the willingness to believe something without proof, and I've never, ever, ever heard why that would be a good thing. Especially since it's usually applied to propositions that, if they were true, would have enormous consequences - things like heaven and hell. So someone says: he'd make a good president because he's a person of faith. You're telling me he's willing to believe extremely important things without having a good reason to believe them? I can't imagine why anyone considers faith a good thing other than the fact they've been told it is.

The religion isn't bound to pure blind faith. The problem is that our faith is founded on several factors you consider to be theories. (And honestly, theories probably is a good word for them because I can't provide explicit certain proof that, say, the Bible was written by the will of God.)

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 23:57It's not that simple. Someone trustworthy tells me they went to the supermarket yesterday, no proof is required.

Here's a claim.

The one true god has actually provided an update since Christianity, through a series of revelations involving a prophet in the 7th/8th century. The holy books arising from this revelation make it clear that the only way to heaven now is to follow the new religion, and those people who stay Christian are going to end up in hell with all the other infidels.

I assume you don't believe that this is true, that you are not convinced that the Prophet Mohammed actually was the real deal. So I'm not the only one who wants proof before believing certain things. Have a good think about why it is you don't believe this.

Quick answer? The Bible we follow was paved with examples, demonstrations. From Old Testament to Christ. The final version of the Bible that we follow today was finalized shortly after

Jesus' death, if I recall correctly. And all up to that point, there were involvements by God and Jesus, and miracles by the apostles.

Mohammed offered nothing like that at all.

But the problem - I didn't see God's message to Mohammed. I also didn't see Jesus himself or the apostles. Our faith, essentially, is built on our ancestor's experiences.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 23:57 He also instructed his followers that if they find a city containing people who worship other gods, that everyone in the city ought to be slaughtered. Everyone in the city.

The slaughter of innocent children as punishment for the crime of their dictator. Well, why not just kill Pharaoh? Why kill innocent people? Same could probably be said for the golden calf; Moses instructs every man to kill his brother, etc etc etc. They were all worshipping the golden calf, were they? And is it really just to have half the men slaughtered and the other half turned into executioners?

They weren't wiped out by God purely for nonbelief. They weren't wiped out by God just because they worshipped false gods, either. They were doing far worse things, such as sacrificing their children to their gods.

As for the children dying - they didn't go to hell. Since they weren't old enough to understand, they went to heaven. If they had lived, though, it would be far worse - they'd have a warped view of what happened that day, and probably rebelled against those people by instinct. Only other option is to let all the people live, and continue their false worship and human sacrifice. Good idea.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 23:57 Firstly, it's not a case of God "not doing you any favours then". We're told that he will visit appalling punishments upon us. That's not simply God deciding he's not going to give me any more pocket money.

Okay, but still, why shouldn't he act the way he has promised he will? Are you saying the punishment should be less severe?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 23:57 Secondly, if disregarding him and thinking he doesn't exist makes him angry, he should have taken the time to come up with a less ridiculously incompetent revelation.

How is it incompetent?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 23:57 Thirdly, what kind of moral system is this? You said religions depend on faith (and you probably didn't realise what a deathblow you dealt when you said that). Here's an extraordinary claim, we aren't going to show you any evidence, you've got to decide it's true and you'll be horribly punished if you've got your doubts? What the fuck?

re: not just faith alone.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 23:57 Yeah, but my question was how are you going to say that these other people are doing anything wrong if they did try that?

Sorry, you lost me...

EDIT: Can I get your opinion on this passage I found?

Quote:Our pre-suppositions can be self-destructive! One is at risk of having built a house on sand. When the rains of existence come down, the house may not stand. We argue that you may have claimed the right to judge the rationality and morality of things. But consider that apart from God you cannot make any of your claims stick beyond your own subjective state. This is so because you cannot explain rationality itself. Why do the laws of logic seem to work? Who says so? Why do we all have moral ideas about right and wrong and the desire to impose them? Why do we expect nature to act uniformly? The skeptic cannot provide a satisfactory explanation for the "why" of the most basic "laws," the very criteria he wants to impose. He has to admit that either he made them up or that he accepts them on the authority of other finite creatures.

<http://tinyurl.com/yjp4vrx>

---