
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 04 Apr 2010 05:47:43 GMT

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

Altzan wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 22:41 Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45a negative meaning, not a negative connotation. dictatorship sucks by definition. and yet i don't know of any human dictatorship that managed to become as all-encompassing, unchallengeable and inescapable as the depiction in christianity.

Why does it suck by definition? And under what circumstances?

why does dictatorship suck? because you exist at the whim of an unchallengeable authority. because you have no way of determining your conditions. because you only have the rights the boss chooses to give you.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45because until you've gotten past that square one, most of your assertions are at best a waste of time.

Then yours are too, because you haven't proved he doesn't exist. And I see no reason why anyone's assertions are valid until one or the other is proven... based on what you said anyway. um, what? none of my moral assertions have required the non-existence of a god, nor would they be disproven if this god of yours turned out to be real after all.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45so in a nutshell, the only reason you're not acting in the bloodthirsty, merciless way islam commands its followers to act is because you don't think it really came from God... there's no moral compunction holding you back, and there wouldn't be if it turned out you were wrong?

One of the main reasons I don't think it came from God is the morals themselves. go on, if you like.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45Quote:Is that any worse than your statement that you'd challenge an almighty God, if you knew for fact he existed, because you don't like his authority?

yes, it is. i'm objecting to christianity because -a- i don't believe any of it and -b- i don't want a dictatorship and -c- i think his rules are absolutely shit.

-a- OK

-b- That's been plainly obvious for awhile... even if there's a higher power, you want to be in control.

-c- I've only heard you challenge OT rules so far.

-b- uh, no. i argued against dictatorship from the very beginning, and argued in favour of democracy. i'd love to know how "i want to have a vote" translates into "i want to be in control" in your mind?

-c- then you haven't read many of the things i've said to you. goodness knows i've tried to get you to understand that it's evil to threaten someone, especially a child, with the most horrific punishment imaginable just because they don't agree with your religion. and that comes from the new.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45your only objection to following islam's rules is you don't believe it. well, it's good you've laid out for us what at least two people reading this thread had already guessed... i.e. that you have no morals.

No, that you THINK I have no morals, which is helped along by you twisting my words so often. and in what instance did i "twist your words"? you said you would murder your innocent child if god instructed you to. you justified the slaughter of innocent children if someone else in the city had a different religious opinion. you said homosexuality is as bad as rape. i don't need to twist anything here.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45my word. i hear it all the time. saying that god gave them the world, saying they have god-given rights (such a stupid thing to say, but nvm for now), saying grace before a meal...

I see no problem with saying grace, but the others I don't agree with.
did god give you anything? life, health, prosperity etc?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45"wanting something god can't give you" sounds like a pretty good reason to turn away from religion; if it can't give you basic human rights, democracy, and intellectual freedom, for example.

"basic human rights"

Which ones do you think he denies?

"democracy"

Mmm-hmm.

"intellectual freedom"

And what would that be?

for starters, the right to freely think and inquire and speak. christianity doesn't even permit freedom of thought, let alone speech.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45wanting something god won't give you doesn't put the person at fault instead of the god.
nor does wanting to do something god considers a sin.

It is if you shouldn't want it at all, if it is wrong.

Of course, you probably don't think they're wrong... ah, morals.

i really feel sorry for you... i really, really do. you've been completely corrupted by religion.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45having a different religious opinion is not even a crime at all

You still haven't answered my question regarding that...

Why should anyone go free of a law, ANY law, just because they don't agree with it?
i did answer that, actually.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45odd to use the word "defense" to explain the supposed behaviour of the israelites...

Why? Do you think the other groups wanted to live in peaceful tolerance with them?
i don't think peaceful tolerance with a group as debauched as the israelites, ruled as they were by an entity as downright evil as yahweh, would be even possible let alone desirable.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45why are you sure? i didn't find god saying the guy shouldn't have done it. you'd think a book perpetually trumpeted as an ultimate moral authority might have something to say against someone who throws a defenceless girl to a mob of rapists to save himself.

Right, the Bible really has space to say things about every sinner in history.
so you're saying the only reason the bible does not condemn this man is thanks to lack of space? well, firstly the bible rambles on and on and on and on. secondly the story basically happens twice (this one, and lot/sodom and gomorrah), and the man who decided to throw defenceless girls at the mob of rapists got off without so much as a slap on the wrist both times.

Quote:Besides... man throws girl to save self, girl dies... how is that NOT murder?
you're admitting the guy was morally wrong, so why doesn't the bible condemn it?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45secondly, you don't think there's anything wrong with that rape rule? the man has to marry the woman and pay off her father. doesn't seem like a terribly severe punishment for the man. more to the point, it makes the woman's predicament even worse. she's just been raped, and then she's told she must marry the bastard who attacked and violated her. is it safe to assume you don't know any women who have been raped? who, in a modern civilised country, would seriously hold a moral position as shitty as this if they didn't get it from religion?

Who today holds that moral position?
answer the question at the beginning of the paragraph. do you think that is a good rule for cases of rape? do you think god did a good job making that rule? do you still think god is the ultimate supreme source of good morals?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45thirdly, you basically said that an adult man who enters into a consenting sexual relationship with another man is just as bad as a man who rapes a woman. i guess you don't know any gay people either.

No, I did not say that. I said that God won't rate either act a worse sin than the other in judgement. I didn't say I thought neither act was worse in itself than the other.
don't try to wriggle out of this one, champ.

here's what i asked.

"what, in your view and in the view of your church, is the worse act of these two:

- a man rapes a woman
- two men, consenting adults, choose to have a sexual relationship"

you answered:

"No sin is worse than another."

and that's all you said on the subject. you said neither was worse than the other. it's right there.

and if your god won't say that one of them IS worse than the other, then that's another thing i have against your god. if he judges two gay guys to be the same as a rapist, then he's morally bankrupt. but then, i've been saying that all along.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45perhaps you could quote the verse(s) in Genesis, the first book in the bible, that explain just who this Satan is and make it clear that the snake who tempted eve is indeed this character Satan.

Genesis 3 explains it pretty well, especially the prophecy made in verse 15.
quote it all, hmm? everything in genesis explaining who satan is and explaining that the snake was satan.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45oh, if it's a test of whether you will do whatever your boss tells you no matter how evil it is, then sure, abraham passes and i emphatically won't. but like i said, some of us actually have morals.

Yet you think that morals came from basically nowhere in particular... and that that isn't ridiculous. nowhere? the human species has existed for hundreds of thousands of years. we learn more all the time. for example, our moral standards are a lot better than they were two thousand years ago. just look at how crappy the morals were of the men who wrote the bible, look at what shitty ideas they had.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45compassion can compel us to do something wrong, like refrain from murdering a close friend or family member who tells us their religious views.
three cheers for compassion, i say.

Kinda conflicts with your above quote...
So much for morals.
??

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45Quote:Example - your friend has finally broken his alcohol addiction, but he is miserable as a result, and keeps desiring just 'one more drink'. You might feel pity and wish to fulfill his wish just to make him happy again. After all, it's just one more drink right? And it'd make him feel better!
uh no, because moral considerations are based on a little more than just immediate happiness.

Once again, you read too far into the example to avoid acknowledging it.
uh no, i responded to what you said.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45remember the first religious debate between you and i? you kept saying that if you won't believe anything without proof, you're a "hopeless case".

I was wrong to say that.
Also, I said it once, not "kept saying".
you kept trying to justify it. dover and i repeatedly tried to get you to open your eyes. it's good that you admit you were wrong in that case; you didn't in the thread and it went on for quite a while.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45you said that anyone who finds your religion unconvincing is "desperately trying to find an excuse because they want an easier path".

Quote me, since I have no idea what you're referring to.
this was the same post or nearby as the "hopeless case" remark

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45that isn't even internally consistent

I have yet to see evidence it isn't...
the gospels can't agree on almost anything.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45and whose authorship is dubious

I'll give you that, but it's safe to say any ancient writing has dubious authorship.
yes, but most ancient books don't claim to be infallible. and yet the bible's history of collation is entirely political.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45and we have monumentally large implications.

What?
heaven and hell?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45we don't even have ordinary proof. however,
earlier you said there was... that didn't go very well, did it?

No, it didn't. Because you didn't even read the entire thing. You skipped all the -ology sections.
lol? i replied to everything i saw, and all of it horribly feeble.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45so muslims have greater faith than you, basically?

Implying that less proof = more faith?
well, yeah. their religion is even more incomprehensible and absurd than yours, so they must
have more faith if they believe in it, right?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45it's what the boss wants that counts.

And you've basically said you want to be that boss, or at least one of them.
again, i'd love to know how you got from "i want democracy instead of dictatorship" to "i want to be
the boss or at least one of them"

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45Quote:You were quoting scripture. That wasn't an
opinion of yours, that was a point of yours you tried to back up. That's why i responded.
i have absolutely no idea what you're trying to say here.

You quoting scripture and pointing at it is NOT an opinion, it's a point you were trying to make.
So I replied in kind.
i'm still confused as to your point

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:451. Hear the message (Romans 10:17)
So faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ.
what exactly is the message?

Basically, the plan.
And the Bible as a whole.
shrug

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:452. Believe it (Mark 16:16)
Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved, but whoever does not believe will be condemned.
carrot and stick! shame we're talking about thoughtcrime here. see my earlier objections.

I have, believe me.
well, then your five-step plan falls at point 2 in my case, because i don't believe it, and because i
don't believe it i am going to be "condemned". what a shitty moral system.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45i'm reminded again of our earlier religious debate.
you said that you'd done things which you would deserve to go to hell for if you hadn't "repented".
well, that's quite a daring admission, telling us that you'd done something so evil that it would
justify the most horrific punishment of all. (unless you're arguing that god and his punishments are
unjust, and you've never seemed to think that)

"so evil"? It doesn't have to be "So evil" to trigger that.
and doesn't that suck?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45well, i couldn't help but ask what those things
were. what were these horrific crimes you committed? you wouldn't say.

Well, if someone asked you to list the morally unjust things you've done that have violated your
moral code, would you list them all?
whoah there. i didn't say i'd done anything so bad that it would justify me receiving the very worst
punishment imaginable. even if i had committed murder, the penalty would be less harsh than
hell.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45 i also asked how you define "repented". you said
that it basically means asking for forgiveness in private prayer or in church. interesting, that. if i
thought i had done something so appalling evil, so damaging to the world around me that it would
justify me receiving the very worst punishment imaginable, i can't imagine how just saying sorry in
a church could possibly make up for it.

"appallingly evil"? "So damaging to the world"?
Your whole sentence hangs on those two vague and unexplained phrases.
Care to interpret?
sorry, i guess i'm just trying to be generous and make the assumption that your god is just, in spite
of the bible making it clear that he isn't.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45finally... "and you will receive the gift of the Holy
Spirit". what's that then?

Heaven?

k, well, obviously i'm not gonna get that but may as well ask

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:454. State that you believe christ is the son of God (Romans 10:10)

For with the heart one believes and is justified, and with the mouth one confesses and is saved. well, i don't believe that. i do have a question, though.

what would you prefer?

person A doesn't believe this, and says so honestly.

person B says he believes this, and you don't have any way of really knowing whether he's telling the truth or just wants you to shut the fuck up.

What I'd prefer?

Person A, myself.

Because with Person B, I don't even have a chance to save them. save them from what?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45[b]6. Live faithfully until Death (Revelations 2: 10) is this only addressed to people who are about to be thrown into prison, or about to encounter the devil? or can we ignore the first two sentences and it's the third that applies to everyone at all times?

He was speaking to the imminent prisoners at the time, but the message is not addressed to just specifically them, but to everyone.

how do you know? remember, you said earlier that a particular verse is only applicable to the israelites.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45well, "be faithful". define that for me, please. you'd also better explain what "the crown of life" is.

"be faithful"

Follow the commandments in the Bible, like weekly worship, Lord's Supper, behaviour and conduct, avoidance of sins...

are you sure that's what "faithful" means? usually "faith" seems more to do with believing stuff without evidence.

Quote:snpr1101 wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45Now I'm not really sure as to how Altzan came to the conclusion that one is worse than the other (maybe there's some sort of point system in the bible that i missed aka 10 points for rape, yay I win!), but I think in his view, they are both sins.

Yeah, Spoony didn't give me much of a chance to justify my statement, did he? Jumped all over it and spread it around before I could tell him he was wrong.

i think i can see you're beginning to realise you made a terrible fuckup in your statement about rape vs homosexuality. it's cool if you want to retract it, but do yourself a favour and don't act like i'm at fault for asking the question and then finding your very clear response to be appalling.