

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 19 Apr 2010 01:44:03 GMT

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

---

Altzan wrote on Sun, 18 April 2010 19:11 Spoony said:Quote:He created it all, and he set the standards. There is punishment for those who don't follow.

the same feeble defence could be offered for any dictatorship with crappy laws.

Mmm-hmm.

Yet it still hasn't been shown that every single dictatorship is wrong. The only seemingly-bad aspect is how the people don't have equal status.

perhaps you can name one true dictatorship that worked out well?

Quote:Spoony said:Quote:If there was a sign warning people not to stray near thin ice, it wouldn't matter who walked over it: a punk who wants to show off, a man who thinks it's safe enough, a person who doesn't think that the ice will break if he's careful - if they walk that ice, it will break. then what will you say when you stand before god and he asks you why you didn't follow his more recent revelation to you through his prophet Mohammed? you didn't think the ice was real? it's still gonna break!

I'd rather believe in a sign that has evidence of being placed there by someone who knew what they were talking about, and not a sign placed by one man who had a vision.

you still fall into the "doesn't think the ice will break" category by saying that.

Quote:Spoony said:it's not clear at all that this is not what it means. obviously you aren't sure what it does mean.

Oh, its obvious it doesn't mean what you were trying to pass it off as.

actually, what i "tried to pass it off as" was one of the many examples in the bible of god holding one person accountable for the actions of others, which shows just how crappy his morals are (or, rather, how crappy are the morals of the men who invented this fictional character)

if god takes the view that having a child out of wedlock is sinful, then the people to punish would be the parents, right? the child was not consulted in the matter, could not have possibly avoided the conditions of his/her birth.

Quote:Spoony said:Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 14 April 2010 07:44Quote:Fossils created? No, the living beings they used to be...

If life slowly spread over Earth and not just suddenly appeared, there wouldn't be fossils just mass-appearing in groups. They'd be showing up in small but increasing numbers.

i've never heard anybody suggest that the population (in animal terms) of the earth at 4000 BC was very small.

Isn't that the point?

uh no, it's the opposite of the point.

How? If nobody ever hinted at the animal population starting small, that's against evolution and for creation.

i said nobody said that the population of the earth at 4000 BC was small. life's been on this planet for a lot longer than that.

Quote:Spoony said:Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 14 April 2010 07:44Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 12 April 2010 10:13so it's the same as the mafia protection, then. we're being "saved" by the guy who put us in the danger in the first place.

We're always 'in the danger' as it is from the start, then, because there are no other options other than accept or refuse...

...and who put us into that situation?

I already answered that.

sure, but you didn't seem to hear what you were saying.

the mafia protection analogy still holds.

I hear what you're saying, and I made a response for it.

Then you tunneled into one specific aspect...

the fact the whole "saved" concept is a tendentious and immoral racket?

Quote:Spoony said:why should the system not be an unchallengeable dictatorship?

Why can't it be? What is it about the basic definition of a dictatorship that's so horrible?

you said that you find islamic morality objectionable. it doesn't seem like you need this explained to you.

Quote:Spoony said:why should the system not have such appalling laws?

If the system decided to conform to anyone's standards, you can bet there will be people arguing against it just as vehemently as you are now.

...which is precisely why we need democracy, free inquiry and freedom of speech.

Quote:Right, the freedom to believe that you can do whatever you want in this world... and when you die, you will cease to exist.

If this life is the only one we have (and nobody has made a good case that it is otherwise), then it would make our life even more precious.

As for doing whatever we want, no. We do want laws, to uphold the basic human rights, to protect citizens, their rights and their property. But when it comes to the laws, we want the right to decide them democratically.

Quote:People will forget you, your actions will have been for nothing.

You don't think anything in your life is worthwhile?

Quote:Spoony said:ah, "inspired by god"... shame there's absolutely no good reason to think that's true.

Correction: you think there's absolutely no good reason to think that's true.

I've gone to extraordinary lengths to allow your side to support your claims, and I'm still open to evidence.

No rush.

Quote:Spoony said:it's very easy to notice that the only reason christians keep saying this is because the "evidence" is so laughably feeble. if they did have proof of christianity, they'd raise the roof and everybody knows it.

I've been studying something called "The Case for the Existence of God", and the "evidence" is anything but laughable - a lot of it makes sense.  
And why did the author write and publish this book?

Quote:Spoony said:the "evidence doesn't apply here, duhhh" (aka 'faith') is the biggest con trick mankind ever played on itself, it's extremely easy to see through but it's astonishing how many people have fallen for it.

Let me ask you then: do you think man as a whole is rational?  
Partially. Our brains are more advanced than animals, but they're still evolving; they're far from perfect.

Quote:I'm not trying to declare it as absolute fact to whoever I mention it to. I acknowledge it as unproven.  
But that does NOT translate to "I don't believe it."  
Whatever.

---