
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 24 Apr 2010 10:43:27 GMT

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

Altzan wrote on Fri, 23 April 2010 22:29 Whether you believe in a God or no, surely you don't think he's human...

Nobody's given any reason to think Jesus was anything more than human. (I don't have too much of a problem accepting that a man called Jesus existed at a particular time and place, although there isn't much evidence for it. the evidence that he was in any way supernatural is absolutely nil)

Nobody's given any reason to think that the bible was not written in just the same way as any other book; the product of the imagination of humans.

And even if you did set up a Christian theocracy, who will be in charge of it? Who'll be enforcing the rules in the here and now? Either humans or nobody, it seems.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:58Quote:Well, I don't think the Earth has been around longer than over 8 millenia or so.

well, that's not a view you can come to by actually studying evidence critically.

Actually, it is and it was.

I don't doubt that you believe that.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:58Quote:Islamic morality hardly involves the definition of dictatorship being wrong.

you said you objected to islamic morality. what if the islamic revelation was correct? if you object to it, if you think its rules are evil, then the concept of dictatorship falls...

Why?

Islam may believe in a dictatorship, but not agreeing with it hardly topples the dictatorship system. i didn't mean it topples the system, i meant it shatters the concept that it could be a good thing. the whole point of a dictatorship is: if you don't like something (or everything) about it, there's nothing you or any of your fellow humans can do about it.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:58Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 18 April 2010 20:44As 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.

The system can be as perfect or corrupt as it can or will.

sure, and you'll invariably find that the more religious a society is, the more corrupt it is.

Not accounting for the religions that did help a society's way of life?

You use the plural... are you saying that a religion other than Christianity has had a positive benefit?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:58Quote:That doesn't change the fact that once it and the people within it are gone, they're gone for good... if there's no afterlife.

Yes, but the party will go on. The human race goes on, the planet's still here, our friends and

relatives are still here...

For a time. But it all will be gone eventually, it isn't eternal.
Then what's left?
I don't know why you're asking me, frankly.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:58"Your actions will have been for nothing" if there's no afterlife. If there is, then your actions will mean a better deal for you.

Or a worse deal. There's two sides to the coin.
And the deal applies to everyone, not just me.
You missed the point.

You started off by saying that the heaven/hell concept was better because otherwise, if there's no afterlife, you can indulge your own selfish desires, do whatever you like because it won't matter once you're dead. Selfishness, lack of care for others, that must be the problem.

Well, a couple of quick questions later and it turns out that your number one reason for preferring the Christian concept is selfishness. You act the way you do in life because you think there's something in it for you later on. That was the point.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:58Excuse me? I've gone to quite some trouble to respond to the "evidence" you posted, and pointed out how laughably feeble it was. If you've got any more, go ahead. Don't post a whole mess of links though; put it all in one place.

I'm not going to run it by you again, because you've already proved that you aren't interested. If I did, you'd likely laugh it off and ignore parts of it again.
I'm not gonna let you get away with lying about this again.

Pages and pages ago, I asked: what's the evidence supporting the biblical account reported in Genesis? I've asked this question again and again and again, and you still haven't supplied anything tangible. What little you did provide, not that any of it even answered the question, was very very easy to debunk.

Of course, you aren't the first religious person I've challenged them for evidence; there are usually two ways they react. Either they arbitrarily declare that evidence is inadmissible, or they try to prove it and come up with something really pathetic that shouldn't convince a child, and then they isolate themselves from counterargument.

But it's ok - we have a summary of the situation right there in your post.
Spoony: "Excuse me? I've gone to quite some trouble to respond to the "evidence" you posted, and pointed out how laughably feeble it was. If you've got any more, go ahead. Don't post a whole mess of links though; put it all in one place."
Altzan: "I'm not going to run it by you again, because you've already proved that you aren't interested.
If I did, you'd likely laugh it off and ignore parts of it again."

it's fine, you see, because anyone reading this thread can clearly see you're just lying to try to

evade the question... you have a very clear demand for evidence (again), and you have a flat refusal on the grounds that I won't even look at it. I do say you're lying on this point rather than just stupid, because you don't seem to be that stupid.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:58Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 18 April 2010 20:44Quote: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?
Do I really have to explain? It's obvious as to why he published an article of that nature.
I would like you to answer the question.

Since I don't see where you're getting at, I won't.
I'm sure you're capable of making a point without it.
I wish I understood why you're so extraordinarily evasive on this point.

It's a simple question. What was the purpose the author had of writing this book? You say it was obvious. So what was it?

Quote:Sure, sure. But this basic human attribute of looking toward a higher power had to have come from somewhere.
And you've already agreed that the overwhelming majority of the attempts we humans have made on the subject... have been completely wrong.

As for where it comes from, seems like we went over that in terms of morality. I answered where morals come from, you didn't...

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:58Quote:Also, here's another question:
"The creative power of the mind amounts to nothing more than the faculty of combining, transposing, augmenting, and diminishing the materials afforded to us by sense and experience."
(David Hume)
Do you agree with this statement?
I can see why he said it, and I can see why a religious person would jump on it.

Ok. But do you think he is right, or wrong? It's not an opinion he's stating, it's a true or false fact. Is it? I wouldn't have phrased it that way.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:58What about that evil rape law we discussed earlier? It was never repudiated, remember. You made some weak bleating about how it must have been something to do with the culture at the time.

It's a sensible point, one you countered with, "You don't know that for sure."[/quote]
I have no idea why you keep lying about this stuff.

I pressed you again and again on this evil piece of garbage in your holy book. I asked you over and over: do you think there's anything wrong with this rule? Eventually you got this far:

Spoony: "do you think that is a good rule for cases of rape?"
Altzan: "Of course not, we live in different times now. Civilization was a lot different back then.

I have never lived in those times so I can't say how good or bad that law was."

Spoony: "what a cowardly, euphemistic answer.

the law is sick and immoral, there's no two ways about it. and if it came from god, then god's sick and immoral too.

yes, civilisation was different back then. they had really shitty morals. you can tell just by reading books written at the time, most obviously the bible. thank god we don't have huge numbers of people trying to live their lives based on the moral standards of primitive middle-east barbarians.

oh wait, we do, don't we."

it's odd, my response doesn't look much like "you don't know that for sure". it looks more like "the rule is evil, and if it came from god, god's evil too."
