

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Mon, 26 Apr 2010 02:41:13 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010 05:43 You use the plural... are you saying that a religion other than Christianity has had a positive benefit?

Certainly. There hve been plenty of belief systems that have revolved around the idea of peacefully coexisting with fellow human beings.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010 05:43 Quote: 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.

Heck, I'd accept an answer from anyone.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010 05:43 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.

So when you obey the laws of your country, you do it because you're selfish?

Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010 05:43 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.

Mmmkay. The Genesis accout deals with the origin of the universe, and so far, I'm the only one who provided a possible explanation of where it came from. Nothing from you yet, that I recall. But clearly there are only three possible ways:

- 1) The universe is eternal.
- 2) The universe is not eternal - it created itself from nothing.
- 3) The universe is not eternal - it was created by something aterior, and superior, from itself.

Now let's hit it with logic.

- 1) Science has already declared the universe to not be eternal. "In science, as in the Bible, the World begins in an act of creation. That view hasn't always been held by science. Only as a result of the most recent discoveries can we say that with a fair degree of confidence that our universe has not existed forever; that it began abruptly, without any apparent cause, in a blinding event that defies scientific explanation." -Jastrow
- 2) This possibility is just absurd. "No material thing can create itself." -J.C. Monsma
- 3) This is the only choice left...

If there was a time where only NOTHING existed, there would be NOTHING still, because something cannot come out of nothing. Since something obviously does exist, it must have ALWAYS existed... so what is it?

- 1) Everything is categorized as matter or mind... nothing else...so:
- 2) Something is eternal, as mentioned
- 3) That something must be either mind or matter
- 4) It cannot be matter, for matter is not eternal.
- 5) That eternal something must be "mind". There has been an eternal mind.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010 05:43 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.

This paragraph is just a bunch of hot air and you know it.

I've presented material and you have responded. Now give me a clear reason why I should show it to you AGAIN, since if you truly wanted to see it again, you would go look at it yourself. That isn't a refusal on my part rather than yours.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010 05:43 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?

I'm not being evasive. I'm trying to avoid being redundant.

But fine.

He wrote the article on Evidence of the Existence of God because he wants to convey evidence of the existence of God to those who want to know why he believes in a God.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010 05:43 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...

Oh no. I DID answer that question, I told you where I believe morals come from, same as you. I believe a higher power created us and those morals. You believe man and morals came from... somewhere.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010 05:43 Quote: Spoony wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:58 Quote: 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.

Now who's being evasive?

Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 25 April 2010 20:17 It is by belief that a huge majority of christians blame earthquakes on human actions and a fatal car accident on your god's wrath. It ain't a choice. It's very real and biblical.

How is it Biblical to believe that God is involved in current affairs?

Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 25 April 2010 20:17 This is what I was getting at. They are as christian as you are. As mentioned earlier, from what's quiet apparent, the western versions of your religion is modernized and phoney. It's quiet amazing that this coincides with the fact that the west has been leading human progress for thousands of years.

Why don't you describe what you mean by "modernized and phony" so I don't have to leave this unreplied-to from puzzlement.

Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 25 April 2010 20:17 When an atheist points to previous versions of christianity that used to be practiced, there is nothing but denial followed up with a "life used to be different then" excuse.

You can come that close to finding the right answer (i.e, "life used to be different then") but then stop yourself there. Yes, life used to be different then and the earth was considered to be flat and the center of the universe and humanity as a whole was a lot more idiotic level than it is now.

If life has been a whole lot different in the past, changing greatly (and you just admitted that) then why should religion be eternally unchanged to be valid?

Obviously, aspects of a belief system will have to change as man's way of life changes.

Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 25 April 2010 20:17 It's the same deal with the concept of sacrifice. They used to sacrifice live humans at one point before moving on to valuable goods like food. Now it's down to "self-sacrifice" by giving up what are obviously natural human traits but mistaken for "lust." You get this all the time with sexuality...it's completely natural yet the religious see it as something to be treated with "caution" and control. That's "religious sacrifice thru the ages" for you in a nutshell.

Sexuality is natural. It exists to help man as a race live on. In that aspect, homosexuality isn't "natural".

And the idea of abstinence deals mostly with morals and civilization rather than religion.

Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 25 April 2010 20:17 You here is in a similar situation though it leans more toward the condensed concept of some form of self-sacrifice to get faith-based rewards in the afterlife. "Make your body a living sacrifice" said the new-age pastor of the nondenominational megachurch a couple months ago. Well, quiet risky (I bet you think the 9/11 hijackers didn't get their reward for all their hard work). While I do think the reward that you feel "will be worth it" is quiet illusionary and not worth gambling your life away for, I am not interested in intruding into that area as it does not affect me...only you.

In other words, you think it is nonsensical to believe in any sort of afterlife whatsoever, and that no action in this life should be spent to affect actions or events in a possible afterlife.

Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 25 April 2010 20:17 You jumped from "basic human attribute" to "god maybe real" which is not quiet surprising from religious people (who jump at gaps). I have heard this argument from many folks that use it in debates like this and I myself used this argument here when I used to be christian. I rejected this argument eventually because it gets easily untenable when more facts are brought in to the mix.

My question stands though - we have a basic human attribute of trying to understand what superior force put us where we are, and man did NOT just imagine it, because it is impossible to create an idea without prior influences. If we didn't come up with it by reasoning, as athiests claim, or by evidence of one (again claimed by atheists), then I challenge you to tell me where this idea came from.

Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 25 April 2010 20:17 If any supernatural creatures did come down and gave humanity our moral compass, wouldn't the early religions be based around and worship these very same supernatural beings? Why then did pre-historic humans worship nature initaly before moving on to spirits...

Man didn't initially worship nature, they did worship those "same supernatural beings".

Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 25 April 2010 20:17 Whatever way you look at it, its obvious humanity is like a person in a dark room trying to make sense of who and what they are. Most definitely not a person in a dark room with a flashlight (courtesy of gods) and knowing where exactly to go. If that had been the case, there wouln't have been so many variations in belief systems popping up. It's been a long process of understanding and we have come a long way and have a better idea of who we are than any ancient belief system could claim.

Um, if we were given a flashlight and told where to go, I'm pretty sure we wouldn't be able to get there on our own without disagreements on the best way to get there... hence the variations.

Mr.Mom wrote on Sun, 25 April 2010 14:30 I completely disagree. I believe it is a choice. Everybody has free will to choose whether they want to be heterosexual or homosexual. That is just my opinion.

Do you have any hard proof to support your statement? Other than opinions of other people. I mean hard proof.

I agree with you as well - it's a choice, not something you are born with.

---