
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sun, 09 May 2010 06:10:02 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48Quote:I'd be puzzled to understand how it ultimately holds less priority than this life.

so you sympathise with the suicide murderers of islam, for example? they're told they're going straight to paradise if they kill a few infidels and die in the process.

No, I'm not a islamic sympathiser. Not sure how you came to that conclusion.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48you've spent several pages asking what would be so wrong with a heavenly dictatorship.

swap "religion" in your last sentence for "god" and ask the question again. are you against god having power over a person who does not want any of it?

No.

If (I put an if there so I won't offend you further) God exists and did create everything, then I don't see why his creation deserves seperation from creator by default.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 05 May 2010 08:16how can you say a rejection of theism based on its extreme improbability and lack of any evidence (not to mention moral objections) is "not atheism"?

OK, bad wording on my part, since the loose definition of atheism is "denies the existence of (a) god".

i'm sure that is how religious people usually like to define atheists.

Define atheism, then, in your own words.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 05 May 2010 08:16nice dodge. you started off on a bullshit assumption, i.e. that everything is mind or matter.

Go ahead, explain how it's bullshit...

...the question i asked and which you couldn't answer. "i.e. show me something that's mind with no basis of matter, please"

And MY question was to provide an example of something that doesn't fit into "mind" or "matter". However, if I can't give an example of a mind existing without matter (and I explained why I could not) that in no way disproves the idea.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 05 May 2010

08:16Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 02 May 2010 09:00Quote:Logically, it is a statement. It is either true or false. I asked you which you think it is. If you refuse to answer and give no reason other than "I don't accept that this is a yes-no question" then you are indeed evading it.

When did I refuse to answer? I said I wouldn't have phrased it like that.

Well, if you hesitate to throw your opinion to either choice, then rephrase it to how you think it is, don't avoid it altogether.

moving the goalposts again.

OK, I'll leave it at that, then. Thanks for showing me an easy way to evade questions, I might give

it a go later on.
quite plainly i did not evade the question at all.

This is just silly.

I provided a quote, asked for your opinion. If you won't give one, then at least give a reason why. Even "I don't want to" will do fine.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48 When somebody says something as astonishingly fatuous as what you just said, the kindest thing you can do is shock them into realising it. If they're offended, tough... it's better than carrying on not knowing what an idiot they just make themselves look like, and probably doing it again later.

Thing is, my "saying something as astonishingly fatuous" is your own opinion.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48 okay... so until then he's quite content to let the world be fucked up beyond recognition

It's man's choice, not his.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48 (usually by the religious)

Yet the worst events I see usually aren't religious by nature, but simply humans infringing on other's rights for selfish and immoral reasons. And the religion I'm a part of wants (and gives) peace and goodwill with their neighbors and fellow humans.

Groan about our spiritual message all you like, you certainly have a right to. But you'd have to be pretty biased to disapprove of our behaviour/ethics involving interaction with our fellow man... we certainly don't think murder/theft/crime/hate/greed is proper. Hopefully you feel the same.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48 y'know, after islam started up, it wasn't long before it conquered half the christian world. all these devout christians slaughtered and subjugated by a false prophet... wouldn't it have been nice to get a little memo saying "this guy mohammed doesn't actually work for me"?

It would have been, yes. Why?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48 you start off by this string of pseudo-logic how there must be a god (your god, conveniently) because the universe can't create itself. so people ask the obvious question - how did this god come into existence, then? you say he doesn't have to follow these same rules of common sense. well, how do you know that? "i just believe it"

facepalm

Come on. I said the universe must have been created by a higher power. I stated that I believe it is a diety.

And if that diety wasn't eternal, then something even more powerful must have created him, and then what about THAT one, and...

Doesn't work out.

kadoosh wrote on Sat, 08 May 2010 21:36Altzan It's quite simple really. You believe in a higher power. You live your life the way you feel you should. As long as you don't inhibit someone else from doing the same, there's no problem with what religion you believe in.

Problem is, Spoonny thinks I'm doing more than just that, apparently.

kadoosh wrote on Sat, 08 May 2010 21:36If other countries let religion have reign on their gov't and they are pissed about it, don't let them lure you into useless debates on the existence of god. Skeptics will find loop holes in anything to have an argument about. They will not accept any form of proof short of having God himself arrive at these peoples house, and explaining his plan to them. As long as you live your life as a law obeying citizen then there's nothing they can say against you personally.

That's actually very well worded. Thank you.

The thread did start with a gov't action in the UK, and a protest against religious government authority. And it's getting applied to me purely because they're both carrying the Christian label. And I still don't know why people think that's logical.

kadoosh wrote on Sat, 08 May 2010 21:36The proof of people looking for evidence and believing only certain parts of that information can be proven by looking at anything political. Different people look at things and interpret them differently. Then you get ridiculous arguments where people point to 1 page of a 4000 page report and say this flaw proves you are wrong.

True, it's happened many times in this thread alone.

Sometimes debaters (myself included at some points I admit) don't look at an opposing argument with a "let's see what they have to say" attitude, but rather a "let's see the best way to refute or ridicule this" attitude. I wish this never happened, flamewars would be less likely to happen. But it's the internet, the location of almost pure anonymity, which fuels such behaviour. It's hard to curb.

kadoosh wrote on Sat, 08 May 2010 21:36It matters not what these people say to you. It's best for you to no waste your time on them. If there is an after life I guarantee I'll be in hell, but I'll go defending to the end your right to believe in what ever man made religion you wish.

"man made religion"? :\

Well, thanks for your post in general. I'm glad to see there's viewers other than just Spoonny/Starbuzz looking at this. I don't think this needs to be PM'd - it should be open to everyone's opinion.

Spoonny wrote on Sat, 08 May 2010 15:06Useless?

We're told we're going to suffer the most horrific punishment ever designed for disagreeing with this, the religious claim RIDICULOUS privileges in the here and now, and you say the question of whether a bloody word of it is true is useless?

The question isn't useless at all.

These debates are, though.

Do you REALLY expect anyone's opinion to change, on an anonymous-type forum, with the same

old arguments on both sides?

Spoony wrote on Sat, 08 May 2010 15:06 i'll defend that too. i absolutely believe in the right of freedom of belief and have said so many times.

And I appreciate that. However...

Spoony wrote on Sat, 08 May 2010 15:06 religion doesn't.

Guess what this is?

Generalization.

And guess what generalizations usually are?

WRONG.
