Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality
Posted by Spoony on Sun, 09 May 2010 12:30:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Altzan wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 01:10Spoony 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.
you said what goes on in this world is pretty trivial compared to the afterlife.

whenever you encounter an islamic suicide murderer, you'll see someone who can't wait to get to paradise. they believe in their religion much more than you do. it's why they murder innocent people, dying in the process.

they're throwing away everything - their own lives and others' - because of what they're told about the afterlife. and trust me, they really believe it.

Quote: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.
well, there you have it. complete, unchallengeable dictatorship. no hope of escape. it amazes me how many people want this to be true.

that's the first problem.

the second problem is that you think it's the root creator who should have ultimate control. you don't think, for example, that your parents should have eternal power over you. it has to keep going back until we reach the entity that started it all off. (did god decide that you should be born?)
well, what are god's origins? who created him?

thirdly, i asked a hypothetical question before - if you found out that you were created in a lab by a mad scientist, a modern-day frankenstein, would you be his serf or would you assert your basic rights and freedoms instead? if we found out that the earth was seeded by an alien race, would we then become their servants?

the fourth problem is more practical. you're taking the position that god should have power over us but religion shouldn't. well, what do we do about god's supposed instructions? a particular commandment, for example. should we put that into the laws of the land and have it enforced by police and courts? or simply let people get away with it and god will punish them later?

Quote: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.
simply someone who does not subscribe to theism.

it's like calling someone a non-smoker. it doesn't say anything about them other than that they do not smoke. it doesn't even say why they don't smoke - it could be health concerns, they might not like the taste, they might rather spend the money on something else.... likewise, the word atheism doesn't tell you why a person does not consider themselves followers of a religion. they might not think it is true (but this doesn't mean they think all religion is axiomatically false), it could be a moral objection to the texts, it could be the thought that the texts had been corrupted or hijacked by errant humans, etc etc etc

and the thing being rejected is theism, remember, not deism. so it doesn't necessarily mean that an atheist is convinced there aren't such things as gods. "a-deism" might be a good word for that. it's theism that is being rejected, i.e. the idea that yes there is a god, that this or that book is directly inspired by him, that there are things of which he disapproves, that he watches us and judges us...

Quote: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.
what it does is undermines the basic assumption at the very start of your "here's why the universe must have been created by a god" thesis.

Quote: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.
facepalm i have no idea why i need to keeping repeating myself

i did answer the question

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48When 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.
and it's also my opinion that what you just said right there ^^ is astonishingly fatuous too.

maybe you think i should be posting someone else's opinions? i have no idea why people say things as stupid as this. "THAT'S JUST YOUR OPINION!" well duhhh, whose else am i gonna express? it's like when you said earlier that all i'm doing is posting my opinion instead of quotes or texts. what a stupid thing to say. i can express my opinion or i can copy-paste someone else's.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48okay... 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.
...aided by religion more often than not.

Quote:And the religion I'm a part of wants (and gives) peace and goodwill with their neighbors and fellow humans.
including the ones god absolutely despises, according to the bible?

Quote:Groan about our spiritual message all you like, you certainly have a right to.
i do, do i? won't i be punished?

Quote: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.
you asked me that too. murder and theft, sure. crime is too vague... many things are illegal for which there is no moral justification, and many morally objectionable and damaging things are perfectly legal. hate is rather vague too. greed can have its uses.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 07 May 2010 10:48y'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?
see above re: god seems quite content to let the world be smashed up. he doesn't even look out for his religion (although, of course, your religion didn't exist until quite recently. for a long time there was just catholicism... it split a few times and they've been kicking the shit out of each other since)

Quote: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.
no, it doesn't!

Quote: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 govt 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.
and i don't know who you're talking about. who linked you to the catholic church's systematic raping of children and protection of the offenders?

it just happens to be in the same thread.

Quote: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.
answer the question i asked kadoosh.

is god perfect or not perfect? is the bible a perfect depiction of his views or not?

Quote:Sometimes debators (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.
would you curb it if you could? don't we have enough blasphemy laws already?

Quote:Spoony 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?
i'm reluctant to answer this question, but i suppose i should.

i've had many religious debates. most of them might have been called useless by kadoosh. one of them helped lead the christian on the other side of it to intellectual freedom, which he never had before - neither his parents nor his local religious folks wanted him to have it and they still don't want him to. and yet what did i actually do? ripped on his religious ideas. many people would've called it rude, and i'm sure i offended him (to begin with) more than i've offended you. and yet look at the results. it genuinely was a question of basic human rights. (like i said, i was reluctant to answer the question, firstly because i don't want to presume too much about what's going on in his life, secondly because i personally think that when he expressed his gratitude to me, he was probably giving me more credit than i deserved)

to answer your question, no, i didn't expect it would happen.

but if i could swap all the time i've put into doing stuff for renegade - running the clanwars league etc - in exchange for being able to say that this had happened for two people instead of one, it would be a worthy trade.

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

Guess what this is?
Generalization.
And guess what generalizations usually are?
WRONG.
sure it's a generalisation, just to save time. there might be religions out there who do believe in freedom of belief, but the ones with all the power now don't seem to. does yours? see my earlier question. do i really have the right to criticise and reject your religion? if i'm gonna be punished for it, then no i don't.