
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Tue, 11 May 2010 04:47:17 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30well, 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.

Dictatorship can work just fine with the right leader. It's very similar to a monarchy, a very old and widely used system.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30the 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?)

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?

On the surface, those scenarios seem similar, but they just don't compare.

The parents didn't create the baby, they used an already established means of reproduction to form the child. The form of reproduction being designed by the actual creator.

The mad scientist, if he did create something, used materials around him, in his universe. The universe he lives in would also subject itself to the creation.

Aliens wouldn't seed a planet with nothingness - they'd have to have formed the seeds somehow, with other materials.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30the 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?

The latter. Right now, we're given a choice, we decide whether or not to follow his word. Consequences for those decisions come later.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote: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.

How? It doesn't disprove the "matter or mind" idea.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote: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

So "it's not a yes or no question" is your answer?

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote: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.

You're missing the point. The idea of my statement being fatuous is an opinion, so I naturally pointed out that you spoke of it as a fact.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote: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?

Yes.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30murder and theft, sure.

Good.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30crime is too vague... many things are illegal for which

there is no moral justification, and many morally objectionable and damaging things are perfectly legal.

True. It's too vague to say "crime" in general.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30hate is rather vague too.

Well, I don't see very many reasons to truly hate somebody, for example. There are some acts that would invoke such a reaction, just not many in my eyes.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30greed can have its uses.

How so? If you don't mind describing.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30see 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)

I'm sure you prefer this system than having God actively smash up any rebellers, no? You like your "basic human freedom of thought and expression".

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote: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.

Yes, I saw it.

My point here was that you've mentioned Christianity in goverment as an argument against me, in this thread earlier. I don't know why that's logical, since I disagree with it as well. Basically what kadoosh said.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote: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?

Perfect - it's not a universal definition. I personally see him as perfect - Jesus especially... although I'm sure you disagree.

I see no reason why the Bible would inaccurately depict his views, apart from transcription error.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote: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?

Blasphemy laws hardly apply. It's about the recipient's attitude to the incoming argument or point. A biased view can lead to missing the idea or ignoring a point, thus screwing up the debate process.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30i'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.

I feel the same way when someone is converted to Christianity after visiting our church for some time. It's a simple feeling of elation after conversion.

I was sad to hear Starbuzz convert - although I won't host a pity party mentioning how he was misled to believe lies and blah blah - it's rude and biased.

Actually, I was glad to hear he was leaving the Catholic side anyhow. From the experiences he described, they don't sound pleasant.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30sure 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.

I prefer to talk in terms of this physical existence's terms of rights. Yes, you have the right to criticize my religion now. The only reason you would is if you don't believe in it, and if that's the case, why worry about what our afterlife beliefs are?

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote:I think god is fiction, and you are proving my point that you will go So far out of your way, even though I know you don't think it's to far, to find something to argue about to someone who does believe.

i really don't think civilised criticism is "going too far" in response to an ideology that's trying to take over the world.

I have been meaning to ask you to justify this. It seems like a pretty large hyperbole to me.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote:Spoony
where do you live?

I live in the US where there is a line between Religion and Gov't. As thin as it may be there's a line. We have had the 10 commandments pulled from courthouses. If people here have a problem with something we take it upon ourselves to get it changed. the line certainly is thin and it's being tested all the time, isn't it?

Yep, and usually by the atheists. Almost every time we hear of a bill in petition, it's about some atheist group wanting so-and-so removed.

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote:clearly you believe i'm to ignorant to think of leaving something out so people don't expect it.
sorry, you've lost me.

You're probably making it more complex than needed. Rewritten:
"You must think I'm ignorant, since you believe I don't understand the principle of deception/foreshadowing."

Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote:Have fun but remember you are also attempting to FORCE someone to believe their religion is wrong.
What an AMAZINGLY stupid accusation.

Maybe not "AMAZINGLY stupid" per se, but I do agree it's false. You're no more forcing me than I am forcing you.
