

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 11 May 2010 13:32:34 GMT

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

---

Altzan wrote on Mon, 10 May 2010 23:47Spoony 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.

firstly, the idea that it would be fine with the right leader is a fallacy, cos the whole point of dictatorship is that if you don't have the right leader, there's nothing you can do about it.

secondly, if the bible was accurate then god is not the right leader. he's the most vicious, merciless and unjust character ever created.

thirdly, you think monarchies are a good thing? they're what you get before you get democracies, and they were the second biggest obstacle to human rights throughout the centuries (the biggest being, of course, religion)

Quote: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.

you already said this and i already rebuked it.

firstly, not only have you not established that this god of yours is real at all, you also haven't established that he was at the top of the creation chain.

secondly, i really don't see a moral difference anyway. in each case, the 'creator' is using the tools and sciences available to them.

Quote: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.

just want to make sure i heard you right. the worst crimes according to the bible (which tend not to be the worst crimes according to modern society)... you think we should just let people get away with them?

secondly, how do you know god does not want you to set his commandments as the laws of the

land?

thirdly, isn't god a bit of a prick for making his revelation so unclear?  
even though the majority of humanity think "faith" is a good thing (our greatest weakness, in my view, but i'm hopeful that we can overcome it), the vast majority of people do not think your bible is true. (muslims may think it's true but not the prevailing law)

of this minority of "christians", you've said yourself that the majority of these people are not really christians. your church, the real christians, are a tiny minority of what is already a minority of "supposed" christians.

let's assume your guys are the ones who have it right. couldn't god have done a little bit better than that?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30what 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.  
your entire line of reasoning was based on taking "everything is either mind or matter" as a known fact, which it plainly isn't.

Quote:So "it's not a yes or no question" is your answer?  
no, "i can see why you're asking" and more importantly "i wouldn't have phrased it like that" was the answer.

Quote: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.  
don't think i did. i think a bigger problem would be talking about religions as if they're facts.

Quote:Quote:including the ones god absolutely despises, according to the bible?

Yes.

How do you know god wants you to do that?

according to the bible there are people who infuriate god no end. people who worship other gods, homosexuals, etc. his rage towards these guys is apparently much greater than his annoyance at, say, the devil. how do you know god wants you to be nice to these appalling sinners? don't you think god might ask you "i spent half the old testament trying to make it clear to you what absolute scum these people are, now i see you're having tea with them?"

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

How so? If you don't mind describing.  
compare it to "take no thought for the morrow".

greed is usually undesirable, but would you rather have parents who want well-paid jobs or would you rather have parents who follow jesus's instruction to think nothing of the future and just follow him? (i.e. no investment, no looking after your family, etc etc etc)

Quote: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? actually, no i don't.

if god was kicking ass here and now and making examples of the murderers and rapists of the world (well, i say rapists, but god doesn't seem to mind that too much, so let's just stick with murderers) then at least people would figure out that these punishments are going to happen.

with the current "system" (if "system" is a good word to describe the fact that your god is nowhere to be seen... seems to me there's a better explanation for that), remember that the people who really follow god's rules are a very small minority. the vast majority don't see a reason to think that the bible must be followed. and yet they'll suffer the most horrific punishments regardless.

don't get me wrong, both scenarios are horrific, but if god was laying the smackdown in the here and now then at least more people would know about it instead of the tiny minority who do, according to you.

Quote:You like your "basic human freedom of thought and expression".  
i also like to have just laws, so that's another thing which sets me at odds with your god.

Quote: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.

you really don't disagree with it. it's basically come down to a distinction between god and the followers of god. you don't think the followers of god should be in undemocratic control, but you'd quite like it if god was in undemocratic control.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30is 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 has perfect - Jesus especially... although I'm sure you dsagree.

I sure do. How do you explain something as morally shit as the rape law, for example? How about those passages I brought up earlier, where god is very enthusiastic about slaughtering innocent bystanders, including children, for the supposed crimes of others?

Seriously, if we needed to make a list of laws with which to form a basis of morality, the average child could have done better than your god.

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

why would the bible not be an accurate depiction of the views of a god?

off the top of my head....

1. the people writing the books were lying
2. the people writing the books were crazy
3. the people writing the books were plain wrong (for example, thought they knew something they weren't sure of)

ask two simple questions about the bible. 1: who wrote them? (don't just give a name, try to find out who these people were) and 2: how did they know what to write?

and isn't it quite a big deal that there might be "transcription errors"?

Quote: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.

don't act as if the two things are the same.

intellectual freedom is a basic human right (though most religions don't want to admit it). it was being denied him for one reason: religion.

Quote: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.

I really don't think "convert" is the right word. He wasn't welcomed into a friendly crowd of fellow unbelievers, he wasn't told he'd be more safe or he'd get lovely rewards if he became an atheist. And from what I understand he still has a tough time keeping his views hidden from his uber-religious parents and the local religious groups. In Starbuzz you have a genuine story of the damage religion can do to a person and to a family.

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

i haven't heard exactly what denomination he was subjected to, but i don't think it was catholic.

Quote: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?

Firstly, this does not answer the question.

Secondly, the second sentence really is odd. "If you don't think there's a hell, why object to us telling everyone that they must do what we say because otherwise they'll go there?" If someone tries to mug a person with a gun, it doesn't make them innocent if it turns out the gun was unloaded, even if the mugger was absolutely convinced it was loaded.

Quote:I have been meaning to ask you to justify this. It seems like a pretty large hyperbole to me. i thought i'd explained it enough times already, frankly

Quote: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.  
Such as?

Quote: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."  
could still use some clarification, i'm afraid.

Quote: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.  
"no more" is only grammatically correct, i'm afraid, since "less" is not "more".

you're not personally forcing religion onto me, but you approve of your boss doing it. well, that's not much of a distinction.

---