
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 12 Jun 2010 16:57:33 GMT

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

Altzan wrote on Wed, 09 June 2010 22:57Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 06 June 2010 21:10Altzan wrote on Sun, 06 June 2010 21:10But it also is not completely DEVOID of belief. so what beliefs does it have?

Either a belief that no higher power exists, or a very skeptical view of the idea of a higher power.

I suppose you could also define atheism as being open-minded and unresolved, maybe, but my impression of an atheist usually incorporates someone who has clearly decided his belief on whether or not any higher power exists.

sigh

once again, it's theism that's being rejected, not merely deism. religious people don't just say that they think there's likely to be a 'god'... they claim to know quite a lot of details.

there's nothing closed-minded about the position that nobody's come up with the slightest shred of convincing evidence, or even a decent logical argument, that there's a god at all LET ALONE that they know the details (i.e. what religions claim)

Quote:Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 06 June 2010 21:10According to their dogma, if they accept their Jesus and stay away from sin, and live the life, they are either going to heaven or hell.

Many details that denominations pick over deal with matters that are sins if done improperly. Baptists, for example, do not believe that baptism is necessary to be saved - if they're wrong, then there's a big problem...

i'll repeat what i said earlier...

if your god is going to torture people for ever and ever if they don't get this question right, isn't he a COLOSSAL prick for not making it very clear to begin with? isn't it a huge indictment of His incompetence as well as His cruelty?

i don't normally use capital letters for that, but we hear so often of His love and His mercy etc

Quote:Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 06 June 2010 21:10Altzan wrote on Sun, 06 June 2010 21:10That's not absolute, you know. Homosexuality can hurt people in several ways. have any reasoning behind this?

One example is health - homosexuality can be physically unhealthy. You're just seeing homosexuality as a form of sex. It's not just a form of sex, it's a form of love too (maybe the bigger part of the two is the love part, not that I am in a position to know).

love can hurt heterosexual people too, can't it?

as to the part you seem to be getting at... are you referring to AIDS and other STDs? well, homosexual women are much, much less likely to get and pass around STDs than heterosexual

couples are. that'll do as a counterargument for starters. i'd also be willing to wager that rape is far more common in a heterosexual context, i.e. a male perpetrator and a female victim, other than in prisons.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 07 June 2010 10:07i've never met an atheist who advocates telling kids that there's no such thing as god. that there's no evidence that there is one, let alone that anyone has discovered the details, sure. that faith is always a bad thing, sure. kids should be taught those.

but are you suggesting that, for example, teaching a kid that $2+2=4$ in a maths class is "brainwashing"?

Conceded.

It's not brainwashing if it's fact. It's difficult, however, to explain to a child the evidences against a religion while avoiding drawing conclusions for him or her.

so far so good.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 07 June 2010 10:07Quote:Let me try again - while hell is most assuredly worse than a verbal attack, it does not make a verbal attack insignificant.

Understand now?

a "verbal attack" (i'd love to hear specifics) absolutely is insignificant compared to the two thousand years of hell threats.

But not so insignificant that it should be ignored.

It's ridiclous to vindicate any abuse over an idea by comparing it to another.

i'm just waiting to hear specifics

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 07 June 2010 10:07Quote:Either you or Spoony believes it can be impossible for an individual to believe in Christianity.

eh?

Here:

Spoony: what i can't do is flick a switch and make myself believe any of this, it's not the way the mind works, or at least not the way my mind works.

ah.

how do you define "believe in"? if it's just a matter of acknowledging something's factual correctness, then it would be possible for me to "believe in" Christianity just so long as sufficient evidence was provided.

if instead "believe in" means worshipping, then someone would just have to answer my many moral objections against Christianity, and nobody's done that either.

but my point was a repetition of something i'd said earlier, because you kept referring to belief as though it was a choice. evidently my mind works very differently to yours. i can't choose to believe something. i can, by evidence and logical argument, be persuaded that something is correct when i previously doubted it, but i can't choose to believe it as a matter of policy.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 07 June 2010 10:07Quote:Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:064) I, a complete outsider, is interfering with someone else's sex life. Same as above... you, a complete outsider, are interfering with my beliefs, and I, a complete outsider, am interfering with your ideas. define "interfering with your beliefs", please, and explain how it is possibly comparable to interfering with someone's love life.

It's quite plain to see that challenging my ideas and beliefs is "interference". Not negative, but interference nonetheless.
odd way to look at it

Quote:I don't know what you mean by a comparison to their love life - it's just another debate over a different topic, that one being homosexuality. Challenging their ideas on it and calling that "interfering with their love life" is the same as challenging a religious person's ideas and calling that "interfering with their religious life".
if only religious people were content JUST to verbally challenge homosexuality. what a better world that would be. well, i'm all for free speech.
