

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 18 Mar 2010 08:43:25 GMT

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

---

Altzan wrote on Wed, 17 March 2010 22:22 If I remember correctly, you mentioned in another thread that Christianity basically has a governmental seat in your country, right? Christianity is automatically given a whole block of seats in Parliament. 20-something of them, I believe. (There's never ever been a vote about this - it was set up when the king ran the show and elections were never even thought of.) We the people can vote for one MP for our region, as opposed to Americans who can vote for a senator and a congress member.

That's not all. Christianity also has control over thousands and thousands of schools, as does the Catholic church. More recently, Judaism and Islam have been given control over schools too. I'm not sure if any other religions have, Sikhism might do, but the idea that a religion can have control over a school ought to be rather alarming. It's no different than the idea of a political ideology having control over a school. A "Catholic school" or a "Church of England school" or a "Protestant school" ought to be viewed the same as if someone said "a Labour school", a "Conservative school", a "Socialist school", "Communist school", "Neo-conservative school", "Nationalist school", etc.

And if you want to see just how well religiously segregating our children works out, just look at Northern Ireland.

And that's not all the privileges it has, though I'd say the automatic block of parliamentary seats and the control over thousands of schools are the important issues. Technically the monarch is the head of state. It isn't Gordon Brown, it wasn't Tony Blair. The monarch is also the head of the Church.

I will admit that our current Queen is a decent person, but the reason I can say this is precisely because the monarchy doesn't really meddle in politics anymore, which begs the question why we still have it.

What else? Blasphemy law. We only just got rid of that a couple of years ago. It used to be illegal to "blaspheme" Christianity. That's right. It has a huge block of seats in Parliament whether we like it or not, it has control over thousands of schools, its leader is the undemocratically elected head of state, but if we criticise it and its power, we're breaking the law, or at least we were until a couple of years ago.

Of course, like all other religions, it doesn't have to pay taxes. In the Church of England's case this is quite odd, because it's just about the biggest land-owner in the country, and it's very eager to invest in dodgy companies for its own profits. It's invested in arms dealers who supply countries like Indonesia, for example, an Islamic dictatorship who committed horrific crimes against humanity against the largely Christian society of East Timor, and used British and American weapons to do so. It's invested in the housing market and that all went tits up for the church, of course.

And despite all this, despite the fact it's got all this land (which it didn't buy... it was given it by the monarchy), despite the fact it doesn't pay taxes, despite its dodgy financial dealings, it's still

financially fucked and it's still always begging the taxpayer to pull it out. Well, I'm sorry, but if a company is doing as badly as that, then going belly-up would be a mercy. I don't see the Archbishop of Canterbury offering to sell either of his two palaces, for example, and living somewhere a little more modest. And this is a man who loves, absolutely loves to lecture we Brits on the dangers of "materialism", which is the best knock at atheism he can think of. That's right - he's basically the CEO of a company which insists on not paying taxes, which has very shady investment practices, which is if not the biggest landowner in the country must come pretty close, and he himself has two palaces both funded by the taxpayer. By comparison, I don't aspire to great wealth or extravagant possessions - give me my basic human rights, the freedom to live my life unharrassed and the freedom to examine and question the world, and to write and play my music, and I'm happy. Who's the materialistic one here, I wonder?

Quote:That kind of thing is against my belief as well - we are charged to spread his word but not shove it down their throats. If we did what we could and they still don't believe, we don't relentlessly pursue it.

What about children, what do you tell them about Christianity?

As for the blasphemy law, well, as ridiculous and immoral as blasphemy laws are, it's in line with Christian teaching. Blasphemy is very sternly prohibited in the Bible, is it not?

Quote:Also, we are seperate from Catholicism and Baptism and all the other splinter denominations... that's why stories about this and that church irritate me, because they get associated with Christianity as a whole.

I am perfectly happy to recognise the differences between the innumerable flavours of Christianity, so long as they don't deny the similarities (which tend to outnumber the differences)

Quote:As for the last part - would I force a nonbeliever to obey a Biblical rule? No. Would I fight against a governemtal decree legally allowing something I consider a sin? Yes, because not doing so would be allowing it, thus being an accomplice to said sin.

This seems a rather contradictory position.

---