

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Thu, 18 Mar 2010 21:34:18 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 02:43 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...

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?

Nicely written summary... I think that's way too much involvement in government. I wish you didn't have to put up with that every day.

I don't really have any other comment here, unless you want one.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 02:43 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?

We teach our Children the faith, yes - that's how I was taught - but we don't go overboard with it, although I suppose the term is open to interpretation. That Jesus camp video posted awhile ago - We'd never do anything like that. My parents took me to church and taught me the religion and that's basically it. I could stop going right now if I wanted to and they probably wouldn't put up much of a fight, maybe a discussion at most.

What do you mean by blasphemy being prohibited? If I'm reading you right, then I see no problem if someone mouths off about Christianity - I can't make them believe, and I wouldn't badmouth atheism or other back at the person.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 02:43 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)

True. As far as I know, there are only a few differences separating Church of Christ and Baptists, mainly the "no-baptism" and "faith-only" beliefs they have (which is why they're a larger group, I suspect).

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 02:43 This seems a rather contradictory position.

It's hard to explain. Abortion might be a good example... when abortion was legalized in some states of the US, we fought the passage of the law because we don't believe abortion is right. But I would not physically attempt to stop someone from getting an abortion, neither would I attack the clinic, as I've heard some do before.

---