

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Fri, 19 Mar 2010 05:02:26 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55 and should this not apply to parents too? would it not also make sense for parents not to fill the head of a child with religion before they're old enough to think critically about it?

It makes sense, yes. Unfortunately, I don't think the chances of that will rise anytime soon.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55 but you can't make an informed decision without it, can you?

Nope. But I have yet to meet or hear of a parent who will give all this info before asking their child to make a decision.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55 furthermore, is belief really a "decision"? most christian sects say that you will suffer the most horrific punishment imaginable if you believe the wrong thing, or to phrase it differently, if you don't believe the right thing. well, i could make an outward display of christianity. i could pretend i believed all this, i could probably fool anyone who took the time to wonder what my religious beliefs were, but if this god of yours can see and know everything including the contents of our minds, then i wouldn't be fooling god and i wouldn't be avoiding hell. 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.

Why would it not be a decision? You've seen arguments on both sides and you've decided what you want to believe. That's a decision on your part, and you can't 'flip a switch' because it's considered an important decision, therefore you won't change your mind without heavy consideration.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55 then see above re: protecting kids from it.

i'm an adult. you preach to me as much as you like, you present your case for believing what you believe and why you think it would be a good idea for me to believe it too, i would never tell you to shut up and i don't want anyone else telling you on my behalf. but i'm old enough to think critically, to hear a thing from someone and recognise that it might not be true, they might be mistaken or they might be plain lying, it might not be exactly as they say it is, it's worth asking why they think it or how they think they know it, etc etc etc, as well as what the implications are.

it's not the same for children. they're taught to take in what their parents and teachers say. without that idea, education falls apart.

Very true.

I'm curious - if you were to have a child of your own, what method would you use to teach him what theories there are about the origin of man and Earth while being neutral?

I'm not asking for a huge explanation. But you support the idea of letting a child become old enough to understand that there are many ideas and theories out there, and allow them to decide for themselves.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55 firstly, i did not include events done by people who simply happened to be christian. that would be unfair. only when christianity had a real part in influencing the actions.

if you'd like to hear a justification for any of the examples i mentioned, feel free to challenge any of these and i'll defend them. here are all the ones i cited off the top of my head:

- two thousand years of horrific anti-semitism and anti-gay people
- violently standing in the way of scientific progress
- the crusades
- the inquisition
- willing tool of imperialism and of a huge list of dictators throughout the ages
- enthusiastic ally of fascism in europe
- the enormous death toll it's helped to rack up by assisting the spread of AIDS by absurd rules on condoms, especially in africa

I can tell by the list that you know your history. I do not possess such knowledge (yet). If you want to defend a few, go ahead, but I won't pick and choose myself.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55 So what's "faith" (i'm just checking that your definition is the same as mine), and why is it a good thing?

Hebrews 1:11

"Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." (KJV)

I know that you don't consider faith to be good enough, that you want proof before belief. I respect that decision.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55 i'm sorry, but you speak as someone who is not familiar with your bible. the depiction of god is as a ruthless maniac at the best of times, but the things that really, really piss him off the most are worshipping other gods, having doubts about him, and blaspheming him.

In the Old Testament, he was active against those who didn't believe. This was mainly because he was giving them proof he existed. For example, he threw 12 plagues at Pharaoh to convince him to let the Israelites go. Not too long later, Moses goes up Mt. Sinai to talk with God, and they build and start worshipping a golden cow. They knew for a fact he existed, but were against him just the same.

(Note that I speak in context of the Bible, in token with your examples being pulled from the Bible as well.)

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55 1. Why oppose other things that are "sins" being made legal, if you believe God's going to sort it out? That's what you said earlier.

2. Are you OK with the belief that God will act against it? Myself, for example? If your religion is true then I've got a bit of trouble ahead; you've alluded to it yourself. Do you approve of that?

1. Because I don't think they're morally right. We've seen many cases where a person hears what

we have to say and genuinely is interested to learn about it - but they shy away later, because they have this one 'pet sin' (homosexuality, drinking, fornication, etc) that they are too attached to and would rather take the easy road.

2. I don't see why a God should pander to those who refuse to believe in him. If you decide he doesn't exist, I won't bang my head on the wall trying to change your mind (I'd make some effort, but not an overbearing one). But why should he cater to those who disregard him?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55 And how exactly can you fault them? My case against them is pretty straightforward - i don't think the god's real, i think that even if the god is real it would not mean that this book is anything to do with him, and i think a lot of the rules are bullshit anyway. I'm curious to hear what your objection to that is if you do believe in god, if you do believe that the bible is a good reflection of what he expects of us.

I don't have an objection to your belief. Unlike others, I won't persecute you because you don't believe in God, even if I had the power to.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55 Really? Most non-believers who are against homosexuality generally just don't want to do it themselves. They don't want to restrict the rights of those who are homosexual, and they don't insist on filling the minds of children with homophobia in schools, and those are the real problems.

Bad wording on my part, then. Look to my earlier comment on 'pet sins'.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55 and i absolutely defend your right to say that.

Good to know

---