
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 19 Mar 2010 05:57:39 GMT

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

Altzan wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 23:02Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55and 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. it's good to hear a religious person who agrees with this view.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55but 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.
says it all, really, doesn't it?

Quote: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.

see above re: not how the mind works. finding something believable or finding something incredible really isn't a 'decision'.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55Very 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.

well, i don't want kids of my own but i'll answer anyway. this would also apply to educational policies.

nothing religious, nothing that is dependent on 'faith' belongs in a science class. certainly you can tell people that a lot of people believe the genesis story, for example, just so long as you point out that we don't know who even wrote it, when, why, and how they knew what to write. and on that basis, and the fact there's no evidence at all to support the writing, it does not qualify as a "theory", as for example the big bang and evolution do.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55I 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.

there's no need so long as you acknowledge that christianity does have a bad side. i expect that even if you aren't convinced of everything on my list, you're probably nodding at a couple of them. and if you're really teaching someone about the religion, it's only fair to include the bad bits as well as the good, the way the religion behaved when it really had power.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 18 March 2010 18:55So 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 thought you'd say that. I have no idea why people can't see what a really, really stupid sentence it is.

Evidence simply means seen, something observable to support a claim. It's a completely nonsensical statement.

I generally hear faith to mean the willingness to believe something without proof, and I've never, ever, ever heard why that would be a good thing. Especially since it's usually applied to propositions that, if they were true, would have enormous consequences - things like heaven and hell. So someone says: he'd make a good president because he's a person of faith. You're telling me he's willing to believe extremely important things without having a good reason to believe them? I can't imagine why anyone considers faith a good thing other than the fact they've been told it is. But I'm about to take this in a different direction... read on.

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

It's not that simple. Someone trustworthy tells me they went to the supermarket yesterday, no proof is required.

Here's a claim.

The one true god has actually provided an update since Christianity, through a series of revelations involving a prophet in the 7th/8th century. The holy books arising from this revelation make it clear that the only way to heaven now is to follow the new religion, and those people who stay Christian are going to end up in hell with all the other infidels.

I assume you don't believe that this is true, that you are not convinced that the Prophet Mohammed actually was the real deal. So I'm not the only one who wants proof before believing certain things. Have a good think about why it is you don't believe this.

Quote: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.

He also instructed his followers that if they find a city containing people who worship other gods, that everyone in the city ought to be slaughtered. Everyone in the city.

The same objection can be made to the two examples you mention. Pharaoh and the plagues. Specifically the death of the first-born.

The slaughter of innocent children as punishment for the crime of their dictator. Well, why not just kill Pharaoh? Why kill innocent people? Same could probably be said for the golden calf; Moses instructs every man to kill his brother, etc etc etc. They were all worshipping the golden calf, were

they? And is it really just to have half the men slaughtered and the other half turned into executioners?

But hey, I don't regard the bible as being a good source of morals, nor do I have any particular reason to think that any of the stories are true, so these aren't problems from my perspective.

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

Quote: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.

Well, I don't think there is anything wrong with homosexuality. I'm not attached to that, but I see the right of gay people to live their lives unharrassed under the same laws as the rest of us as a basic human right, as is free speech (see blasphemy laws). I'm not attached to a homosexual lifestyle, I'm attached to basic human rights. As for taking the easy road, I personally think turning over all moral decisions to a book would count as an easy road instead of using our brains to actually think about actions, which are wrong, and why they're wrong, such as whether they actually cause suffering or not.

Quote: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? Firstly, it's not a case of God "not doing you any favours then". We're told that he will visit appalling punishments upon us. That's not simply god deciding he's not going to give me any more pocket money.

Secondly, if disregarding him and thinking he doesn't exist makes him angry, he should have taken the time to come up with a less ridiculously incompetent revelation.

Thirdly, what kind of moral system is this? You said religions depend on faith (and you probably didn't realise what a deathblow you dealt when you said that). Here's an extraordinary claim, we aren't going to show you any evidence, you've got to decide it's true and you'll be horribly punished if you've got your doubts? What the fuck?

Quote: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.

Yeah, but my question was how are you going to say that these other people are doing anything wrong if they did try that?