
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [snpr1101](#) on Mon, 05 Apr 2010 04:27:40 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 04 April 2010 11:55snpr1101 wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 20:35yea it might help if I read it all

this is good advice.

snpr1101 wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 20:35Therefore, you see rape as wrong (which it is), and two homosexual men who "love" eachother (prove that exists while your at it) as normal (debatable - disprove God and the Bible and you'll win it)

Had you talked to homosexual couples in real life? Their love is no different than the love of a heterosexual couple.

As for it being normal, it is as normal as a black man loving and marrying a white woman...which btw was seen as wrong and illegal just a few decades ago.

You are gonna have to get over this and you will get over it just as those who were against interracial marriage got over it.

snpr1101 wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 20:35Therefore, disprove the Bible and God, and you will win the argument.

I don't think you realise what a asinine request this is. What will be your response if a hindu asked you that same question regarding his gods?

The bible and the christian god are already disproved just as the ancient greek gods, the hindu vedic texts, and allah.

btw, I find it sad you think this is another "argument" to "win"

I think you're misunderstanding some things here. What exactly do I have to get over? I don't judge homosexual couples, nor do I think it's wrong. I was just pointing what I saw as the difference in thinking between a person who believes in the Bible and God; and a person who does not. Yes I realise there may be some who support homosexual couples whilst having this belief; but I am speaking from a standpoint of those who are religious and are strictly against homosexuality. All you seem to be doing is taking what I said, and stating things that seem contrary to it that I already agree with.

And about disproving God and the Bible etc. Alot of the reasons behind the arguments presented here are based upon, or have a strong link to teachings in the Bible, or a lack of. If you're a person who has an immense belief in the Bible and your God; and somebody starts to argue against certain points of it - how can the believer accept they are wrong without accepting their God does not exist - hence the teachings and everything that fuels their argument is moot? That, I believe, is the only way to prove someone wrong in this case.

The same thing goes for the non-believer. How can they be proven wrong when they simply do not accept that the other persons' God does not exist; and the teachings and arguments in the Bible that fuel their arguments are false or do not pertain to what they perceive as right, or wrong.

And no, I don't think this is "another" argument to "win". I thought you might of observed how I made reference to God, the Bible etc. I didn't make light of this debate. I simply saw a way, in my opinion, whether it be wrong or not, to allow someone to accept another's thinking as truth over their own. Perhaps I should of written it as above to avoid confusion. But did you really think I saw it as the "Victor" of this debate could stand up on the "podium" and give an "acceptance speech" whilst I handed him his "First Place Trophy"?

Quote:my god, the yellow lobster called jeremy, says raping children is a good idea.

snpr1101, you think that sucks? then YOU HAVE TO PROVE THE YELLOW LOBSTER DOESN'T EXIST!

rollseyes

even if he did exist, god or not, if that was one of his commandments then he'd be a twat. just as the bible's rules on rape are evil, just as so much else of christianity is evil. we don't need to disprove the existence of a god to make a moral case against a religion.

My god, the almighty yellow lobster God called Jeremy, for which I have no belief in - nor do I believe in the Lobsters little book called the Lobster Bible, says theres nothing wrong with rape, or anything else I care to debate. HOW DARE THIS GOD CHALLENGE MY THINKING! SURELY I MUST KNOW WHAT IS RIGHT OVER A GOD. Oh wait, maybe he doesn't exist. If I can prove this, then surely the argument of the lobster is wrong; and mine is right.

Yea ok, so I wasn't as serious about that, but I aside the little chuckle it gave me, I think it holds some relevance. Sure, using rape in that sarcastic example doesn't really get the message across that easily, but insert another word or debatable topic that isn't as strong as the word.

Look, I'm not saying rape is fine, but look at the words you're using. Evil, Moral etc. What is your definition of Evil? Where do your morals stem from? What is Evil really? - something morally objectionable? Morals are quite a personal belief (Although many are shared), almost as personal as a belief in God.

Do you see what I'm getting at? Everything we argue about based upon morals, belief, religion, God - or subjects we argue about that draw upon these is linked to a bigger picture; it Stems from a greater Issue and debate, in my opinion. You cannot debate smaller topics and arrive at an agreed conclusion, or shared argument, unless there is a shared mutual agreement in the accuracy of the morals and beliefs that govern the topic you're arguing about.

I could elaborate on that more, but my above posts cover it, I think.

.-+| As I finish writing this I feel regretful for getting into this argument. I think what I said is too broad and could form an entirely different argument all together. But It's just my opinion, feel free to challenge it and prove my thinking wrong (which I have no doubt someone will). I don't mean to take the piss out of anyones views too much, as I've only been in this world 18 years and could learn alot from those who've been here longer |+-.