

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 05 Apr 2010 12:40:57 GMT

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

---

snpr1101 wrote on Sun, 04 April 2010 23:27 And about disproving God and the Bible etc. A lot 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.

actually, no, it's not.

if their entire argument is "it's wrong because god disapproves of it" (and that's what it always boils down to), then this doesn't deserve to be taken seriously UNTIL the following things have been successfully demonstrated.

1. that this god exists at all
2. that the bible is an accurate depiction of god's character
3. that god is so morally superior that his wishes overrule our ideas on human rights

nobody's done any of the above. they need to do all three before they can expect to be taken seriously.

Quote: 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.

for the non-believer, it's totally different. i have never justified my thoughts on, for example, the rights of homosexuals by saying "and the reason i think this is because i don't think your god is real". i'd think it even if god turned out to be real. even if god was real i'd still think his moral standards are appalling. you cannot disprove my moral assertions by proving there's a god, because they were never the reason for me saying them.

secondly, another reason why you're totally wrong here: there is a huge difference between an atheist's position and a christian's position. it's not a case of "the atheist thinks there isn't a god, the christian thinks there is one". you might draw a parallel between thinking there is one and thinking there probably isn't one, but that's not where the goalposts are here. the christian says: there is a god, and I know the details about him. that's not at all equivalent to my position, which is: i've never seen any convincing evidence or heard any convincing logic that there is a god. that would be square one. even if someone could show that, they would still have all their work ahead of them to prove that any particular book is the accurate source of what god expects from us, AND they would still have to successfully argue that god's wishes trump our principles of human rights, democracy and the rule of law.

Quote: 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.

If you understand how ridiculous it would be if someone seriously held the yellow lobster/child rape position, it ought to be apparent how ridiculous the "homosexuality is wrong because the judeo-christian god says so" position is.

Quote:Look, I'm not saying rape is fine

Answer my earlier question. What do you think about the Bible's rules on rape? I've asked that two or three times now.

Here's what the Bible says. If a man rapes a woman, he must marry her and pay off her father. Two points of commentary about this. Firstly it doesn't seem like much of a punishment to the man, as opposed to the death penalty for gay people who choose to have relationship with a consenting adult.

Secondly, look how fucked up it is from the woman's perspective. She's just been raped - I struggle to imagine what that's like - she probably needs the comfort and understanding of her family and friends, and she ought to know that the law is totally on her side and she ought never to have to look at the rapist ever again.

But what happens? She has to marry him! The bastard who raped her, she is now confined to a life attached to him as an inferior partner (the bible makes it quite clear that women are men's property, which was probably the general view at the time it was written). Never mind what she had in mind for her future, maybe she was in love with a different man and wanted to marry him, maybe she doesn't want to get married at all. No. She's got to marry a rapist who attacked and violated her.

So answer my question, and so must Altzan... do you think there's anything morally wrong with this law? Never mind whether God exists. Even if he does exist and he really did inspire this law, it's still horrendous and it would just mean God was an immoral piece of shit.

Quote: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.

Morals stem from human solidarity, the principles of human rights, freedom under the rule of law, democracy, etc etc etc. They develop gradually, we learn more all the time.

As for where evil comes from? Religion

before anyone objects too hard to that, it's just intended to be snappy and simplistic, don't read too much into it