
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Fri, 30 Apr 2010 05:26:08 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 05:57Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010 05:43You started off by saying that the heaven/hell concept was better because otherwise, if there's no afterlife, you can indulge your own selfish desires, do whatever you like because it won't matter once you're dead. Selfishness, lack of care for others, that must be the problem.

Well, a couple of quick questions later and it turns out that your number one reason for preferring the Christian concept is selfishness. You act the way you do in life because you think there's something in it for you later on. That was the point.

So when you obey the laws of your country, you do it because you're selfish?

No, and that doesn't follow.

Why? You said I only obey because I want the future reward, because I'm selfish. (Not true, but why go there)

I highly doubt that you obey the laws of your country because you believe that they are right and just in every way.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 05:57Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010 05:43Pages and pages ago, I asked: what's the evidence supporting the biblical account reported in Genesis? I've asked this question again and again and again, and you still haven't supplied anything tangible. What little you did provide, not that any of it even answered the question, was very very easy to debunk.

Mmmkay. The Genesis accout deals with the origin of the universe, and so far, I'm the only one who provided a possible explanation of where it came from.

No, you didn't. I asked you again and again and again: where is the evidence that proves that the account given in Genesis is correct? YOU-HAVE-NOT-GIVEN-ANY.

And you haven't given a single piece of evidence of any other possibility, either.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 05:57I'll ask the question again, the one I asked several pages ago. What is the evidence that proves the version of events described in Genesis is correct?

See, there's the problem again: you're asking for PROOF.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 05:57Quote:3) This is the only choice left...

If there was a time where only NOTHING existed, there would be NOTHING still, because something cannot come out of nothing. Since something obviously does exist, it must have ALWAYS existed... so what is it?

This can only get you as far as deism. It's an absolutely enormous jump to get from that position to theism, i.e. that you know the details of what created the universe. Furthermore, it obviously raises the much bigger question of where the deity came from, and I've never heard a religious person give anything but the most feeble guesswork answer to that.

Assuming you think it's feeble that a diety could have always existed.

Still, it's a step towards deism and away from atheism.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 05:57i also can't help but laugh at this

Quote:1)Everything is categorized as matter or mind... nothing else...so:

2) Something is eternal, as mentioned

3) That something must be either mind or matter

4) It cannot be matter, for matter is not eternal.

5) That eternal something must be "mind". There has been an eternal mind.

matter can't be eternal, and therefore we must be dealing with an eternal mind... lol.

Go ahead and laugh... I'll just sit back and wait for a rebuttal.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 05:57Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010 05:43I wish I understood why you're so extraordinarily evasive on this point.

It's a simple question. What was the purpose the author had of writing this book? You say it was obvious. So what was it?

I'm not being evasive. I'm trying to avoid being redundant.

But fine.

He wrote the article on Evidence of the Existence of God because he wants to convey evidence of the existence of God to those who want to know why he believes in a God.

...well done.

the problem is, the post right before that, you said "that's the problem, it can't be proven. if it could, everyone would be christians"

How's that a problem? His motivation, as I just stated, is to share evidence. That's not the same as proof.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 05:57(i guess you still haven't figured out that a lot of people have moral objections to your religion)

With you around, it's hard not to be constantly reminded.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 05:57Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 24 April 2010

05:43Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 22 April 2010 05:58Quote:Also, here's another question:

"The creative power of the mind amounts to nothing more than the faculty of combining, transposing, augmenting, and diminishing the materials afforded to us by sense and experience." (David Hume)

Do you agree with this statement?

I can see why he said it, and I can see why a religious person would jump on it.

Ok. But do you think he is right, or wrong? It's not an opinion he's stating, it's a true or false fact.

Is it? I wouldn't have phrased it that way.

Now who's being evasive?

I don't accept that this is a yes-no question.

Logically, it is... so I don't see why you're evading it, unless you just aren't sure.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 05:57Quote:Starbuzz wrote on Sun, 25 April 2010 20:17It is by belief that a huge majority of christians blame earthquakes on human actions and a fatal car accident on your god's wrath. It ain't a choice. It's very real and biblical.

How is it Biblical to believe that God is involved in current affairs?
I'm still waiting to hear your justification for your belief that he isn't.

It's hard for me to look at all of the evil occurring in today's world and know that some believe God's active...

The Bible has enough evidence to support that, if God were active today, he would certainly be doing so.

Which he was, in the Old Testament.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 05:57Quote:Quote:2) your entire motivation to do so is based on a feeble faith-based belief system cooked up by a certain eastern-mediterranean sea people who's ancient ancestor is a mesopotamian man by the name of abraham.

And an athiest's belief is based on an idea that the universe appeared by the means of some unknown force that cannot possibly be directed by an intelligent entity.

no, it's not.

Which do you deny?

That the universe was created by an unknown force?

Or that there wasn't an intelligent mind behind it?

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59Altzan wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 04:55Yes, he did control many aspects of the events in the Old Testament. He isn't doing that now, though - not since Jesus' ascension.

Hmmm...what about his angels then? Are they still around? It does seem he overworked his angels in the NewT. Everything from sending messages to helping peter(?) escape from prison and many instances more.

Or is this part of the tale rejected nowadays as well?

Yes, angels did those things in the NewT... they don't today, though.

Basically, they were helping establish the new church that Jesus had just put into place.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59Altzan wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 04:55Starbuzz wrote on Mon, 26 April 2010 03:43I was told god is watching your everymove and directly and indirectly interferes whenever possible. I guess you are going to challenge that too using the version you were taught with huh?

Of course... as I stated above. I'm "mind-boggled" that people still believe this.

What does your version of christianity say regarding where non-christians and casual christians will "go to" after death? What about satan?

What does this have to do with God's modern activities?

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59Altzan wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 04:55There's definitely plenty of evidence, that is undeniable. As for proof, that's obvious. There'd be a lot more Christians in there were proof.

Trust me...I have looked at all this. They all amount to nothing but the same old clever but dishonest exploitation of gaps. If there was "undeniable evidence" and "obvious proof" I would have already beaten you to defending christianity in this thread (and in real life too).

But the thing is, I don't understand how anyone can think arguments for atheism are any more credible.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59) it does not make any sense to use the word "belief" to anything atheist.

Why not? Atheism isn't the absence of belief. It's a belief that no deity exists. Only time I've ever seen the "atheism is not a belief" argument is when an atheist wanted to get out of giving any sort of evidence for their side of the coin. Why should I take anti-Christian bashings seriously when the atheists supposedly don't have their own belief to go to? That's like complaining that the boat you're on in the middle of the ocean is weak and crumbling, and won't last long, when there's no other floatation device available.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59) you ignored my original statement that goes to the root start of christianity.

Yeah, because it didn't make sense. More like sarcasm.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59) you don't know what atheism really is.

Define atheism, then?

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59) What is far-fetched and not flimsy? Remember we are talking hell, heaven, eternal life and eternal torment, angels, weird angelic creatures like cherubim, bright light...all packed in a faith-based belief system that uses intellectual dishonesty, brainwashing of little children to gain future followers, and the extensive use of fear-based blackmail.

And look at all the far-fetched things we see in our world today - underwater life, solar flares, thousands upon thousands of different flora and fauna, planets and stars, and all the little details - atoms, cells, and organs.

The only difference between those and what you mentioned is that they're here today and are able to be examined and studied.

I doubt you'd have much success trying to convince older civilizations about the existence of atoms, cells, and such like...

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59) I said that in all seriousness. I am not here to "get you." I feel like I am talking to the christian starbuzz from three years ago and am genuinely liking this convo.

I am, too. It's great to see both sides of the story and compare.

What's irritating are the atheists who imply that Christians are moronic simply because of their faith, and that their ideas are superior. It's quite pathetic. (And I'm not pointing this finger at anyone in particular, especially you.)

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59) to gauge if the religion I abandoned has any "new juice" left

2) to not prove you wrong but to see if my own rational conclusions are tenable still.

- 1) Why should it have any "new juice"? apart from your saying that religions change.
- 2) I don't understand.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59Altzan wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 04:55I believe in the biblical account... science's version of older events is no more reliable than any other historical idea, even the Bible's.
law of belief, i.e, whatever you believe becomes the truth.

Or a law of time, ie the longer ago something occurred, the harder it is to prove its validity.
And really, I don't see how science's ideas of what happened so long ago are any more credible.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59answer this honestly in your own words; what made humanity start wearing clothing?

This is another belief thing, you know...
It occurred when Adam and Eve ate the forbidden fruit, and realized that they were naked.
Apparently they thought this was a problem.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59Strange thing is I keep noticing this trend all the time with christians during debates against atheists. I am referring to christians going from being christian to suddenly talking like a deist. Then leaping forward to christianity to provide an explanation!

You're reading too far into it. It's simply a step to indicate that there is a diety! Why is that so ridiculous?

I mean, to say there's a God cannot be logical unless you also imply there's a diety. Which is why I make that point. If I could unchallengingly fill the gap and prove my specific God exists, I would certainly have done so. But it's difficult when I only exist physically, whereas God is spiritual. It's just a logical view that shows the idea of a diety is very real, very possible, and very likely.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59So we all would be better off if we studied the deep ancient religions, tried to gather more evidence and learn more about them, and then tried to work backward still to uncover whatever "force" was behind it all in the beginning. Right? That would be the sane thing to do. Why then does Altzan grab a recent religion and try to apply it to everything that came before it? I know; its the childhood religious indoctrination kicking in. I can vouch for this.

Not really. It's looking at the facts. Such as that it isn't recent.

Starbuzz wrote on Wed, 28 April 2010 09:59Anyway, I wonder what those early humans will say or do if you go upto them and ask them where they got their ideas from. I would be more worried to go near them savages anyway! I wouldn't want to be dragged off to the top of a pyramid and have my heart cut out or just eaten. So much for "basic human attribute" and "superior force." Very laughable, indeed.

Lol, even if all the early humans were like that, it stills vindicates the point of "basic human attribute" and "superior force".

Now THAT's laughable.
