Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality
Posted by Altzan on Thu, 13 May 2010 05:58:34 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32firstly, the idea that it would be fine with the right leader is a fallacy, cos the whole point of dictatorship is that if you don't have the right leader, there's nothing you can do about it.

shrug

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32secondly, if the bible was accurate then god is not the right leader. he's the most vicious, merciless and unjust character ever created.

Hey, look. Another hyperbole.
It's easy to make such a claim when you only look at the negative sides.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32thirdly, you think monarchies are a good thing? they're what you get before you get democracies, and they were the second biggest obstacle to human rights throughout the centuries (the biggest being, of course, religion)

I never said they were good. My point was about how widely used it was.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32just want to make sure i heard you right. the worst crimes according to the bible (which tend not to be the worst crimes accordig to modern society)... you think we should just let people get away with them?

Obviously you didn't hear me right.
God's not going to fry them with a lightning bolt today for those crimes. That doesn't mean we shouldn't punish them wuth the laws of our land.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32secondly, how do you know god does not want you to set his commandments as the laws of the land?

Because he state in the NT that we should obey the laws of our land, provided they were just.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32thirdly, isn't god a bit of a prick for making his revelation so unclear?
even though the majority of humanity think "faith" is a good thing (our greatest weakness, in my view, but i'm hopeful that we can overcome it), the vast majority of people do not think your bible is true. (muslims may think it's true but not the prevailing law)

Heck, people were disbelieving in him and rallying against him even when he was active and leading.
That's man's fault if they don't want to believe what's happening in front of their own eyes.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32your entire line of reasoning was based on taking "everything is either mind or matter" as a known fact, which it plainly isn't.

I still have yet to hear why. What can only be categorized in a third?

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32Quote:So "it's not a yes or no question" is your answer?
no, "i can see why you're asking" and more importantly "i wouldn't have phrased it like that" was the answer.

"i wouldn't have phrased it like that" implies you have a different opinion. One yet unshared.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32Quote:You're missing the point. The idea of my statement being fatuous is an opinion, so I naturally pointed out that you spoke of it as a fact.
don't think i did. i think a bigger problem would be talking about religions as if they're facts.

I just read Starbuzzz's post and it's full of crap like this, only it's an "atheists are right" view.
So that kind of talk is only bad when theists use it?

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32Quote:Quote:including the ones god absolutely despises, according to the bible?
Yes.
How do you know god wants you to do that?
according to the bible there are people who infuriate god no end. people who worship other gods, homosexuals, etc. his rage towards these guys is apparently much greater than his annoyance at, say, the devil. how do you know god wants you to be nice to these appalling sinners? don't you think god might ask you "i spent half the old testament trying to make it clear to you what absolute scum these people are, now i see you're having tea with them?"

NT explicitly states that we should be friendly with everyone, NOT make enemies with them.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32greed is usually undesirable, but would you rather have parents who want well-paid jobs or would you rather have parents who follow jesus's instruction to think nothing of the future and just follow him? (i.e. no investment, no looking after your family, etc etc etc)

If you think Christians do things like that in the name of faith, you are badly misinformed.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32if god was kicking ass here and now and making examples of the murderers and rapists of the world (well, i say rapists, but god doesn't seem to mind that too much, so let's just stick with murderers) then at least people would figure out that these punishments are going to happen.

If you look at the OT, there were still plenty of people who didn't. A smaller percentage, maybe, but it's with a system you've rejected thus far.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32you really don't disagree with it. it's basically come down to a distinction between god and the followers of god. you don't think the followers of god should be in undemocratic control, but you'd quite like it if god was in undemocratic control.

Pretty much.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32Quote:I see no reason why the Bible would inaccurately depict his views, apart from transcription error.
why would the bible not be an accurate depiction of the views of a god?
off the top of my head....
1. the people writing the books were lying
2. the people writing the books were crazy
3. the people writing the books were plain wrong (for example, thought they knew something they weren't sure of)
ask two simple questions about the bible. 1: who wrote them? (don't just give a name, try to find out who these people were) and 2: how did they know what to write?
and isn't it quite a big deal that there might be "transcription errors"?

Not surprising that all of these deal with human error.
If the Bible is really God's word, he would have made sure it did not get screwed over by human error. It's either true or false, just as it is.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32Quote:I feel the same way when someone is converted to Christianity after visiting our church for some time. It's a simple feeling of elation after conversion.
don't act as if the two things are the same.

Excuse me? The basis IS the same: an individual changing what he believes.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32intellectual freedom is a basic human right (though most religions don't want to admit it). it was being denied him for one reason: religion.

Religion doesn't block "intellectual freedom" as much as you claim it does.
It doesn't demand that we stop all scientific progress and stick with the stone age.
At least, not most of them.

Spoony said:i haven't heard exactly what denomination he was subjected to, but i don't think it was catholic.

Starbuzzz said:I wasn't catholic (sorry to disappoint).

Sorry. I thought I'd seen that in his posts, although it was a while back and I should have checked. What did they call themselves, then?

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32the second sentence really is odd. "If you don't think there's a hell, why object to us telling everyone that they must do what we say because otherwise they'll go there?" If someone tries to mug a person with a gun, it doesn't make them innocent if it turns out the gun was unloaded, even if the mugger was absolutely convinced it was loaded.

No. If that was the case, the mugger would be saying he had a gun, but showing no indication of it, not even a bulge in his pocket.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32Quote:I have been meaning to ask you to justify this. It seems like a pretty large hyperbole to me.

i thought i'd explained it enough times already, frankly

Not in terms of such a drastic claim, no.

Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 07:30Quote:Spoony
where do you live?
I live in the US where there is a line between Religion and Gov't. As thin as it may be there's a line. We have had the 10 commandments pulled from courthouses. If people here have a problem with something we take it upon ourselves to get it changed.
the line certainly is thin and it's being tested all the time, isn't it?
Yep, and usually by the atheists. Almost every time we hear of a bill in petition, it's about some atheist group wanting so-and-so removed.
Such as?

Pretty much everything that refers to God.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44So far you have said that god is not interefering in the world; stepping on a cornerstone dogma for billions of christians around the world. Your claims equal that of saying the majority of christians around the world are wrong about pretty much everything.

...No, they don't. They have a lot of it right, but what isn't is what can break them.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44And satan? The idea of satan is so absurd in America that most christians here are afraid and downright embarrased to talk about him while the same christians elsewhere, treat him with so much respect and give him so much credit. The world "devil" is ignored here and conveniently so.

We don't ingore him. He's a frequent topic.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44So it is under this context that saying jesus negating god's need for supernatural acts and angels helping establish the church (I heard this first time btw) really amount to nothing but excuses of a religion that has trouble answering the basic question. This has been formulated by theologians in seminaries as a way to explain it away and is not biblical at all. It's the same with the "christianity is not a religion but a relationship" marketing gimmick made up by your theologians.

Wow, this started to make sense until halfway through. I can't understand a shady reference to theological seminars about an idea you supposedly heard first from me.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44Altzan wrote on Tue, 04 May 2010 22:26I was brought under a different church than you, and you have certainly surprised me with some of the things you say your church tried to teach you.
This isn't a church vs church battle. It's christianity's core dogma vs revised modernised dogma. There's a huge difference.
If jesus were here, he wouldn't want to be associated with most christians except, say the Amish.

I never said it was. I'm pointing out that I'm not the only one bringing a point or two that is totally new to the other side.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44Altzan wrote on Tue, 04 May 2010 22:26Starbuzzz wrote on Mon, 03 May 2010 15:44wow...so many christians don't know this. All jews, christians, and muslims trace the root of their religions to the Patriach Abraham.
I'd trace it to Adam and Eve, and their creator, myself.
It doesn't matter who you feel like tracing it to.
The 3 major religions today tracing their history back to Abraham is pretty much accepted among them. I have seen it written in top christian magazines as well.

If it doesn't matter what I trace it to, it doesn't matter where those mag guys trace it. I don't have to shove myself into a majority.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44So according to you, we should put "underwater life, solar flares, flora and fauna, planets and stars, and atoms, cells, and organs" in the same category as "hell, heaven, eternal life and eternal torment, angels, weird angelic creatures like cerubims, bright light, thor, vishnu, reincarnation, poseidon, athena, hercules, zeus, Minotaur..." And we should show both to ignoramuses and ask for their opinion as well?

Specifically, people who know little or nothing of both sets. Then they both seem just as mystic.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44Altzan wrote on Tue, 04 May 2010 22:26Starbuzzz wrote on Mon, 03 May 2010 15:44do you imply that reincarnation is true but we aren't in a position to have "examined and studied" it?
I imply that, while I don't believe in it, I don't have concrete proof that it is false.
Why the need for formalities and political correctness? It would be much easier if you just said it's man-made falsehood.

Easier if I lied, then? No.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44Who's rights do you think matter more? Sadly, most religious people can't even bring themselves to say "everyone." As long as they get the bigger cut of the meat...

Seriously? The religious around here care more about rights than the local atheists.
They especially don't care about these 'cuts of meat' you mention.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44Tell me what are some things you learned alone on your own? From what you have posted, you have said everything a freshly indoctrinated christian would say.

Yeah, it's pretty funny how I seem to say the common and accepted beliefs of a Christian...

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44Infact you have been so morally corrupted that you justify the murders of the children commited by the exodus gang and then so shockingly excuse that by saying "BUT THEY ARE IN HEAVEN." I guess them losing their lives in gruesome murders and the terrible agony and grief of their parents before the slaughter doesn't matter to

you.

Bad guess. But going against the method or reason won't bring them back.
And, as I said, I'm not sure keeping them alive would be any less scarring, not that it justifies the act.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44What else have you learned? You justify dictatorships over and over again. I guess dictatorships are ok with you if the dictator shares your same view. How unfair for the others! You don't realize this simple concept of equality. Is this what someone who hasn't been seriously stained with religion will say?

Is it a simple assumption, then, that no matter how well a system is designed, there will be people who want no part of it, and deserve rights?
And if the Biblical system is so bad, why are all the examples I've seen so far been OT based?

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44See, I don't mind you "believing" all this, but it is highly contrary to your original claim that you "learned" something on your own. There's a huge difference between believing and learning. And learning imo starts with asking questions, raising doubts, and demanding clarification. And if a shady answer is given to you over and over and you are also told to shut up, then the alarms should go off in your head and you think there is something wrong and seek the answer yourself.

I know the difference. And I know that I wasn't given 'shady information'. A lot of it has evidence to back it up and simple makes sense. Despite the fact that all of the ones I mentioned so far have been ridiculed (but not always retorted to).

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44No one is going to be convinced if you just assert this over and over while outright ignoring the basic evolutionary history and social processes of early human movements that eventually forms deeper concepts such as unity, tribal idnetity, religions etc etc. And you have already plentifully demonstrated that you know little about other diverse cultures and societies both past and present (other than believing they are all going to hell).

And when I question these "basic evolutionary history and social processes", I am told to shut up (not by anyone in partuclar - apparently I need to emphasize this).
Sound familiar?

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44You did deny something so basic by simply asserting this:
Altzan wrote on Mon, 26 April 2010 03:41Man didn't initially worship nature, they did worship those "same supernatural beings".
This statement is nonsensical; it's akin to saying the 747 jumbo jet came first before the Wright brothers tiny wooden airplane. The question is simple: why would man even worship nature first if your favorite diety made everything and gave instructions? Our early evolutionary history perfectly answers this.

My question was, what makes you so positive that they worshipped nature first?

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44And do you have anything to say about the vastly

growing and expanding population of non-religious people in the world today? Seems superstition is not so "inherent" after all and we are getting over religion finally just as the present day religions replaced the older religions they dethroned.

With the expansion of technology and science, it's not that surprising, is it?

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44For example, as a kid living in a christian Indian home, the lie that hindus are the lowest scum of the earth ever has been impressed upon me. Seems they ain't all as bad as they were pumped up to be. I guess atheism has made me more tolerant towards others.

And you expect me to believe all Christians are the same. Bull.
We don't discriminate like that!

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44There you go, everyone!
We must just simply close our eyes and say "I believe this to be true..." in the face of incredible contrary reason.
We just have to believe this...just like that. I can see why your religion needs the all important childhood indoctrination; without which it would disappear!

Riiiight. Because when I refuse to bang my head on the already established "I cannot possibly believe this" brick wall, it's me just refusing to look at the facts.
Get over it and move along, please. No implied truth here.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44** The question isn't useless but this particular debate is **
???
And so why spend so much time here then?

Fixed.
And I spend time here because it's interesting and relevant.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44As for me, I can only be happy for myself. I owe so much to Spoony; I am so much indebted to him and can never repay him ever for what he has done. I could never have torn away the tight blindfolds that my parents and church put around my eyes (when I was a helpless little child) all by myself though I did try.
I see my own 10 year old brother in this. Already brainwashed in an American sunday school to believe that in heaven the jewish god "sits with a feather pen and big book in a judge's chair."
Who is going to remove his blindfolds? You tell me if this is right or wrong to do to children?
Day-before-yesterday in church (this was a smaller baptist church), they brought all the sunday school kids to the front and announced that the children learned the story of "Abraham's obedience"...the story of the little boy Issac about to be offered as a live sacrifice. I sincerely felt so heartbroken for those kids and felt like walking out because I couldn't bear to watch their young minds lied to like that. That's a lot of future Altzans and old Starbuzzes right there!
So if it weren't for debates like this, I would still be in my miserable state of mind.
And there's no need to bash the "lol internet" when it's convenient to you. I see 3 people who have done so in this thread. I bet nobody bashes convenience of email over written mailed letters, no?
You see the oppressed free-thinking people in Iran and China using the internet as a loophole to

connect and share their precious thoughts. why? Cuz they will get arrested by their regimes if they do it in real life. It's the same case for me. It just confirms my view that most people don't really know what freedom really is. It's more deeper than just due process, free speech, and right to own firearms. Those are important yes, but freedom doesn't stop here.

If your big thing here is simply brainwashing... do you mostly ridicule Christianity because that's the subject you purged yourself from?

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44I already said my reasons for debating you. Not to prove you wrong but trying to see if you have anything new. It's hard for me to look at what you are saying with a "let's see what they have to say" attitude because I was once in your position and can never be in your posititon again unless I "believe" and have "faith."

I wasn't speaking about anyone in particular. Why do I have to express that?
I even mentioned earlier the reasons why you're debating here, incase you missed it.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44Altzan wrote on Sun, 09 May 2010 01:10But it's the internet, the location of almost pure anonymity, which fuels such behaviour. It's hard to curb.
I don't think Spoony or me hide behind internet anonymity. You can see the true information in our profiles and you can see who we are in the picture thread. Harldy the people that seem to hide in "pure" anonymity and act as such.

Again, why are you tunneling my general statements onto yourselves?

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44I just can't "believe" just like that eventhough you keep demanding I do just that.

No, I don't, actually.

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44Spoony was the most lenient of them all. Why? Even though he offended me a lot and I hated him for it, I kept debating with him because I he never insulted me and or uselessly retorted to name-calling like the others.

I wonder why he does it now, then?

Starbuzzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44Anyone else see damage limitation here!? Trying to escape from accountability again, eh?
How dishonest of you! I lost track of how many times in this thread you have pulled the "my denomination, my church, and my version of christianity [that I was brought up in] is the real correct version over all others across the world so anyone crying about being being mistreated by any other version of christianity is moot!"

facepalm

Fine. I'll go on a mudering spree and kill everyone even remotely religious, saying that they're poisioning our civilization and ruining our gene pool, and that I'm purifying the human race.

Oh, and I'll mention how I'm an atheist.

And you can't say that he's not a true atheist to cover yourselves, because that's just "pulling a fast one".

Don't you see how ridiculous that is?

Your Hindu friend, for example. If there happened to be a faction who have the core beliefs of Hindu's, but also believed that violence is both permitted and required for spreading the religion, you're basically saying that your Hindu friend cannot claim she isn't a part of it in some way.

Ludicrous.
