
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Mon, 17 May 2010 04:38:13 GMT

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

Sorry for the extra delay. High school exams, graduation, college prep and driving tests all equal a busy schedule.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote:God's not going to fry them with a lightning bolt today for those crimes. That doesn't mean we shouldn't punish them with the laws of our land. so who's really sorting the world out?

Good question, isn't it?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote: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.

Oh, really? Your god says it's ok to opt-out of a legal system if it's morally shit?

Excellent.

I'm sure you can guess where I'm going with this.

Yeah. Your many-expressed opinion of what you think my moral beliefs are.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote: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?

sigh... i didn't say there was a third option, i said it's bullshit to say these are the only two options.

Um, sure...

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote: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 Starbuzz'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?

you can talk that way if you like.

You said it's a problem to do it, and now you're OK with me doing it? What's with the change of opinion?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote:NT explicitly states that we should be friendly with everyone, NOT make enemies with them.

ah, yes. it also says you should love and forgive your enemies, and turn the other cheek.

what a ridiculous teaching.

shrug

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote: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. why don't they? it's what Jesus supposedly said...

re: badly misinformed

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote:Not surprising that all of these deal with human error.
well, if there's no God (or if there might be a God but there's no reason to suppose it's anything at all like the depiction in the Bible) then this would be a human error in saying otherwise, wouldn't it?

Kinda stating the obvious here, but yes it would be.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote:If the Bible is really God's word, he would have made sure it did not get screwed over by human error.
i think a rebuttal is superfluous

Good for you.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote: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.
there's a world of difference.

In the basic premise? I don't think so.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01nobody told starbuzz what he must believe. what he believes is not a result of swallowing dogma.

Sure, I agree that. You just argued against what he already believed.
But now, since he's an atheist (I assume - forgive me if I'm wrong), do you say he now has no belief, whatsoever?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01secondly, i would never dream of saying he has to agree with me and he'll be punished if he doesn't - i'd be ashamed of myself if i said something so sick.

Then let's hope that 'punishment' truly doesn't exist.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01thirdly, it'd be all fine with me if, after breaking free of christianity, he made the free informed choice to follow a different religion.

Thus implying you're more agreeable with religions other than Christianity?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote:Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 08:32the 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.

Give a specific example? (or several if you like)

A few years ago, at a graduation, the valedictorian was giving her speech. At one point, she mentioned God - just a passing comment, something like how she, or th class, were truly blessed to be able to gain their education - and the board presiding cut off her microphone. They were afraid her comment might offend someone who didn't believe in God.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote: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? this isn't much of a rebuttal, since we don't accept that this system is well-designed at all.

Any system, actually.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01as to the second part of the question - will there always be people who want to assert their basic human rights? i certainly hope so.

Not basic human rights. Any 'rights' that the presiding system denies.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote:And if the Biblical system is so bad, why are all the examples I've seen so far been OT based?

cough hell *cough*

There's one. Any more?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote: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).

by who, then?

The guys in our school system who want to teach it to us.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01and are you told that you'll be physically punished for daring to question these concepts?

Not sure about physical, per se. They'd certainly give us a lot of grief about it, saying that it's got so much evidence behind it and has been scientifically accepted and boy, we must be stupid to think it could be wrong.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 08:01Quote: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?

I wouldn't say I "uselessly resorted to namecalling".

I was looking at the "because I he never insulted me" part, actually.

Starbuzz wroteAltzan wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 00:58I just read Starbuzz's post and it's full of crap like this, only it's an "atheists are right" view.

oh wow. Way to misunderstand. I honestly described how I was going to debate you:

Toggle Spoiler1) you say something first

2) I will state why exactly I don't share that same view

3) you provide clarification further

Here's an example; I asked you where humans learned how to wear clothes. You said it's a "belief thing" and said your god clothed them with animal skins before kicking their butt out of the garden. I then followed it up with why I wasn't sold on that and said something that made sense and also gave examples of people who still don't give much priority to clothing in this world. You didn't follow up to that and I didn't push.

So how dishonest of you to come back and post later I am "full of crap like this" and "atheists are right" view.

I abandoned the theistic position almost a year ago because it was so flawed and untenable This is where the difference between indoctrinated theistic dogma vs thinking for yourself comes in. If you want your religion to be accepted as fact, then asserting, and implying and simply asking to believe is not going to help.

Indeed, what a way to misunderstand!

I was, for the most part, referring to how you described Christians as "having blindfolds" and "having the truth hidden from them".

Starbuzz wroteYou are one who "believes" and has asked us to do so over and over

What? No, I haven't.

Starbuzz wroteand when we wanted elementary proof to justify such belief, you called us a "hopeless case" a year ago.

And I've already apologized for that statement.

Starbuzz wroteSay you have kids and you raised them christian and one of them becomes atheist after seeing through it when he is like 23. Are you going to let him go [to hell] just like that? What are all the options you think you will have to get him back?

We'd try to talk with him about it, sure. We wouldn't relentlessly bother him until he came back, though.

Starbuzz wroteOr would you value your child's decision to think freely?

Of course.

Starbuzz wrote You already mentioned earlier that not doing anything when government sets fair laws for homosexuals equals you being accomplices in sin!

Did I?

Starbuzz wrote For someone who directed merciless military campaigns and oversaw systemic genocides, why this change of rule? Why didn't he say this at the start?

He was actively there at the start, that's why.

Starbuzz wrote The "turn your other cheek rule" seriously undermines a human being's right to self-defense, tbh.

What, you think this means not to defend yourself from physical attack? How silly.

Starbuzz wrote The world and christianity doesn't revolve around a modernized, cleaned up revision of christianity being practiced in a small denomination in Tennessee.

"what isn't is what can break them" lol

Neither does it revolve around these bigger, "come one come all" groups.

Starbuzz wrote Anyway, is this a church of christ? May I please ask?

Yes, it is.

Starbuzz wrote Anyway, this is my 10th year in America and I have gone to a couple hundred different churches across many denominations (thanks to having religious zealots as parents). I also lived 3 months in Nashville, Tennessee 9 years ago and went to church there.

I have yet to go to an American church where the sermon even mentioned anything about the devil and his horrible mischief to trick us all.

That's surprising....

Starbuzz wrote I did hear how your culturally advanced denomination rejects the basic idea of god interfering with humanity. And I can see it for what it was; religious revision.

Care to explain how you 'know' it's such?

Starbuzz wrote So surprised to hear you reject a basic, supposed, historic fact about your religion.

I'm not so sure it is "basic, supposed, and historic".

Starbuzz wrote Altzan wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 00:58 The religious around here care more about rights than the local atheists.

"around here" , "local"

I understand you are not talking about the whole nation.

I'm sure that the areas like this aren't as small and remote as you'd like me to believe.

Starbuzz wroteAltzan wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 00:58Starbuzz wrote on Tue, 11 May 2010 16:44Why 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.

I didn't believe you because when I read what you said, it seemed to greatly contradict with what you said on page 3:

Altzan wrote on Tue, 30 March 2010 22:43And no, I don't believe there were other gods, although those idolators apparently did.

When you refer to the faithful confident worshippers of another religion with a biblical and offensive smear word such as "idolators," I kinda thought how likely was it for you to be open to the concept of [reincarnation] that is believed by the world's sole remaining "idol-worshipping" religion.

IDOLATER: "A worshiper of idols; one who pays divine honors to images, statues, or representations of anything made by hands".

Is that so offensive? Why?

Starbuzz wroteIt's scary how you are adamant and endorse the "reason" to kill them and say whining about it is not going to "bring them back!"

Do you even have a heart? It's amazing how corrupted you have been turned into without an ounce of mercy.

It's amazing how I'm labeled a heartless, evil, immoral jackass over one single aspect.

Starbuzz wroteWhy should they kill the children? They were babies/toddlers. They could have been adopted and raised in the israeli camp, no?

Can you not see just how badly this would have turned out?

Starbuzz wroteAltzan wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 00:58I 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. How can you just assume that you got the right "information" or you were shown the entire information? You got a selective information just enough to make you believe in christianity. Some get information that is enough to make them believe in hinduism. Some get information that makes them muslim. All claim that it makes sense.

What, you don't think we're taught what the other religions believe and why?

Starbuzz wroteAnd what about when the information you were given didn't exist? What information was the child Alexander [the great] given?

?

Starbuzz wroteYou see how "information" keeps changing over generations? That's the steady evolution of religion as new ideas are brought out.

No, I don't, actually.

Starbuzz wroteAltzan wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 00:58And when I question these "basic evolutionary history and social processes", I am told to shut up
I fail to see in this thread where you asked and someone actually said that.

Never said it was someone in this thread, did I?

Starbuzz wroteAltzan wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 00:58My question was, what makes you so positive that they worshipped nature first?
recorded history? Animism seems to have been rampant among the early humans and still is in many religions. And I see it as making sense with the development and evolution of religions over our social history.

Ah, yes. Recorded history. Just ignore the fact that we don't have reliable history dating that far back... and if we did, Christianity would have a much stronger case.

Starbuzz wroteAltzan wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 00:58And you expect me to believe all Christians are the same. Bull.

We don't discriminate like that!

"sinners"

"the evil world"

"ways of the world"

"lost world"

The recent example is homosexuals and atheists. The discrimination is there.

I fail to see your point. We don't think atheists and homosexuals are "scum".

Starbuzz wroteAltzan wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 00:58Because when I refuse to bang my head on the already established "I cannot possibly believe this because it doesn't tie up with basic history, contradictory, immoral, with zero evidence to back it up and requiring "faith" and "belief" to convince myself under threat of hell" brick wall, it's me just refusing to look at the facts.
Fixed. I am trying to get this thru to you.

Ironic how you say that as a result of not understanding what I'm trying to get through to you.

I understand why people will not believe in Christianity. What I refuse to believe is that it is completely and utterly IMPOSSIBLE for anyone to believe that Christianity could be right.

Starbuzz wrotejeez, "interesting" and "relevant" is not something I would associate with "useless." Anyway...I guess we all like this debate!

You serious? Practically everything humorous is this. It's useless for anything other than a cheap entertainment, but it can easily be seen as interesting.

Starbuzz wrote And like it or not, it's brainwashing by a whole lot. No matter how hard you try to, the solid irrefutable fact remains that you are christian because you were born in America with its majority christian population into a christian family and it would have been different if say you were born in Iran.

Then every single person who is born is brainwashed, no? Even telling a child to not be fooled by all the religions out there is brainwashing in and of itself.

Starbuzz wrote Oh the audacity of you to turn a blind eye to a billion variables that decided who you were going to be before you were even born and then claim your religion is the right one?! Oh my!

One, I don't. I recognize them quite well.

Two, you sound strange here - maybe you should take a break between large blocks of text and clear your mind a bit before continuing.

Starbuzz wrote This is just what the average christian thinks atheists are; heartless murderers bent on population planning. How incredibly stupid. Why am I not surprised by you saying this?

Why am I not suprised that you AGAIN took an example LITERALLY? "Oh my!"

I DON'T think all atheists are what you described. It was an EXAMPLE.

And I'm starting to think it flew right over your head.

Starbuzz wrote I will put it to you in very very simple terms since bigger posts apparently don't work. This ain't about factions, churches, and groups like you would love them to be so you can escape from accountability...it's about a religion that doesn't make sense...

If it isn't, then you changed the subject. Point - don't try to put ME accountable for something in a belief system that I don't believe in. If you find a Catholic belief stupid or wrong, don't run to me - I don't go with it any more than you do.

Starbuzz wrote And so when you reject the religion due to its absurdity and become atheist, the very same morons (parents) that brainwashed you in the first place as a kid bully you to "believe" ...they denied me intellectual freedom and still are doing so apparently to save my soul!

If that's really how they're doing it... next time they visit, tell them they're doing it wrong.

Starbuzz wrote I am leading a double life (like millions of others) because people like you are in the majority

?

Starbuzz wrote and have undeserved power of influence

Oh really? How?

Starbuzz wrote No matter how hard you try to put the blame on other factions, groups, denominations, the problem (which you never acknowledge) lies deep within your religion and the all important question of basic intellectual freedom of thought it denies under threat of hell.

What problem, then? Do tell.

If it's about hell, back up - I have acknowledged it. I probably didn't give an answer you liked, though.
