
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Mon, 07 Jun 2010 02:10:32 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 Religious people always tend to think atheism is another belief system just to try to bring it down to their level to show it is equal to their lowly dogmas.

Not a belief SYSTEM, no.

But it also is not completely DEVOID of belief.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 The fact that you think "not brainwashing a kid with religion itself is brainwashing" tells a lot about you.

No, telling a kid anything as fact at all (including telling, as a fact, that no higher power exists) is brainwashing.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 The most important christian claim: that god is omnipresent watching your every move and shifting through your thoughts, punishing you (or "testing" you if you will), hearing prayers, answering them, and providing protection from danger would be too easy to observe or at least discern but as I described above, there is no evidence, not a bit, of such a system existing.

It's most important because it's most popular. People like the idea of a higher power watching over them, rewarding, punishing, and guiding. Therefore it becomes important.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 They need not be compared? We were talking about how atheism, unlike christianity, doesn't threaten anyone with punishment for disagreeing with it. You responded to that with a "but they cause us grief and call as stupid" and now you are asking to not compare the two?

Let me try again - while hell is most assuredly worse than a verbal attack, it does not make a verbal attack insignificant.
Understand now?

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 Perhaps you should just concede the obvious; that atheism doesn't threaten anyone with painful eternal punishment for disagreeing with it.

You can't quote me as claiming the opposite, so I don't understand why you're putting words in my mouth.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 true but first you said "fighting against a governmental decree legally allowing something you consider to be a sin" which seems like a obvious intrusion into the political system to have the laws influenced to favour your side.

Did I?

I said I believe in voicing myself, and being heard, on my opinions and thoughts, like everyone else (I think that might be called intellectual freedom by some)... but not that we should take that

to a fighting level. No higher than the usual governmental process, which was used to pass the governmental decree in the first place.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 All christians, despite denominations, believe in the doctrine of creation as in genesis (some differ with the days vs eras in creation), the old testament stories are considered factual, all accept christ as saviour, his teachings and that of his disciples (albeit with some nitpicking), have some view on what is going to happen in the "end times" (either a second coming or rapture), and believe in a heaven and a hell.

True.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 The minor denominational differences are hardly important (just a mere sampling of the differences in opinion) in relation to the christian religion as a whole because each denomination is critical of the other and consider themselves to be right. They are in essence the same. You see why I think denominational differences are pathetic? Perhaps "pathetic" is a strong/wrong word to use... "irrelavent" and "pointless" is more apropiate.

Denominations are seperated by small details, yes. But that doesn't make them "pointless". I will use another example at the risk of you misunderstanding once more...

Researchers nearly finish calculations for a new outer-space rocket. However, one of the details in the physical formulas is interpreted two different ways. The researchers split up, unable to resolve the issue. Each build their own rocket, and their calculations are nearly identical, with only the one detail different.

Yes, the detail may be insignificant and will not harm either rocket.

But it is very possible that one interpretation will get the rocket in space and beyond, and the other will end up in the rocket's destruction.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 Somehow in this thread, you made me think that you elected yourself to represent the entire religion and that caused my misunderstanding regarding denominations.

Fixed. Yeah, I can do that too.

Look, it's simple. When you make a point against something I believe in, I'll respond; if it's about something I don't believe in or something I agree with you about, I won't. If the majority of Christians believe it and we don't, I won't defend it, and attaching it to me is just plain STUPID if I tell you I don't adhere to it.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 After the 9/11 attacks, did you as an American really give a shit as to whether the terrorists were Shia or Sunni? You would be lying through your teeth if you said yes. So why is it that when I have a complaint about an outrageous atrocity committed against me in the name of your god and your religion that you felt the need to use the denominational card to cover yourself?

See above? If the complaint is about something I believe in, I won't fling the denominational card,

plain and simple.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 Maybe when you are dragged to a mosque against your will, you too will feel the pain of absolute mental rape (which you have the sheer bloody luxury of not having experienced and I hope you never do) and this debate will stop being a "humorous" source of "cheap entertainment" to you. At that time, I would have rather traded their mind-rape for a couple lashes instead.

I don't share your background, and therefore don't hold this debate on the same mental standpoint as you.

Also, I never said this thread was "cheap entertainment" for me, and claiming such is putting words in my mouth.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 Instead, you clearly misunderstood every word of it thinking I am blaming you on some silly belief differences, accused me of changing the subject, and you had to bring in denominations and how your denomination doesn't believe this or that and you came up with so many "don't blame me!" statements, and you had to bring in the idiotic example of abortion clinic bombing while that wasn't my point.

Clearly, you misunderstood ME, actually. That's as false of a summarization as I have ever seen. When I use the denominational aspect, it's over something you want to blame me for despite the fact that I don't believe in it any more than you do.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 And you topped it off with an absurd example of atheists going on a killing spree and showed everyone how you completely misunderstand what atheism really is.

Yes, EXAMPLE. I know what atheism is, thank you. So how long are you going to continue this charade?

I don't think atheists are like that. It was an example, hypothetical - whatever the heck word you please.

Continuing to say that the example represents my view on what atheism is just continues to prove how close-minded and unreasonable you are becoming.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 Altzan wrote on Thu, 20 May 2010 01:14 A description of religion's origins and evolutions hardly explains why you think the idea is made up. I wonder how you can honestly say this and actually mean it when you outright claim that a thousand other religions are plain wrong just because you think so. Tell me about the other religions and how they are not made up, if you will.

I was referring to you saying "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."

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06 Remarkable how you "pre-mention" me going to chew you out for the childkilling itself. I will save it considering you have expressed yourself thoroughly enough on why the children should be killed.

Eitherway, it was one of the only suggestions I can seriously think of to avoid killing the children

and make a humane choice instead. And you had to turn that into something you can use against me and pose it as a question!

Excuse me for making a counterpoint to your own point - I thought we were supposed to do that in debates, no?

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06Altzan wrote on Thu, 20 May 2010 01:14Starbuzz wrote on Mon, 17 May 2010 15:06Why question mark when the question is so simple? What did the child Alexander learn and what belief systems did he have?

What about the Ötzi iceman? Just another human being we are fortunate enough to have found his body. What information was he given and what beliefs did he have? Is he in your hell too screaming and kickin? lol

I find all religious folks to not see the past that was before their religions came to power. It's all the more ridiculous when they say they are the one true religion ever.Again = ?

What do those people have to do with the topic?

Why am I not surprised that someone religious doesn't understand this despite me writing plainly...?

Why am I surprised that the point you're trying to make apparently cannot be explained any simpler than this?

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06Altzan wrote on Thu, 20 May 2010 01:14there's a difference between mentally incapable of belief and deciding not to believe.

So you are saying either a person must be clinically braindead OR simply outright stubborn to not believe?

Do you think that every time I disagree with you, then what I actually believe is always completely opposite?

Either you or Spooky believes it can be impossible for an individual to believe in Christianity. And now you are claiming I believe that it can be impossible to think as an atheist?

Nope. Try again.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06What I find pathetic is you rejecting every other religion, even those that came before yours, and also condemning them all to some sadistic roasting for eternity. So are you right? Really? Are you christians really this desperate to be in the middle of the grand scheme of things in the universe? Give me a break!

I'm not, but God is, provided he does exist.

If you are angry about the "nonbelievers are going to burn in hell" aspect, don't blame me for it - I didn't design the system. I believe that the system exists, but it's not how I would have set it up.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06Was your 10th grade biology teacher really this nasty to you?

Not me specifically, but a fellow student who got into a discussion with him about it.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06I am pretty sure you hate atheists sticking up for

homosexuality.

I'm pretty sure you're wrong.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:061) they are not hurting anybody

That's not absolute, you know. Homosexuality can hurt people in several ways.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:062) they are consenting adults

This is indeed almost always the case

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:063) that I was needlessly interfering into their personal lives

If there's wrong in it (not just wrong in the religious aspect), then it isn't needless

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:064) I, a complete outsider, is interfering with someone else's sex life.

Same as above... you, a complete outsider, are interfering with my beliefs, and I, a complete outsider, am interfering with your ideas.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 03 June 2010 17:06It doesn't stop there. Take the pledge of allegiance for example. So there is "under god" in it and tbh, I don't mind it. But is this really "one nation under god?" Under what basis do you imply that this is "one nation under god" and do you have anything solid to say about it? To me it sounds like typical pumped-up mix of christianity and some crude patriotic rhetoric. I am really an outsider here but obviously many Americans feel it needs to go and I don't blame your fellow atheist countrymen for attempting to do so...

This particular example is one I can agree with on their terms. I can understand why they want it removed.

But what they want removed and censored isn't always this simple.
