
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Mon, 14 Jun 2010 02:40:40 GMT

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

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25Altzan wrote on Wed, 09 June 2010 22:57 Seriously? It's happened countless times, a small error ending with the failure of a mission (on any front, not just space exploration).

The rocket analogy is just fine but comparing it to denominational differences isn't since denominations are just differences in opinions.

"Differences in opinions" can have the same result if only one of the two can possibly be correct.

Take baptism. If it truly isn't necessary, both sides are likely to be in the clear, provided God doesn't have a problem with baptism. But if it is required, then those who do not do so are not obeying, which is sin.

Saying that every denomination's opinion doesn't matter is a generalization, and generalizations are almost always incorrect.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25The entire concept of baptism (like every other christian concept) comes down to wrangling and nitpicking bible verses to form such varied opinions. There is absolutely no reason to think that baptism is necessary to be saved.

Despite the fact that many verses say it is?

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25Altzan wrote on Wed, 09 June 2010 22:57 Now you're making assumptions on my first impression of atheism? Nice try, but wrong.

I didn't have to assume anything considering you illustrated well with that example:

Altzan wrote on Thu, 13 May 2010 00:58

Fine. I'll go on a murdering spree and kill everyone even remotely religious, saying that they're poisoning 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".

That doesn't represent my opinion of atheists.

Go ahead and keep ignoring the points I try to make, and turn around my statements to mean something else. The only people who can't see past it don't concern me anyhow.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25 You miss the point. That's the only suggestion I could come up with to avoid killing the children. What suggestions have you brought up to avoid having them killed? That's the point of this.

Mine would be trying to diplomatically change their religious practices, or perhaps doing an act similar to the plagues on Egypt.

It's logical to see that they very likely would not have worked, since those acts' influences would

have hit them by the first times they were done anywhere, or not at all.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25imo, "public lack of acceptance" is irrelevant. Tyranny of the majority shouldn't stop anyone from enjoying their lives. It was the same with race, it was the same with gender, it was the same with interracial marriages, and I feel it is the same with homosexuals.

What do you mean by "tyranny of the majority"?

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25I wonder what makes you think atheists are going to cram such topics to a "child" in the first place?

Resentment?

I'm sure plenty of atheists feel hostile to the religious, and try to ensure that their children are never fooled by such things.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25There's no need for you to play victim here.

That's awfully bigoted

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25And I don't know how you came to the conclusion that we are "vindicating abuse" when what we are saying is hell and verbal threats are absolutely not equal.

It was your response, or perhaps excuse.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25It's crazy what religious indoctrination can do to a person...it makes them absolutely sure that they are right. I have the luxury of knowing what it feels like i.e, having "faith."

The irony seeps off of this... seeing as how you speak in the air of one who knows he is right. I'm not sure how "being absolutely sure they are right" is better the second time around rather than the first.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25And you cannot have "faith" if you take away childhood brainwashing.

Then how do people who've never been religious all their life hear the message and study it, and decide to become Christians? That's not childhood brainwashing.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25Simply stating it is interference doesn't make it so. How is it interfering? Any specifics?

Interference = hindrance, intrusion

Debating over the topic is surely a hindrance at the least.

Starbuzz wrote on Thu, 10 June 2010 03:25How did someone challenging your beliefs obstruct and hinder you from practising your faith?

I'd think this was obvious.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 12 June 2010 11:57it's theism that's being rejected, not merely deism. religious people don't just say that they think there's likely to be a 'god'... they claim to know quite a lot of details.

I understood that when you said it earlier. My apologies if I spoke contrary to it.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 12 June 2010 11:57if your god is going to torture people for ever and ever if they don't get this question right, isn't he a COLOSSAL prick for not making it very clear to begin with? isn't it a huge indictment of His incompetence as well as His cruelty?

As far as baptism goes, it's quite clear, although many try to pull verses out of context to dispute it.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 12 June 2010 11:57You're just seeing homosexuality as a form of sex. It's not just a form of sex, it's a form of love too (maybe the bigger part of the two is the love part, not that I am in a position to know).

It's safe to say that the vast majority of homosexual couples practice homosexual intercourse.

And as for the unhealthy part, here's an example:

Quote:For example, one 1982 study mentioned in the Journal of the American Medical Association found that the anal cancer rate for homosexuals is way above normal, maybe as high as 50 times normal.¹ And a 1997 New England Journal of Medicine study again drew attention to the "strong association between anal cancer and male homosexual contact."² (The reason for the connection is that the lining of the anus, as opposed to the much thicker lining of the vagina, is only a single cell in thickness, tears easily, and thus is an easy point of entry for viruses and bacteria. Just as repeatedly assaulting lung tissue with cigarette smoke increases one's lung cancer risk, repeatedly damaging the anus and rectum increases one's anal cancer risk. Anal sex frequently results in damage to the anus and rectum. Too, this helps explain why AIDS is spread so easily in the homosexual community. However, even when there are not any tears in the anal lining, there is still a high risk for HIV infection because certain cells in its mucous lining [M-cells and Langerhans cells] can be infected and will then carry HIV deeper into one's body.)

Spoony wrote on Sat, 12 June 2010 11:57Quote:I don't know what you mean by a comparison to their love life - it's just another debate over a different topic, that one being homosexuality. Challenging their ideas on it and calling that "interfering with their love life" is the same as challenging a religious person's ideas and calling that "interfering with their religious life". if only religious people were content JUST to verbally challenge homosexuality. what a better world that would be. well, i'm all for free speech.

The only two acts I support are verbal challenge and voting on the issue politically.

CarrierII wrote on Sun, 13 June 2010 16:171) To be honest, so long as the parents have good qualites to impart, does it matter which qualities?

It might if there really are certain qualities that only one gender can impart. Determining whether or not there are such qualities is a whole different problem, though.

CarrierII wrote on Sun, 13 June 2010 16:172) A person's personality is not dictated by the gender of their parents, and nothing else. A lot of my personality comes from school, for example.

True.

CarrierII wrote on Sun, 13 June 2010 16:173) I also fail to see why the opinions of one faith should dictate the law, fortunately in the UK, it doesn't.

Opinions of one faith shouldn't dictate the law.
