
Subject: Re: Why did you vote for Obama?

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 08 Dec 2008 10:48:46 GMT

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

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 If we don't change, we are called bigots, fools, and homophobes. Christian marriage commissioners, police officers have lost their jobs for their religious views because obviously they are "discriminating." That's the new excuse to throw dirt at us.

We are forced to change our value system if we don't adapt. The progressives love to pout off like as we we are the ones being oppressive but they don't realise their own oppressive ways towards Christians.

You are being oppressive. Until the day equal rights are granted on grounds of sexuality, you are oppressive to oppose them. As for being "called" a bigot, a fool or a homophobe, you think that's oppression? Hmmm ok, one side gets a word thrown at them, the other side doesn't have equal rights under the law.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 You probably heard of eharmony.com (a dating service for men and women).

No, but go on.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 Well, a homosexual man filed a lawsuit against them accusing them of discriminating because they rejected his homosexaul application. Guess what? The guy took them to court and eharmony settled the case paying for expensive changes to their service to include dating service for gays! Way to shove it down our throats. Still think we don't have to change?

This isn't an excuse to deny equal rights, it's just an example of legal bullying.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 eharmony is a business run by a Christian...not a public service. And if he chose not to settle the case and open up a newer site, he would have faced other lawsuits as well (that's how liberals operate; using the court system to shut down any opposing school of thought)...but I think he was a wimp for giving in.

Still think we don't have to change? They will file suits and sue us heavily for discriminating. And they have the huge monetary support to drag us to the courts.

I don't think you SHOULD have to change. Like I keep saying, I have made a suggestion which suits everybody, namely: If your religion doesn't want homosexuals marrying, then you shouldn't have to officiate at weddings within that religion. Gays can therefore find a more progressive religion, or go one step further and become an atheist. This would not require you to "change", you can think whatever you like about gay marriage; you just wouldn't be able to interfere in other peoples' lives anymore.

I don't want legal bullying by a minority of homosexuals either. But read this until you understand it: IT DOES NOT JUSTIFY HOMOSEXUALS BEING UNEQUAL UNDER THE LAW!

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 This applies to each individual Christian. We are forced to hold our mouth while it is forcefully opened to stuff worldly views down our throat. And if we so much as raise our voice, we are instantly called "insert-next-popular-word-here."

But the moment we agree with them (in essence abandoning our faith), we have nothing to worry! So I would think my initial statement is correct; we are forced to change our values or face the consequences; the latter of which many have chosen to do.

All of this is insignificant compared to the fact that a minority of the human species does not have equal rights under the law. Here you are crying about being called a homophobe; grow the fuck up.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 Makes the Bible look lightyears more tolerant regarding slaves compared to the ravings of a disillusioned freakster whose word most people believe to be true.

Believing Darwin's word? Uh no, people believe evidence. As a scientist, nobody is claiming Darwin was more than human, nobody is claiming he is infallible, nobody is claiming he could not make mistakes or be downright wrong from time to time. If anybody ever received a death threat for criticising Darwin, I have not heard of it. And as for the quote, things were very different then; specifically education and the social order. Mostly thanks to religion, this is basically what the common view was. I could show you quotes from Lincoln or Thomas Huxley which seem ruthlessly bigoted, and yet they were progressive men. If they lived today and someone said these quotes, they'd have been the first to cringe.

This is my earlier point; the progress of civilisation, in terms of human rights and scientific research, is a slow one. It's gradual. It would be REALLY NICE if the religious would stop getting in the way, and it would be even nicer if we weren't told that everything we need to know is in a book written over a thousand years ago.

What's more, even if Darwin was a bigoted racist, it doesn't mean that his scientific research was wrong!

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 You can refer to the first part of this post to see why I am not crazy when I mentioned the threat of eventual subjugation by homosexuals...my fault I did not mention the gleeful progressives who stand behind homosexuals ready to jump on Christians at a moment's notice. See my reply above.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 Funniest part about homosexuality is that how unnatural it is.

A man and a woman are naturally capable of making love and have the external sexual organs to do so...homosexuals do not; they will end up with a swollen anus/rectum. If homosexuality was intended by "nature" I would think there would be a provision for homosexuals to show love on a physical level as a male and female are capable of.

It's still less unnatural than Christianity. As for the "it's not natural" argument, it fails utterly.

Given that homosexuality is not a choice (because it isn't), we have to conclude that either nature or God created homosexuals. If it was God, then who are you to argue with him? If it was nature, then presumably I should be disallowed from marriage too. After all, I don't want kids. Don't ask me why; I just don't. Perhaps this goes against nature in the sense that I will not be propagating my DNA, but that is not a justification to deny me equal rights under the law.

Oh, and by the way, there's also fellatio and handjobs.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 But we don't see it...other than falling into a close friendship and forcing everyone around them (with money/bashing expertise/court costs help from 21st century progressives) to acknowledge their love as natural, homosexuals have nothing else naturally going for them that even comes close to convincing.
So let me get this straight.

After being a persecuted minority throughout all of history, a handful of them fighting back means the rest of them still don't deserve equal rights.

Your arrogance and stupidity is absolutely staggering.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 Not to mention that if every child being born on this planet from this minute onwards is naturally homosexual, we will be looking at the end of the human race due to inability to reproduce. Quite unnatural isn't it?
The exact same thing would happen if every child was born male, or female, and yet I would not argue that this proves anything or is a justification for oppressive laws. Still, that's a little less statistically improbable, given that the odds of being homosexual are, I dunno, 1 in 30 or something (I don't have the figures, but that'll do) compared to the odds of being male are about as good as a flip of a coin.

Furthermore, unless you have some kind of eugenics program in mind (which would rather seem to be quarrelling with God's design, wouldn't it...?) then no law is going to make fewer people be homosexual.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 Of course, they are free to do what they please (I can't stop it and don't want to) but I won't acknowledge/approve their act. Homosexuals want a kind of approval Christians cannot give...hence the increased attacks/nitpicking on our Scripture in attempts to undermine it.
I don't care if they get Christian approval; they need society's approval, which they currently do not have under the law. Like I said, you carry on disallowing gay marriage in your own church for all I care.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 A celestial superbeing making everything is far less embarrassing than saying we are products of a mighty big bangin' celestial fart...a theory that still has to come out with it's golden gun. Trust me, my kids won't lose face.
Oh, you criticise lack of a "golden gun" when there has never, EVER, EVER been the slightest evidence for creationism. Once again the religious seem to think the rules of evidence only apply to the other side. It's like a chess game where you tell me I can't take any of your pieces or move on your half of the board, it really is.

It also seems you are mistaking truth for comfort. You may find it comforting to believe that the world and the human race were designed by a God. That does not make it true.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27 Plus it explains ghostly phenomenon, NDE's, and OBE's and our advanced design of our bodies which are valid credible arguments to the existence

of a supernatural being and the afterlife and which Science carefully avoids since they are not observable and so they can't be possibly true.

What the fuck? No, it doesn't explain them, it's the absence of an explanation. Don't understand something? Say God did it! This isn't science, this isn't knowledge, it's a get-out-of-having-to-say-you-don't-know card. It also demonstrates my earlier point that the religious only apply the laws of evidence to the opposition, i.e. scientists who say things the religious don't like to hear.

Like I said, science (like the advance of human rights) is gradually progressive. When the Bible was written, we didn't know much about the world at all. For example, we now know that the earth is spherical, still cooling, has a molten core and fissures in its crust, and a turbulent weather system. We also know about bacteria and whatnot. These things explain stuff like hurricanes, earthquakes, diseases. When the Bible was written, we didn't know any of that, so it was pardonable (in my view) to come up with an explanation like "it was the wrath of a celestial super-bully". There probably wasn't a better explanation knocking about at the time. Still, it was never anything more than guesswork, and now we have far better explanations with evidence to back them up.

You see miracles; I see things we don't understand yet. Science hasn't finished, we haven't finished understanding the world, but religion has never made any decent contribution to the cause, and more often than not has actively stood in the way, as it still does.

Let me illustrate my point with a simple example. Someone asks: why are plants green? You make some case about photosynthesis and chlorophyll etc. I say it was all farted out by an invisible lobster who created the world, who declared that plants must be green.

Let's say someone examines your claim and finds that it's pretty good, near the mark, but with a few missing pieces. I would then say "Hah! Your theory fails, THEREFORE MINE IS CORRECT! Not only that, but EVERYTHING ELSE I'VE EVER SAID ABOUT THE LOBSTER IS CORRECT TOO!"

You see, even if some evidence for a celestial superbeing creating the world did crop up, what makes you assume it was Yahweh? Why not the flying spaghetti monster or the pink unicorn? That would be more comforting to me, considering the staggeringly evil nature of Yahweh as he is depicted in the Bible, and yet I would not argue that this said anything about how much truth there is to it.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27My above explanation covers this.
No, it doesn't.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27And just to repeat myself, if we don't accept, we are put into a corner and are tightly crushed to pulp and if we do accept, we are left alone. Yeah, that's right, you pass yourself off as a cringing oppressed minority. Homosexuals, they're the oppressed minority, and I'll say it again; THEY DO NOT HAVE EQUAL RIGHTS UNDER THE LAW. Whereas someone on the internet called you homophobic and you have the staggering bollock-brained stupidity to think YOU ARE THE VICTIM HERE.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27We Christians follow the teachings of Christ Who created a new covenant...it does not render the old completely useless though.

Yes, it does. It means the previous specific instructions from God are WRONG. Get that word, WRONG. Either you are allowed to work on the Sabbath or you are not. God was wrong or Jesus is wrong, pick one. But then, they're supposed to be the same guy anyway aren't they, for all the "sense" that makes.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27The 10 Commandments are not the only commandments...every other commandment is as important as the ones in the 10 Commandments.

So why are they called the "ten commandments"? Why are these the only ones religious fanatics want prominently displayed in courts and classrooms?

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27But abusing desire and feeling jealous and trying to get other's people's belongings (like how King Ahab took Naboth's vineyard) is what the 10th Commandment addresses against.

No, it doesn't. The 10th commandment does not prohibit theft, actively taking someone else's property. It prohibits WANTING someone else's property. Pure thoughtcrime.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 12 November 2008 06:22You think someone can be punished for a crime committed by someone else?

You haven't answered this part, by the way; the point is made again and again and again and again in the Bible.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27Quote:You think the path to forgiveness is the torture and execution of someone else?

Not just someone, Spoony...Jesus Christ the Son of God and that's was a one-time only deal. It's also an absolutely disgusting moral concept. Whether he was a man or a God or the son of God makes no difference. The idea that I can be forgiven thanks to the torture and execution of someone else is DESPICABLE. Get that word, DESPICABLE. Assuming the whole crucifixion business happened at all (a generous assumption), I would rather be unforgiven than gain redemption through the punishment of somebody else.

See, I believe sins or crimes or whatever you want to call them can be forgiven, but only if you freely accept your error and you, you yourself, are willing to make amends. I can barely express my revulsion at the doctrine of Christ dying for our sins; there simply aren't words in the English language capable of expressing it.

Not only that, but if I reject this barbaric drivel on moral grounds (which I do), I'm told that I have an eternity of torture in store for me after I die. And you want to teach this to children and call it morality. I'll take my chances, though... like I said, if the price of my redemption is the torture and execution of somebody else, I'd rather be unforgiven. So who's the better man, you or I?

Actually, maybe the fact he was God (whatever sense that makes) does make a difference. A quick read of the Old Testament (again, assuming it's true) shows God to be the most evil entity that ever existed. Maybe the crucifixion was punishment for everything God did, albeit a relatively lenient one.

pawky wrote on Mon, 08 December 2008 00:27So Spoony, why does it bother you that we

practice our Christian faith and bring up our children the same way? And what we believe? Aren't you against thoughtcrime? Why then try to endlessly counter us in these forums? Have you read a single damn word I've said?

I don't care what you believe, no matter how ridiculous (or barbaric) it seems to me, as long as you leave other people alone. As long as you don't use those "beliefs" to oppress others, or claim undeserved privileges. There's a line in the sand. Believing whatever the hell you like doesn't cross the line; interfering in other peoples' lives does.

You go ahead and dislike homosexuals for all I care. When you support oppressive laws condemning them as inferior citizens, you've crossed the line. You go ahead and believe the world was created 6000 years ago by a celestial superbeing, despite the absolute lack of evidence for it, for all I care. When you teach this to an impressionable child as though it were a fact, you've crossed the line. My secondary school wasn't religious, it was supposedly secular, and yet the laughable fiction that was "taught" us in religious education classes was taught with the absolute same certainty as what was taught in physics and biology and chemistry. If the teacher ever said "by the way class, there's no proof any of this ever happened, a great deal of proof that it didn't, and a lot of it contradicts the other bits, and a staggering amount of blood has been shed over it all" then I must have been off sick that day.

But you've never actually thought about the rights of your future children, have you? How about the right not to have your intellectual growth stunted?
