Reply ID jj2w

Buhogrunon: You had alot to say, and I don't know where I should begin. I guess the first part about logical fallacies. What I say makes perfect logical sense, but it's a point where we will always disagree on. I don't know if you know it, and you wouldn't unless you really started studying it, but Catholicism is built on Aristotelian Logic. It's how and where all the Dogmas and Creeds come from. How our understanding of the Faith keeps developing and unfolding...but never contradicting.

Like Syllogisms. Major Premise plus Minor Premise equals Logical conclusion. if the two statements: 'All Texabs are Americans" and " Bob is a Texan are true, then even though not explicitly stated, it logically follows that Bob must also be an American.

There's where Philosophy and theology depart. Philosophy takes nothing on Faith. Its starts with provable, proven truths as its premises and builds its conclusions from there. Like Aristotle did. And alot can be known about God in that manner.

But we'll take a basic premise on faith. Like "Jesus Christ is God" From that we'll beleive his words when He says he is the Truth. That His words come from the Father...etc, etc..so when a part where He says "...this sin wil not be forgiven, in this age or the next..." and when His disciple says to pray for our brothers sins that are not mortal..." and when Judas Macabeus ordered his men to offer sacrifices to atone for the sisn of the soldiers that fell in battle" Well, if this is true then a place of purification or purgatory after death must also be true. Thats Logic.

I could go on and on through the dogmas but the point of departure is that if you reject the basic Premise that 'Jesus Christ is God', then all the reason built on that alos falls. But this is exactly what Christ said when He said "The stone which the builders rejected (Him) has become the cheif cornerstone" and it has. Reject Christ and all that we know of God becomes logical foolishness. Accept that one Truth and it all makes perfect sens ethough.

Ok so you question where I get that'God gives people there gifts'. and from there I could offer all tghe logic and syllogisms in the world, but why go through the motions if you reject the beggining? Does this make sese?

But as for proof. There has been proof. Tons of it. Thats why He sends us signs at times that just shatter our paradigms of a strictly materialistic creation. Tghere have been so mnay unexplainable things that cant be reconciled with a creation without a spiritual aspect, or with an impersonal unconcerned god.

Events like Fatima in Portugal in 1917. Reported by major newspapers the world over, witnessed by atheists, agnostics, heretics alike. Things

witnessed and reported by over 70,000 people! The predictions about Russia falling to communism before it did...the prediction about another war coming in the reign of a specifically named Pope...this at a time when all the world was believing in 'peace in our time'. The prophecies of Russia spreading its errors throughout the world...

But there are so mnay other events that prove there is something out there that cant quite be explained by science and human reason. The existence of ghosats and apparitions that have appeared to every culture and age the world over. surely every single person is not crazy? Or the unexplainable cures...or evnts like when a son or husband dies 50 miles away, the wife or mother had an intuition and knew it before any info could ever have reached her. Things like this have been documented and remarked on over and over, I dont think I need to list specific example after specific example.

The point is, God does let us know, in so many ways that we should be looking, and if we do start looking, He'll let Himself be found. It's only if we dont want to believe that we wont believe. and alot of people would rather there not be a God than admit that their ways are less than perfect or that they should strive gaianst their desores.

As far as the two standards of morality existing in one community. The problem with that is that alot of people will believe what they want to believe. and something that may in fact, be very harmful to me, they will claim is harmless an dghat they have a 'right' to their belief. But after all then good arguments fail in the world, people over and over have to resort to force to ammend a situation that reason can't or won't. Either cause people wont take the time to consider the sonsequencews of their actions or dont want to, just cause I have a belief and think I am not harming anyone doesnt mean this is necessarily so.

For example, Lobbyists may think their actions are harmless, even say they have a right to influence political decisions for money. Maybe a prison lobbyist group life GEO or CCA needs a higher incarceratio rate to fill there prisons that they have governmnet contarcts to fill...so they fund campaigns for 'hang 'em high' judges across the land. Harmless people say? they surely would.

But a real conequence is that judges competing for thes efunds for there campaign will have to increase their conviction rates. A judge with a low conviction rate may become a traget for replacement by GEO. So what haoppens? The need to please the interest group subverts justice. Instead of decisoons based soley on the law, the Truth, or Justice, now the decision of the judge is biased oh so much in favor of the prosecution. Overlooked

planted evidence, overlooked perjury by police, overlooked constitutional

violations and safeguards until before you know it, you have destroyed several peoples lives because your harmless belief is harmfully affecting people in ways you cant possibly have imagined. Your sin of covetness and greed has spawned off consequences you may never have imagined,

The same with cops who plant evidence. This is more common than the public is aware of, if you ever spend time in a law library you will discover this to be the case...and unless the crimes committed by law enforcement officers receive a significant amount of public media attention, which they never do, they largely go unprosecuted. No doubt, the cops think they are committing 'harmless' crimes. to protect the people, of course, from a guilty man walking free...but time a nd again this practice results in the condemnation of the innocent.

But we could follow Gods law out in a logical manner all day. I see the communists are rallying recently holding up banners saying "Pornography Fuels Rape". Look at www.Rev.com. Now look, I'm not saying that every person that looks at porn commits rape. at all. But they have a point. When you uneccesarily and artifially increase consumption you create an appetite and demmand for more...and i can see how again, not in all cases, and I'm certainly guilty of looking at alot of porn in my day, but I can see how this increased desire and focus on sex and violence would increase rapes ans sex crimes.

Again, I have never had a sex crime, so this is not a personal problem, but do that make thesin harmless? Is God wrong...or am Iwrong? I know the arrogance of man, "we will lock up everyone who falls susceptible to these temptations" OK But porn is but one exapmle...add the gun violence, the glorification of gang/outlaw lifestyles...how many people can we lock away? 1 million? 2 million? 2.4 million? when we run out of space and the arrogance is stripped of force, then what? will we have to live with teh consequencs of our sins?

Sins is not harmless. It has consequences. You can have a thousand standards of morality and you know, at some point they will always conflict. I hear people over and over say drug sells are a victimless crime...and even some places pass laws to reflct thatmorality. Free choice. Lets say we have a 16 year old daughter. and some pimp gets her all strung out on dope. she makes a dumb decison, doesnt think she'll get addicted but does...and one thing leads to another and shes out there being forced to sell herself...which some people also believe should be legal, free choice, ect, another standard of morality.

Well, obviously, I dont care what you believe or what the law says, your gonna get it. Our beliefs will collide. whats hamless to you is causing

real harm.

These are extreme examples, but the same holds true for less extreme examples. where is the line drawn? Who decides the standard? We all cant peacefully coexist forever when you refuse to admit that you are harming me simply becuase you cant see immediate effects. Some people look deeper.

America may Nuke afganistan...the fallout may spill over into Russia, can we say Oh we nuked Afghanistan, not you, you have no pretext for war?

Whatever; Russia will want action back. Call it negligence or what you will, but differing standatrdsof morality alos have spillover effects.

Some systems like Islam and Chritianity are going to be incompatible without greatly altering one or the other, and in effect, destroying it.

Capitalism/Communism there is no middle ground sometimes.

And I cmpletely agree with you about the destructiveness of Constantly changing Christianity. Thats why I think the Protestant Reformation was a disaster. private interpretation shatters into a thousand different conflicting and contradictory doctrines...until eventually people just believe whatver they want to believe. I'm certanly not a fundamntalist, I know alot of the Bible is allegory. I can see how life forms evolve and change over time...maybe not from apes to man but certainly evolving. Its the basic principle behind breeding animals...controlled evolution. But even Darwin...I mean, the Origin of the Species never touched human evolution, he specifically sidestepped it to avoid confrontation with ecclesiastical authorities. There was nothing to dispute...it was all about plants and animals.

You want to read a controversial book, read his decent of man, he gets into all the racial evolutinary differences. and not to be racial but quoting him, he even admitted a fallacy in his 'survival of the fittest' theory. When he visited Africa and seen all the wildlife and animals thriving then seen the squalid conditions of the humans starving and barely getting by...what did he say? He said if evolution only goes up from less efficient to more efficient, he doesnt seee how these people would have come into being...as anything less efficient than them surely would not have survived long enough to evolve upwards...

Even he maks great arguments for Christianity though, especially in his Voyage of the Beagle. I know he later apostasized, but his points still hold true.

Well, I'm in this Gang renunciation class right now, so I gotta go sit through this mindless BS...but they're calling rec before that, so I better go hit this yard for an hour...I'll holla back at you later though buhogrunon...and as always, thanks for writing and breaking up my thoughts for awhile...take it easy out there.....Chris