

---

Subject: Re: Church of FSM

Posted by [NeoSaber](#) on Wed, 02 Nov 2005 23:20:32 GMT

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

---

Crimson wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 02:31 Yeah, and of course I see right through his manipulations. In fact I would have written this information quite differently because of what I saw as blatant word twisting and assumptions. I guess I thought everyone else would see through that and still think about the content. The passages from the Bible aren't faked. You could look them up yourself and read the surrounding context.

I did look them up myself (in a beat up old bible I have on a bookshelf). My point was you said you never read the bible right after you said it condones slavery. If you had proclaimed the bible says Jesus was God and then said you never read the bible, I'd still question it.

When it comes to what he presents, if someone resorts to attempted manipulation like that guy does, then he isn't worth listening to. If his evidence is credible, then it can stand on its own, without his insults and piss poor attempts at mind control. He discredits his own arguments by acting like that.

Crimson wrote on Wed, 02 November 2005 02:31 I'm not sure what context surrounding this passage would make it any better though:

"Exodus Chapter 21, verse 20" If a man beats his male or female slave with a rod and the slave dies as a direct result, he must be punished, but he is not to be punished if the slave gets up after a day or two, since the slave is his property.

"actual text" 21:20 And if a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand; he shall be surely punished.

21:21 Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for he is his money.

Reference: <http://www.cforc.com/kjv/Exodus/21.html>

If the bible is in fact the word of your God then is this not him directly condoning beating your servant/maid?

And what about this blatant sexism? What other interpretation?

"Timothy chapter 2"

2:11 Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection.

2:12 But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.

2:13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

It took centuries of change to allow women an equal voice. Now we have woman CEOs, and we've have female teachers for quite a while. Aren't we all disobeying God then?

As already stated by others, the first quote comes out of the old testament, and is really irrelevant as it describes a code of conduct and law that was replaced by the new testament. It's more there as a statement of 'this happened', than it is a 'this is true'. Apparently the people who compiled the bible didn't want to hide things that looked bad on the surface. I applaud their honesty.

As to the second quote though, back up a moment to the previous few verses:

1 Timothy 2:8-10 It is my wish, then, that in every place the men should pray, lifting up holy hands, without anger or argument. Similarly, women should adorn themselves with proper conduct, with modesty and self-control, not with braided hairstyles, and gold ornaments, or pearls or expensive clothes, but rather, as befits women who profess reverence for God, with good deeds. (source: the beat up New American Bible I'm looking this up in.)

Then the verses go into your quote, continuing from 'Similarly, women should'. Note how he starts by telling men to stop bitching in church, and then tells women to do the same. I admit he adds in that women shouldn't dress like whores, and it isn't clear in this part he expects the same from men (although I think we can infer he does expect the same). This is all a clarification to his point that men and women have to behave respectfully in church. He doesn't want people thinking these rules only apply to men, they applied to all.

Jumping ahead a little into chapter 3 we get this:

1 Timothy 3:8-11 Similarly, deacons must be dignified, not deceitful, not addicted to drink, not greedy for sordid gain, holding fast to the mystery of the faith with a clear conscience. Moreover, they should be tested first; then, if there is nothing against them, let them serve as deacons. Women, similarly, should be dignified, not slanderers, but temperate and faithful in everything.

Again, we see people being told about proper conduct in church and life, and then he adds "Yes, I mean this applies to women too! Don't be a dumb-ass, Timothy!"

It should be noted that when I refer to the writer of this letter (that's what this particular book in the bible is, a letter) I'm not saying 'He', I'm saying 'he'. No where in the bible does it say God wrote this letter and sent it to Timothy, it's the 1st letter of Paul to Timothy. It's what Paul, a follower of Christ, had to say on the subject. I don't understand why you, or that Michael Moore wannabe, insist on saying that all this is the direct word of God when the bible itself says Paul is the author of this particular book. Yes Paul may have been inspired by God, or used the teachings of Christ in the writing of this letter, but still, it is filtered through a man and not the direct statements of God. Anyone who read this part of the Bible, and not just looked up quotes off a website, should be able to see that.

The bible was written by many people over a long period of time. By looking at the underlying philosophy they all shared, instead of getting "stuck on stupid" with the interpretations of those time periods, you can see the real message plain as day. It's the main reason there are 4 gospels instead of one. The teachings of Jesus were a little too important to rely on one person's account of them. Just as in a courtroom, witnesses state how they saw things, the bible is filled with people telling it 'like they saw it'. Declaring every last word to be God's direct statement is ridiculous. All it proves is a person doesn't understand the bible.

---