
Subject: Re: question to christians about jesus
Posted by [IronWarrior](#) on Wed, 13 Feb 2008 20:07:34 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warranto wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 13:48IronWarrior wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 09:04warranto wrote on Wed, 13 February 2008 09:27Once again, inaction is not the same as action.

Not preventing something is not the same as taking action to ensure an event. Despite what the president of the US said, the only two options are not being either for something, or if not for something automatically against something.

Allowing an event to take place (whatever the circumstances) is not the same thing as doing the event yourself.

Since you keep relaying this back to Jesus, he was the same thing as the death row prisoner and Socrates. Both simply sat around waiting for the state to kill them. You, yourself said that isn't suicide. That's all that happened with Jesus. He was captured, put on a "trial" and sentenced to death.

Actually, like your prisoner analogy, his death was intentionally prolonged by the state, and only hastened when those guarding him took pity and stabbed him.

An inaction is the same as a action, don't see how you can't see that, if you ask any military tactician, he would explain that an inaction is a action in itself.

Jesus and Socrates are different, as one know he was gonna die and one didn't, though the later might had known, but Jesus know he had to die for "our" sins, so know 100% without douth.

Socrates committted a pure act of suicide as he drank the poison to kill himself.

Jesus didn't, Jesus own actions in letting himself get caught when he could had got away, was suicide in nature and infact, it was a early act of the modern problem known as suicide by cop, explained eailer.

Jesus know that the Romans was coming for him in the morning, he know what was they would do to him, he know he was gonna die, he let it all happen, he died for our sins, but he committed a sin himself, I can even dare say that Jesus is on the same terms as a modern day islamic suicide bomber, both know they are gonna die, both died for a "greater good" and both took no action to stop it.

You can't not defeat my pure hard cold logic with anything you say.

Resistance is futile. You will be assimilated, we are the Borg.

When you start demonstrating that cold hard logic, perhaps you will be right.

An inaction is NOT an action, I don't see how you can't see that. They may both result in an act, but they are not the same thing. Its not really that hard to grasp.

The act of drinking the poison was suicide, perhaps - a state enforced action, but an ACTION nonetheless. The idea of him waiting around for it to happen, and not take the means of escape available to him are not an act of suicide, regardless of the knowledge of the outcome or not.

As for the comparision to the "modern-day suicide bomber", I have to outright laugh at you.

Quote:both know they are gonna die

right

Quote:both died for a "greater good"

right

Quote:both took no action to stop it.

Wrong. And this is where that "cold hard logic" of yours is perhaps flawed the most. the suicide bombers TAKES ACTION to ensure his death. He travels to the destination and detonates the bomb. He does not simply sit around waiting for the destination to come to him, and the explosion to happen on its own.

If that is what you qualify as "cold hard logic", then no wonder you have no grasp of what is being said here.

An inaction is a action, as you took no other action then do nothing.