

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sat, 20 Mar 2010 06:39:40 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 firstly, the old testament is no longer in effect, is it? well, jesus said that every jot and tittle of the old laws must be carried out.

No. Otherwise we'd still be doing sacrifices and basically operating under Moses' statutes. Not every single law in the OT is supposed to be disregarded, but certainly not all of it is still applicable.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46- two thousand years of horrific anti-semitism and anti-gay people

well, the worst anti-semitism throughout history has always come directly from christianity. in modern times, islam is catching up fast, but christianity still takes the gold. christianity's sole basis for anti-semitism is one line in one of the gospels which says that, at the trial, the jewish religious authorities actually called for the blood of christ to be on their heads and on the heads of all successive generations.

any atheist will regard this as immoral bullshit. even if the whole story is true, it's a stupid thing to say. i could claim responsibility for a crime, whether i was guilty of it or not. what i can't do is say "and my children, who haven't been born yet, are guilty of it too, as will be their children, and their children..."

and yet this one line is the root cause of unbelievable anti-semitism throughout the ages in every society where christianity has ever had power. killing jesus seems like quite a big crime for a christian, and according to the bible, all jews have that guilt, not just the ones who were involved in the trial and crucifixion.

They called for it to be on their heads, huh? So why does that make it the Bible's fault for relaying that information? I don't recall any passage demanding anti-semitism to be carried out - sounds more like man's stupid actions.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46- violently standing in the way of scientific progress well, if you take the christian view that you must believe the right things about god and jesus otherwise you'll go to hell, and if you really, really believe in hell, you'll do a great deal to stamp out anything that might make people question the religion.

imagine it. imagine you have a child. someone like me who speaks critically of religion, or someone involved in scientific research on the origins of the earth and of the human species... what they say could make your child turn away from christianity. they can make your child liable to suffer the most horrific punishment ever imagined! would this not make us the very worst of criminals, even worse than someone who tried to murder the child, or tried to rape them? would you not do anything to stamp this out? if not, then you probably don't really believe in hell.

I'm not against legit scientific progress, myself.

So far, all the scientific theories that contradict the Bible have no more evidence than it does.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46- the crusades

see the particular old testament law i cited earlier, about if a city contains people who worship a

different god, you must put the entire city and everyone in it to slaughter.

As soon as you quote it. All you've said so far is that God destroyed SOME cities... not every single one they came across.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 if believing the wrong thing sends you to hell, then a little torture to set people straight is basically doing them a favour. if you really, really buy the concept of hell, this is the sort of thing you'll do to protect people from it. blasphemy laws are only the beginning.

No... I wouldn't be doing them a favor at all. As I said before, If you don't want to believe after I've given my case, I won't persist.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46- willing tool of imperialism and of a huge list of dictators throughout the ages  
whenever you read about the great historical european empires, you'll find them to be christian monarchies, or successors to them, in every single case. again, if you really believe in heaven and hell, then taking over some foreign country and converting them to christianity, by force if necessary, would be the kindest thing you could do to them.

See above.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46- enthusiastic ally of fascism in europe  
in every single fascist country in europe leading up to the second world war, and there were a hell of a lot more than just germany and italy, in every single case the fascist powers were either set up directly in collusion with the vatican or the vatican became enthusiastic collaborators with them after they'd taken power. fascism was essentially an exact synonym for "catholic right wing". the very first major treaty hitler signed upon taking power was with the vatican, giving the catholic church all sorts of powers in germany, and that was one of the few treaties hitler didn't break. mussolini did the same in italy, croatia was a catholic puppet state of hitler, salazar was in holy orders, etc etc etc. the last time the catholic church supported a "just war" was when hitler and mussolini helped franco overthrow the spanish republic. the catholic church's relationship with every single fascist country was far stronger than its ties with any non-fascist country. the church even ordered hitler's birthday to be celebrated in churches all over, right up until the very end of nazi germany. even after germany was defeated, the vatican helped numerous nazi war criminals escape to south america.

what about hitler himself? well, when he was rising to power, he said over and over and over again that the reason he hated jews so much was because he was a christian. the bible readily accommodates this, as i've outlined above. he said he was doing god's work in combating the jew, and that resonated with a huge number of christians in germany. hitler didn't just flick a switch and made everyone in germany suddenly hate jews... anti-semitism had been bubbling away under the surface for two thousand years, thanks to europe's christian history.

Thank God I don't belong to that Vatican/Catholic splinter-group.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46- the enormous death toll it's helped to rack up by assisting the spread of AIDS by absurd rules on condoms, especially in africa

well, i'd really love to know the christian justification for spreading lies about the effectiveness of condoms, when millions of africans die of aids every year. in other words, you tell me. i can't figure it out, it doesn't make sense to an atheist, especially since christians generally call themselves pro-life.

I can't tell you - I don't know either, myself. Were they saying condoms were bad and shouldn't be used?

...

Most of your above quotes signify events caused by - as you label them - Christianity in general or specific denominations. My denomination doesn't believe in this stuff:

Anti-semitism - I see no reason to persecute a race for one historical act.

Forced acceptance of religion - No. I DO NOT support that at all.

Fascism - Nope, don't care for that either.

I'm not defending every denomination, just my own and that which is common to all of them. I'm not trying to disregard these events you describe - I'm trying to say that we're just as against their happening as you are.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 So it's not faith at all, then, is it? It's just you're considering things to be evidence when they're either dubious or outright untrue.

How'd you come to that conclusion?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 For starters, the bible you have today was by no means finalised shortly after Jesus' death.

Okay.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 the gospels themselves were written decades after the crucifixion is supposed to have happened, and i'd like you to tell me exactly who by, please, and how they knew what to write, and why they contradict each other so often.

1. Each book in the Bible states who wrote it near the beginning or end.
2. God inspired them to write what they did. They didn't write it by their own intuition alone.
3. Why the gospels contradict? Why four seperate people's own written logs of 30 years do not perfectly match up?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 and they aren't even all the gospels. quite a lot more than just the new testament four existed... it was a council of men, politicians, who decided which bits went into the bible, and this was centuries after the time jesus was supposed to have lived.

Where'd you learn that from?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 Firstly how do you know? All you have is an account supposedly written by their slaughterers.

The same account that says there were slaughters in the first place?  
If you can say "God did this" and point to a Bible scripture, I can do the same.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 Secondly, do you quarrel with the idea of sacrificing a child to your god? The bible appears to be in favour of that. Or is it only if it's the right god?

Since when is the Bible in favor of it? Only mention I know of is the test that was given to Abram.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 Firstly, we're still talking about the old testament here, and there is no mention of hell in the old testament. Either god hadn't made it yet, or he hadn't thought it worth telling anybody about it - which seems implausible, given his general enthusiasm for extravagant punishments in the old testament, and his quickness in threatening them.

Hell existed regardless. There's no separate place for OT-based people to go. They also had a different set of laws to live under.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 There's no small print about human sacrifice in the instructions for genocide on religious grounds. So that just leaves: "the only other option is to let all the people live and continue their false worship, and we can't have that". Oh dear. Bit of a departure from your position on the previous page.

My position? I thought we were discussing what God did and why.  
Also, what are you trying to say here - that they didn't do sacrifices?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 I'm saying that there should not be a punishment at all. Disagreeing with him or his rules, or having doubts in his existence, or having doubts that the books which claim to reflect his mind or that the people who claim to speak for him actually do so, is not a crime at all by any sane definition.

I have yet to see parents raise a child, be subject to all of his/her complaints/disobedience/rudeness/etc, and not punish the child in any way.  
Man was given a paradise with only one rule to obey... one rule. And he broke it. It's all gone downhill from there, what with those taken under God's care constantly complaining and demanding more.  
Or would you rather God not make any rules at all and let humans do as we please, and abolish Heaven and Hell?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46 For starters, it took place in bronze-age Palestine. Not in China, where people could read and write. That was by far the greatest civilisation in the world at the time, and yet it took hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of years for the message of Christianity to reach China, at which point the Chinese asked the pretty good question of what took you so long.

To continue, the fact it's so garbled and inconsistent, and to cut a long story short, ridiculous. A huge number of people are not trying not to believe it, as you've put it, but simply find it too stupid to believe. Furthermore, many people think it would be quite horrible if it was true... the greatest dictatorship ever imagined.

Or the greatest paradise. It all depends on how you look at it, and what facts you bring forth and what facts you bury.

I also see the implication that the possibility of any being having greater stature than man is horrible to consider.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46ah, yes. faith based on evidence. well, any time the evidence wants to present itself, there's no rush. it's only been two thousand years.

but the important part of that statement was the second half.

"Here's an extraordinary claim, we aren't going to show you any evidence, you've got to decide it's true and you'll be horribly punished if you've got your doubts"

There are Bible statements that consist with Astronomy, Paleontology, Meteorology, Biology, Anthropology, Hydrology, Geology, and Physics. Also with Prophecy, Textual Evidence, and Historians.

So yeah, there's evidence.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46we were talking about whether christians should impose their rules on non-believers. you said that many christians don't. well, can you find any fault with the christians that do?

Yes, because they shouldn't impose their rules on non-believers. Standing up for what you think is right is one thing, but trying to force someone else to think your way is another.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46Quote:This is so because you cannot explain rationality itself. Why do the laws of logic seem to work? Who says so?

We're doing our best to understand them. It doesn't help that faith gets in the way.

"Get the answer book out of my face and let me solve it myself."

Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46Quote:Why do we all have moral ideas about right and wrong and the desire to impose them?

Because most of us care about ourselves, our families, and humanity in general.

Why are we born with that caring attitude? Or are you still trying to figure that out as well?

---