
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Mon, 22 Mar 2010 01:37:24 GMT

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

Altzan wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 15:00 There's also verses saying why the Old Testament was replaced by the New Testament. Several mention the "new covenant" God was planning on/did make with the people. Another mentioned something like, "If the old system was perfect, it wouldn't need to be replaced." It was an update, per se, since the way of life since then has changed.

pity not all of the barbarism of the old testament has been "replaced", then, eh? no condemnation of slavery, for example. another example: the story of let he without sin cast the first stone. jesus doesn't say that the old law has been removed, he just says that none of you guys here are capable of enforcing it since you're all sinful. well, that surely means that we can't enforce laws at all, doesn't it? we can't punish adultery?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22 if you're further told that all Jews are guilty of the murder of Jesus...Where is that said?

one of the gospels has the jews at the crucifixion calling for the responsibility of the murder of jesus to fall upon themselves and on all their descendants.

any atheist can see that this is ridiculous - it is immoral to hold one person responsible for a crime committed by another - but the bible is absolutely full of this moral bankruptcy. god does it all the time, in the story.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22 lol... where's the evidence supporting every assertion made by the bible, please?

You thus imply that every scientific theory has supporting evidence, which of course is not true. i said no such thing.

you said this:

"So far, all the scientific theories that contradict the Bible have no more evidence than it does." that's plainly nonsense. the age of the earth, for example... there's an extraordinary amount of evidence supporting the old-earth theory (about four and a half billion years). the bible would put it more like 6-10 thousand, for which there is no evidence at all.

another would be evolution. darwin didn't just make it up, he studied the evidence and created his theories accordingly. we're finding new fossils all the time. where's the evidence supporting the account given in genesis?

Quote:"The primary reason was punishment for wrongdoing. The populations of the destroyed cities had long histories of grievous sins (Gen 15:16, Dt 25:17-19), which often included sacrificing their children to false gods (Dt 12:29-31). Their consciences should have told these people they were doing wrong. Had they listened and changed their ways, they would not have been destroyed. God has said that if any nation is about to be destroyed as punishment but repents, he will forgive them and not destroy them (Jer 18:7-8). In fact, this occurred in the city of Ninevah (Jonah 3:4-10).

perhaps you didn't read my statement very carefully. i was not referring to a specific story of god

flattening a city; i was citing the instruction given by god to his followers of what to do if you encounter a city where they worship a different god. firstly it doesn't say that they have to be carrying out human sacrifices to qualify for the punishment, just says they need to be worshipping a different god. that's all it takes. secondly the punishment is the total extermination of the city, including children.

Quote:In the cities that were given to the Israelites as their inheritance, there was a secondary reason: totally depraved cultures were destroyed so that they would not corrupt the Israelites into committing the same evil acts (Dt 7:1-4, 20:16-18). This did in fact occur: when the Israelites didn't obey God and destroy cities, they too began practicing child sacrifice (Ps 106:34-40). according to the story, the israelities carried out quite a lot of evil acts, usually at the command of god or moses.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22so you're quite content to allow others to go to hell, when you could save them?

You misunderstood me, so let me try again. I will try to teach the word to others because I don't want them to go to Hell. If, however, they hear and then choose not to believe, I will not relentlessly press the issue. so you don't mind all that much, is what i was getting at? and you don't actually object to the fact that they will go to hell?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22they're the splinter group, are they?

They're a splinter group, yes. you misunderstood the question. i was asking: so you're the real christian, and they're the splinter group? on what basis do you say that this is the case, as opposed to them being real christians and you being quite mistaken, or as opposed to both of you being wrong?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22they outright lie about the properties of condoms, saying they not only don't help prevent aids (of course they help) but actually can increase the chances of aids. not only that, but they declare that aids are sinful.

Man, that sucks. I don't see how a disease (if that's the right word) is sinful. Certain methods of contacting it are, but not just having it. that's a typo, i meant to say condoms are sinful.

Quote:How do you know that they were aware that condoms did work, or that they really didn't believe condoms were sinful? Who cares?

Quote:You still haven't mentioned where the Bible says to persecute an entire race for one sole act. race? no. religion? yes.

Quote:Yes, I can. Converting is a choice, it can't be forced. If I forced you to be baptized and orally declare that you believe the Bible, it wouldn't do jack. You have to mean it. and what about those of us who simply can't bring ourselves to mean it, who've listened to the

arguments for christianity's truth and simply don't believe them, or those who find the morality of the religion objectionable by modern standards?

Quote:If God exists and has all that power that he does, why should we be equal with him? Might makes right, then?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22Quote:1. Each book in the Bible states who wrote it near the beginning or end.
"exactly who"

"God used men to write down His thoughts much as a businessman uses a secretary. He allowed them to put these thoughts in their own words. But the men themselves said they were inspired.

(2 Peter 1:20-21) 20 For YOU know this first, that no prophecy of Scripture springs from any private interpretation. 21 For prophecy was at no time brought by man's will, but men spoke from God as they were borne along by holy spirit.

Again Paul's words:

(2 Timothy 3:16-17) 16 All Scripture is inspired of God and beneficial for teaching, for reproving, for setting things straight, for disciplining in righteousness, 17 that the man of God may be fully competent, completely equipped for every good work.

Approximately 40 men, from Moses to the Apostle John were Bible writers from 1513 BCE to 98 CE. Many may claim otherwise but an internal study of the Bible will show that it is of Divine origin."

This doesn't answer my question. Who exactly wrote each portion of the bible?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22Quote:2. God inspired them to write what they did. They didn't write it by their own intuition alone.

How do you know that, and how do you know this was not the case for the numerous gospels that were rejected from your bible because a group of politicians decided they should be rejected?

See above.

see above re: not answering the question

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22You didn't answer the question. If Hell was there, why didn't god say anything about it in the old testament? He's very keen on making creatively vicious threats to back up his commandments, so if he's got this fiery torture chamber you'll go to if you aren't careful, why not mention it?

It's mentioned. I'm not familiar with the verses myself, yet. Here's one:

And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame [and] everlasting contempt. (Daniel 12:2)

That's rather vague, isn't it? Doesn't say: hell's a place where all evil people will go after death to be eternally tortured in fire. There's no mention of why someone would go to one or the other, either as a result of good or bad works or by believing the right thing.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22Spoony wrote on Fri, 19 March 2010 22:46I have yet to see parents raise a child, be subject too all of his/her complaints/disobedience/rudeness/etc, and not punish the child in any way. How is that an analogy?

It's an analogy because God took care of the growing nation of Israel, and they constantly complained. Example (one of many), God gave the Israelites manna for food. It was easy, all they had to do was pick it up, no planting or harvesting. It fed them and gave them the nourishment they needed. Yet they complained about it. hey even went as far as to say, "Why'd you bring us out of Egypt to die? I'd rather be a slave than die out here!" Here was my original quote.

"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."

You still haven't refuted that.

Quote:Wow, that whole sentence is wrong.

"This god of yours gives us no reason at all to think he exists" - he gives a plethora of reasons. If a person doesn't want to believe, OK then... Where are these reasons?

And why can't you pull yourself away from this "doesn't want to believe" bullshit? It's simply a case that many people find your assertions unbelievable. This does not imply a choice on our part; it simply means that your assertions are dodgy.

Quote:"and his followers tell us we're rude for asking for evidence" - I bet you've never met someone from my denomination. Asking for evidence here doesn't beget rudeness, rather an invitation to study it. then your denomination is in the extreme minority of those who claim to be Christians.

Quote:"and then we're told we'll suffer horrific punishments if we have doubts." - Not doubts, no. Refusal, yes. Doubt's a middle ground, it means you haven't thrown your lot one way or another. again, you're breathtakingly ignorant.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22You doubt some religious claims too, remember...

True.

and what if you're wrong, for example, about the islamic claim that you need to be a muslim otherwise you'll end up in hell?

Quote:Because Adam and Eve weren't alone. All throughout the Old Testament are numerous examples of people disobeying one of God's commandments, which were given by God's presence.

and all throughout the old testament are numerous examples of god punishing innocent people for

the crimes of others... and here you are defending it.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22your bible is full of genocide, slavery, the punishment of innocents... and you're condemning complaining?

Right, so when God provides me with my physical needs, asking little in return, then complaining about what I've got is totally okay.
did you read the statement of mine you just quoted?

the one where i talked about the genocide and slavery in your horrific holy book?

and you think the problem is someone complaining about your religion?

holy shit.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22as for "demanding more", i wouldn't ask for anything from a character i thought was fictional.

You could watch all twelve plagues hit Egypt consecutively and still be doubtful?
i said *i* wouldn't demand more. i wouldn't demand anything from god, since i've never been shown a convincing reason to think he exists at all, let alone cares about me.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22yes, i do want religion to let humans do as we please, some of us do actually like the idea of democracy.

I'd be okay with democracy too - y'know, if we were all gods as well...
so you're saying you do reject the idea of humans determining the way our societies work by means of voting? just want to make sure i'm getting that right.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22Quote:I also see the implication that the possibility of any being having greater stature than man is horrible to consider.

No, it's not.

well, you keep mentioning how it's bad to be governed by a higher power... so, why?
excuse me, but the people who have spent thousands and thousands of years trying to tell us what to do are not higher powers. they just say they work for one.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22Go on?

Going On.

is that the best you can do?

One Type—The Messianic Prophecies

Of these prophecies, the most striking examples are the predictions about an "anointed one" ("Messiah" in Hebrew) who was to arrive in the future. About 4 BC, a miraculous event occurred—a boy named Jesus was born to a virgin named Mary.

How do you know Jesus' mother was a virgin?

And what would that prove even if it was true? if you and i are arguing, can i just say "you lose this

argument". you: "why's that?" me: "because my mother didn't have sex with a man". a few animals can reproduce this way, so it's not totally unthinkable that a human might as a result of some mutation or something... why would it prove that the child had any divine power, and why would it vindicate everything they said?

His fulfillment of these prophecies was very spectacular: Jesus gave sight to the blind, made the lame walk, cured those who had leprosy, gave the deaf hearing, and raised people from the dead! These miracles and others were done many times in front of thousands of witnesses for three years. About 30 AD, Jesus was crucified (a prophecy) and died (a prophecy). Three days later he rose from the dead (another prophecy), after which He was seen by over 500 witnesses. How do you know he did any of these things?

Secular history supports the Bible. For example, in *The Antiquities of the Jews*, book 18, chapter 3, paragraph 3 the famous historian Flavius Josephus writes:

"Now, there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works—a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ; and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him, for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him; and the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day." Josephus was not a contemporary of Jesus. So the very best you can say about him is that he was repeating what he'd heard. That's evidence, is it?

here's the only other "secular history supports the bible" statement i see.

In 115 AD, P. Cornelius Tacitus wrote the following passage that refers to Jesus (called "Christus," which means "The Messiah") in book 15, chapter 44 of *The Annals*:

"Consequently, to get rid of the report, Nero fastened the guilt and inflicted the most exquisite tortures on a class hated for their abominations, called Christians by the populace. Christus, from whom the name had its origin, suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of Tiberius at the hands of one of our procurators, Pontius Pilatus, and a most mischievous superstition, thus checked for the moment, again broke out not only in Judaea, the first source of the evil, but even in Rome, where all things hideous and shameful from every part of the world find their centre and become popular. Accordingly, an arrest was first made of all who pleaded guilty; then, upon their information, an immense multitude was convicted, not so much of the crime of firing the city, as of hatred against mankind. Mockery of every sort was added to their deaths. Covered with the skins of beasts, they were torn by dogs and perished, or were nailed to crosses, or were doomed to the flames and burnt, to serve as a nightly illumination, when daylight had expired."

the only part referring in the bible here is "christus suffered the extreme penalty during the reign of tiberius at the hands of pontius pilatus" - well, so what? there was someone who'd been called the christ (doesn't even name him as Jesus) who was executed?

so what?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22Quote:Yes, because they shouldn't impose their rules on non-belivers. Standing up for what you think is right is one thing, but trying to force

someone else to think your way is another.

And yet you defend the threatened punishment for thinking the wrong way.

Yes. I said I won't force you to believe what I believe, but that isn't because of a lack of the "right way".

How many people are in your "denomination?"

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22Quote:Why are we born with that caring attitude? Or are you still trying to figure that out as well?

I wouldn't necessarily say we were born with it, but the concept of human solidarity, of caring for one's family, has certainly helped us last this long.

Those concepts had to have come from somewhere, right?

Evolution? We've gradually become more and more intelligent, and most of us have figured out that being good towards the people around us, or at least leaving them alone, is generally more beneficial than being twats towards us.

The idea of protecting your family being a good idea is hardly difficult to understand.
