
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 24 Mar 2010 10:14:48 GMT

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

Altzan wrote on Tue, 23 March 2010 22:25Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37pity 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?

I have no idea what you mean.
it's actually very straightforward.

the baying religious mob bring a woman who they've caught committing adultery before jesus, and say we need to stone her to death.

jesus says: let he without sin cast the first stone. everyone there is sinful (indeed christianity says we're all sinful), so nobody can stone her, and she gets away with it. so that means we can't have and enforce any laws at all, because the only people allowed to punish offenders would have to be entirely sinless, and none of us are, are we?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37Quote:Spoony wrote on Sat, 20 March 2010 01:22if 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.

OK, so how does that translate into a Biblical command to kill Jews?
it's not exactly much of a jump to get from "all jews are responsible of the murder of our god" to actually doing something nasty to jews, is it?

but like i said, you probably aren't taught the bad parts of christianity, how dangerous it used to be to be jewish around easter time.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37you 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.

I wouldn't call it 'extraordinary'. 'Speculative', more like.
For example, what about Carbon-14 or helium present in rocks? If they've been around as long as billions of years, they would have disappeared. Yet they still remain.
it's really odd you mention carbon-14 to try to support the young-earth claim.

the fact carbon-14 has a halflife and decays over time is such a helpful thing in determining the age of stuff. it doesn't get you as far as billions of years, i think it's only good for about 50,000 or something, but that would still make the 6-10,000 year assertion made by young-earth creationists

look a bit stupid.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37another 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?

What about the Second Law of Thermodynamics, or Entropy?

What about it? My question was: where's the evidence supporting the account given in Genesis? So how does this support the account given in Genesis?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37perhaps 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.

Can you cite the specific verse, since you seem so familiar with it?
you've seriously never heard of it?

i can't match verses to numbers off the top of my head, but i would have thought an avowed christian would at least have read the bible through.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37so 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?

Yes, I mind. But if someone doesn't want to "hear, believe, and repent", then what am I supposed to do, eh? Pressing the issue won't help, forcing it won't help.
what are you supposed to do?

for starters, you could ask god to make his "revelation" a little less ridiculous, or you could ask god not to be such a bastard that he feels the need to dish out the worst crime imaginable just for the "crime" of disbelieving in his existence or disagreeing with his religion.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37you 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?

I suppose all Christian denominations are splinter groups now, since it would be extremely difficult to prove which particular one was the stem.

The main basis of our belief is the Bible, whereas other groups like Baptists and Catholics aren't following Bible scripture.

You started off that statement so well. It would indeed be difficult to prove that, for example, Jesus said anything that the bible reports him as saying, or did anything that the bible reports him as doing. Since the four gospels wildly contradict each other, this seems like quite an important question...

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37Quote:How do you know that they were aware

that condoms did work, or that they really didn't believe condoms were sinful?
Who cares?

Apparently you do... If you're going to say that they were spreading lies about condoms, it would be a good idea to know the intention behind the act, right?
i'm more concerned with the fact millions of people are dying.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37Quote:You still haven't mentioned where the Bible says to persecute an entire race for one sole act.
race? no. religion? yes.
Go on...
we're back to anti-semitism.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37Quote:If God exists and has all that power that he does, why should we be equal with him?
Might makes right, then?

You didn't answer the question.
I did, actually, with another question. Might makes right, i.e. whoever is most powerful ought to be in charge and has the moral high ground...

by this logic, democracy would be impossible. Barack Obama exists, and has an extraordinary amount of power. (he's already got two up on your god). So why should you get a vote from now on?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37This doesn't answer my question. Who exactly wrote each portion of the bible?

"Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy = Moses - 1400 B.C.
Joshua = Joshua - 1350 B.C.
Judges, Ruth, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel = Samuel/Nathan/Gad - 1000 - 900 B.C.
1 Kings, 2 Kings = Jeremiah - 600 B.C.
1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah = Ezra - 450 B.C.
Esther = Mordecai - 400 B.C.
Job = Moses - 1400 B.C.
Psalms = several different authors, mostly David - 1000 - 400 B.C.
Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon = Solomon - 900 B.C.
Isaiah = Isaiah - 700 B.C.
Jeremiah, Lamentations = Jeremiah - 600 B.C.
Ezekiel = Ezekiel - 550 B.C.
Daniel = Daniel - 550 B.C.
Hosea = Hosea - 750 B.C.
Joel = Joel - 850 B.C.
Amos = Amos - 750 B.C.
Obadiah = Obadiah - 600 B.C.
Jonah = Jonah - 700 B.C.
Micah = Micah - 700 B.C.
Nahum = Nahum - 650 B.C.

Habakkuk = Habakkuk - 600 B.C.
Zephaniah = Zephaniah - 650 B.C.
Haggai = Haggai - 520 B.C.
Zechariah = Zechariah - 500 B.C.
Malachi = Malachi - 430 B.C.
Matthew = Matthew - A.D. 55
Mark = John Mark - A.D. 50
Luke = Luke - A.D. 60
John = John - A.D. 90
Acts = Luke - A.D. 65
Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon = Paul - A.D. 50-70
Hebrews = unknown, mostly likely Paul, Luke, Barnabas, or Apollos - A.D. 65
James = James - A.D. 45
1 Peter, 2 Peter = Peter - A.D. 60
1 John, 2 John, 3 John = John - A.D. 90
Jude = Jude - A.D. 60
Revelation = John - A.D. 90"
Doesn't answer my question. Who were they?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37How 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?

Because the writers themselves said they were inspired by God.
how do you even know they said that?

once you've answered that, how do you know they were correct, as opposed to crazy or lying or just plain wrong?
once you've answered that, how do you know this wasn't the case for the rejected gospels?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37Here 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.

I can't refute an opinion, which is all that is.
it wouldn't be the first time i've made the assertion that it's plain evil to threaten someone with horrific punishment just for the "crime" of disagreeing with you or doubting what you say, would it?

i vaguely recall that the last time i tried getting you to understand just what a sick and immoral way this is to behave, you said i had a "binding to science" (????)

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37And 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.

Because it isn't bullshit.

yes it is, you don't know what you're talking about again. your religion makes incredibly feeble claims, it's had two thousand years to prove them and it hasn't even gotten to square one... stop acting like this extraordinary failure is the fault of everyone else instead of the religion's fault.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37and 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?

Then I'm wrong. Your point?

You don't mind being spoken to in that tone of voice? Someone tells you you must agree with them or you'll go to hell?

There's quite an interesting verse in the islamic scripture (i can't tell you off the top of my head if it's the qur'an or the hadith, but bear with me)... it basically says "these guys who don't believe in allah, well, even if we did prove it to them they still wouldn't believe". I'm paraphrasing of course, but that's the gist. You probably read that and thought the same thing i did... it's either the rantings of a lunatic or it's quite a cunning attempt to cover up a lie. It's from a different religion, so you can probably see that without too much trouble.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37did 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.

Hitler killed millions of Jews, and all you can complain about is Catholics in your government?
uh no, i oppose murder and genocide and slavery and oppression wherever i find it. there's not really much of a need to speak out against the third reich now.

Quote:You're changing the subject to avoid my original point, even changing my words. Is that the best argument you have?
you'd better back this up.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37Quote: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.

Changing the subject again?

You sure like to jump to that point a lot, especially when it's irrelevant to my quote.
firstly it's not irrelevant at all, secondly it's quite an important point... the bible continually shows god as willing to punish innocents for crimes committed by somebody else. what a shitty source of morals... no wonder you don't know right from wrong.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37so 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.

No, I like the system a lot. But the system only works when everyone involved is of equal status. so who's not "of equal status"?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37excuse 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.

Hypothetically, if you knew for a fact that there was a higher power, would you or would you not give allegiance to it? Or would you fight it?

That's all I'm asking, here.

if there was a "higher power", i would not think that this justified a dictatorship over us. i'd still be in favour of democracy, human rights, stuff like that.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37How 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?

Alone, it proves little (despite the fact that there is little to no other evidence of a virgin giving birth before), but the baby grew and performed miracles, which is proof enough.

Of course, this visible proof was long ago and only written report remains.

firstly, there's "little to no evidence of a virgin giving birth before"... indeed. that includes mary and jesus.

there's the story that it happened... but then there have been countless gods and messiahs who've been reported as being born in a similar way, jesus is only one of them... i wonder how many of the others you think are correct.

secondly, even if the virgin birth AND the miracles are true, why would that vindicate everything jesus said? why would that make all his moral teachings valid?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37His 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?

What about all the testimony of people who saw it happen? Or wait, since it was so long ago it can't be valid, right?

What about all the testimony of people who claim to have been abducted by UFOs? What about all the people who are convinced - absolutely convinced - in the truth of other religions?

If someone says they saw a miracle, then it's a good idea to consider the odds here.

he may be correct, he may be honestly mistaken (the mind plays tricks), he may be downright crazy, he may just be lying to you. what's most likely, do you think?

now imagine the whole thing is not first-hand but third-hand. you aren't talking to someone who says he saw it himself... you're reading a book. for starters, you have no way of knowing who it was written by.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Sun, 21 March 2010 19:37How many people are in your "denomination?"

I don't know for a fact. A good indicator is that we always worship at a "Church of Christ", since that's the only name the Bible supports.[/quote]

you said earlier that it isn't all that numerous, which brings me to the point of the question.

so your denomination are the "real" christians, right? (they all say that, but never mind that for now).

isn't god a bit of a prick for making his message so ludicrously cryptic that only a small proportion of the population get it right, and punishing everyone who gets it wrong?

what a twat.
