
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Mon, 29 Mar 2010 01:16:50 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53i'm not seeing how this refutes my point?
the woman gets away with it because sinful people are supposedly not allowed to punish offenders. we're told we're all sinful, so what's the point the law being there if it's unenforcable?

Perhaps I wasn't trying to refute it?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53and yet throughout the bible we have innumerable cases of god eagerly punishing or threatening to punish innocents for the crimes of others. you've even defended that bullshit yourself.

That doesn't change the fact that the Bible doesn't command us to persecute Jews.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53firstly, i said: where's the evidence supporting the account given in genesis? you said the second law of thermodynamics/entropy.

When I said those two examples, I was NOT giving them as evidence to Genesis, I was bringing it up against evolution, as I already said.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53secondly, i don't give a shit whether you or anyone else is convinced by the theory of evolution or not, and i'm not aware of anyone saying "you MUST believe this or you'll suffer horrific punishments for eternity". but still, i'm not sure exactly why you think the second law of thermodynamics is supposed to be a counter-argument to the theory of evolution?

So you want me to provide evidence and attempt to vindicate Genesis, but you don't think I should make any move against evolution? One-sided, no?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53k, then here's the one i was talking about we are.
Deuteronomy 13:12-16

If thou shalt hear [say] in one of thy cities, which the LORD thy God hath given thee to dwell there, saying,

[Certain] men, the children of Belial, are gone out from among you, and have withdrawn the inhabitants of their city, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which ye have not known;

Then shalt thou enquire, and make search, and ask diligently; and, behold, [if it be] truth, [and] the thing certain, [that] such abomination is wrought among you;

Thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that [is] therein, and the cattle thereof, with the edge of the sword.

And thou shalt gather all the spoil of it into the midst of the street thereof, and shalt burn with fire the city, and all the spoil thereof every whit, for the LORD thy God: and it shall be an heap for ever; it shall not be built again.

I took the liberty of changing your quoted verses to KJV.

Now here's Matthew Henry's commentary which should hopefully answer any question you have provided you read it carefully.

Toggle Spoiler"Here the case is put of a city revolting from its allegiance to the God of Israel, and serving other gods.

I. The crime is supposed to be committed, 1. By one of the cities of Israel, that lay within the jurisdiction of their courts. The church then judged those only that were within, 1 Co. 5:12, 13. And, even when they were ordered to preserve their religion in the first principles of it by fire and sword to propagate it. Those that are born within the allegiance of a prince, if they take up arms against him, are dealt with as traitors, but foreign invaders are not so. The city that is here supposed to have become idolatrous is one that formerly worshipped the true God, but had now withdrawn to other gods, which intimates how great the crime is, and how sore the punishment will be, of those that, after they have known the way of righteousness, turn aside from it, 2 Pt. 2:21. 2. It is supposed to be committed by the generality of the inhabitants of the city, for we may conclude that, if a considerable number did retain their integrity, those only that were guilty were to be destroyed, and the city was to be spared for the sake of the righteous in it; for will not the Judge of all the earth do right? No doubt he will. 3. They are supposed to be drawn to idolatry by certain men, the children of Belial, men that would endure no yoke (so it signifies), that neither fear God nor regard man, but shake off all restraints of law and conscience, and are perfectly lost to all manner of virtue; these are those that say, "Let us serve other gods," that will not only allow, but will countenance and encourage, our immoralities. Belial is put for the devil (2 Co. 6:15), and the children of Belial are his children. These withdraw the inhabitants of the city; for a little of this old leaven, when it is entertained, soon leavens the whole lump.

II. The cause is ordered to be tried with a great deal of care (v. 14): Thou shalt enquire and make search. They must not proceed upon common fame, or take the information by hearsay, but must examine the proofs, and not give judgment against them unless the evidence was clear and the charge fully made out. God himself, before he destroyed Sodom, is said to have come down to see whether its crimes were according to the clamour, Gen. 18:21. In judicial processes it is requisite that time, and care, and pains, be taken to find out the truth, and that search be made without any passion, prejudice, or partiality. The Jewish writers say that, though particular persons who were idolaters might be judged by the inferior courts, the defection of a city was to be tried by the great Sanhedrim; and, if it appeared that they were thrust away to idolatry, two learned men were sent to them to admonish and reclaim them. If they repented, all would be well; if not, then all Israel must go up to war against them, to testify their indignation against idolatry and to stop the spreading of the contagion.

III. If the crime were proved, and the criminals were incorrigible, the city was to be wholly destroyed. If there were a few righteous men in it, no doubt they would remove themselves and their families out of such a dangerous place, and then all the inhabitants, men, women, and children, must be put to the sword (v. 15), all the spoil of the city, both shop-goods and the furniture of houses, must be brought into the marketplace and burned, and the city itself must be laid in ashes and never built again, v. 16. The soldiers are forbidden, upon pain of death, to convert any of the plunder to their own use, v. 17. It was a devoted thing, and dangerous to meddle with, as we find in the case of Achan. Now, 1. God enjoins this severity of show what a jealous God he is in the matters of his worship, and how great a crime it is to serve other gods. Let men know that God will not give his glory to another, nor his praise to graven images. 2. He expects that magistrates, having their honour and power from him, should be concerned for his honour, and use their power for terror to evil doers, else they bear the sword in vain. 3. The

faithful worshippers of the true God must take all occasions to show their just indignation against idolatry, much more against atheism, infidelity, and irreligion. 4. It is here intimated that the best expedient for the turning away of God's anger from a land is to execute justice upon the wicked of the land (v. 17), that the Lord may turn from the fierceness of his anger, which was ready to break out against the whole nation, for the wickedness of that one apostate city. It is promised that, if they would thus root wickedness out of their land, God would multiply them. They might think it impolitic, and against the interest of their nation, to ruin a whole city for a crime relating purely to religion, and that they should be more sparing of the blood of Israelites: "Fear not the" (says Moses), "God will multiply you the more; the body of your nation will lose nothing by the letting out of this corrupt blood." Lastly, Though we do not find this law put in execution in all the history of the Jewish church (Gibeah was destroyed, not for idolatry, but immorality), yet for the neglect of the execution of it upon the inferior cities that served idols God himself, by the army of the Chaldeans, put it in execution upon Jerusalem, the head city, which, for is apostasy from God, was utterly destroyed and laid waste, and lay in ruins seventy years. Though idolaters may escape punishment from men (nor is this law in the letter of it binding now, under the gospel), yet the Lord our God will not suffer them to escape his righteous judgements. The New Testament speaks of communion with idolaters as a sin which, above any other, provokes the Lord to jealousy, and dares him as if we were stronger than he, 1 Co. 10:21, 22."

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53 Another noteworthy statement along the same lines: Deuteronomy 13:7-11

[Namely], of the gods of the people which [are] round about you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the [one] end of the earth even unto the [other] end of the earth; Thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: But thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones, that he die; because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the LORD thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage. And all Israel shall hear, and fear, and shall do no more any such wickedness as this is among you.

Same as above, here:

Toggle Spoiler"Further provision is made by this branch of the statute against receiving the infection of idolatry from those that are near and dear to us.

I. It is the policy of the tempter to send his solicitations by the hand of those whom we love, whom we least suspect of any ill design upon us, and whom we are desirous to please and apt to conform ourselves to. The enticement here is supposed to come from a brother or child that are near by nature, from a wife or friend that are near by choice, and are to us as our own souls, v. 6. Satan tempted Adam by Eve and Christ by Peter. We are therefore concerned to stand upon our guard against a bad proposal when the person that makes it can pretend to an interest in us, that we may never sin against God in compliment to the best friend we have in the world. The temptation is supposed to be private: he will entice thee secretly, implying that idolatry is a work of darkness, which dreads the light and covets to be concealed, and in which the sinner promises himself, and the tempter promises him, secrecy and security. Concerning the false gods proposed to be served, 1. The tempter suggests that the worshipping of these gods was the common

practice of the world; and, if they limited their adorations to an invisible Deity, they were singular, and like nobody, for these gods were the gods of the people round about them, and indeed of all the nations of the earth, v. 7. This suggestion draws many away from religion and godliness, that it is an unfashionable thing; and they make their court to the world and the flesh because these are the gods of the people that are round about them. 2. Moses suggests, in opposition to this, that it had not been the practice of their ancestors; they are gods which thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers. Those that are born of godly parents, and have been educated in pious exercises, when they are enticed to a vain, loose, careless way of living should remember that those are ways which they have not known, they nor their fathers. And will they thus degenerate?

II. It is our duty to prefer God and religion before the best friends we have in the world. 1. We must not, in complaisance to our friends, break God's law (v. 8): "Thou shalt not consent to him. nor go with him to his idolatrous worship, no, not for company, or curiosity, or to gain a better interest in his affections." It is a general rule, If sinners entice thee, consent thou not, Prov. 1:10. 2. We must not, in compassion to our friends, obstruct the course of God's justice. He that attempts such a thing must not only be looked upon as an enemy, or dangerous person, whom one should be afraid of, and swear the peace against, but as a criminal or traitor, whom, in zeal for our sovereign Lord, his crown and dignity, we are bound to inform against, and cannot conceal without incurring the guilt of a great misprision (v. 9): Thou shalt surely kill him. By this law the persons enticed were bound to the seducer, and to give evidence against him before the proper judges, that he might suffer the penalty of the law, and that without delay, which the Jews say is here intended in that phrase, as it is in the Hebrew, killing thou shalt kill him. Neither the prosecution nor the execution must be deferred; and he that was first in the former must be first in the latter, to show that he stood to his testimony: "Thy hand shall be first upon him, to mark him out as an anathema, and then the hands of all the people, to put him away as an accursed thing." The death he must die was that which was looked upon among the Jews as the severest of all deaths. He must be stoned: and his accusation written is that he has sought to thrust thee away, by a kind of violence, from the Lord thy God, v. 10. Those are certainly our worst enemies that would thrust us from God, our best friend; and whatever draws us to sin, separates between us and God, is a design upon our life, and to be resented accordingly, And, lastly, here is the good effect of this necessary execution (v. 11): All Israel shall hear and fear. They ought to hear and fear; for the punishment of crimes committed is designed in terrorem—to terrify, and so to prevent their repetition. And it is to be hoped they will hear and fear, and by the severity of the punishment, especially when it is at the prosecution of a father, a brother, or a friend, will be made to conceive a horror of the sin, as exceedingly sinful, and to be afraid of incurring the like punishment themselves. Smite the scorner that sins presumptuously, and the simple, that is in danger of sinning carelessly, will beware."

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53 I'm not seeing why someone else thinking that the Christian revelations were crystal clear and think there's nothing immoral about his commandments justifies the horrific punishment threatened to anyone who disagrees with them.

It doesn't justify, sure, but I'm trying to point out a different opinion since yours is the prominent one here.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53 Not really, the catholic church has had plenty of time up till now to defend its absurd and immoral position on contraception, and it hasn't done so.

If the people who physically did those things were still alive and were asked the question, I'm

sure they'd answer... but they're not around today, are they?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53. you mean the gospel says so - not the same thing at all. how do you know that everything in there is exactly what the writers wanted to say?

2. they didn't all claim the same thing. the gospels contradict each other about almost every major event in jesus' life.

3. ah. i remember you saying you hadn't read the qur'an or hadith either. well, these all claim to be revelations from the god you believe in... don't you think you should at least read them before deciding they're not the real deal?

1. "How do you know" again? Same answer - I don't. How do you know they weren't? You don't. Simple answer - we don't know.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53. Firstly, you seem to be affirming that you don't think there's anything wrong with threatening someone with horrific punishment for nothing worse than disagreeing with you.

The played-down part here is "disagreeing with you" - it's a lot more than that, you know.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53. Secondly, are you drawing a parallel between 1. disagreeing with someone, and 2. raping a child? we have laws to protect children from paedophiles because raping a child is a genuine crime with potentially severe consequences for the victim, and because basic human decency leads most of us to think vulnerable children need to be protected from predatory adults. i hardly see how this is the same situation as someone who is not convinced that a particular religion is correct or disagrees with its teachings?

I could use ANY exmple here if I wanted. I'm not talking about the act in particular. Let's change it to whatever law then - the lawbreaker disagrees with the law at hand, and doesn't think it's a proper law and should not be enforced. Should we punish him anyway, or should we let him be, since it isn't fair that we punish him for breaking a law he doesn't think is fair or right?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53. Quote: I'm referencing to actions made by the people in the Old Testament, and you keep turning it around to "Look what GOD did!" actually a lot of my criticism of the moral evils of the old testament are reported to have been carried out by the god character himself. certainly his followers do a lot of evil things, certainly he ORDERS a lot of evil things, he also DOES a lot of evil things (ordering them can count in this column too)

That's what I said, yeah. You refer to what GOD did, when I was referring to something else.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53. you misunderstand me. i didn't say humans should have equal rights to 'god'. i don't see any reason why this 'god' should have any rights, since nobody's even managed to demonstrate that it exists at all.

Stop dragging the hypothetical situation to the real world - IF God did exist (IF), should we have equal rights to him?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53. secondly, i seem to recall having this argument with

you before. apparently we're stuck as slaves to anyone who created us? well, what if you found out that you were created by a mad scientist in a lab, a modern-day dr. frankenstein? would that make you his slave, like it or not?

That's a completely different situation, eh? Mad scientists would have to work with inventions and materials around him, not create everything out of nothing with pure will.

Also, if we were made by a mad scientist, we'd be wherever he was (unless he was completely alone in the universe) and would be subject to his existence as well, so...

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53if we were to find out that the origins of life on earth was because some aliens 'seeded' the planet a few million years ago, would that mean we have to be slaves to them?

Again, completely different scenario.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53if instead you decide that you were created by your parents in the traditional way, do they rule you for your entire life?

'The traditional way'?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53if the only people on this planet who've gotten it right are in your particular denomination, then apparently it is.

Again, we're not. But some (or a lot) groups have changed the scripture to suit themselves. And as the Bible says, let no man add or take away from what is written.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53Quote:It also is pretty simple to understand what God says is a sin and what is not.

sure, doesn't mean we need to listen to him, considering how absolutely crap his moral standards seem to be.

but that's no surprise; he was, after all, created by bronze-age middle-eastern barbarians.

But they're simple, as you just affirmed. Not cryptic at all.
