

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Wed, 31 Mar 2010 04:43:19 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 well, it would be nice if all the christian authorities had said this for the last two thousand years, instead of specifically encouraging the persecution of jews, culminating in the holocaust.

Agreed.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote:"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

oh dear. already i've got to stop you. i don't accept that a crime has been committed here.

Why should I care?

God created all, including the laws. He is the lawmaker. So if he says it's a crime, it is.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote:The crime is supposed to be committed, 1. By one of the cities of Israel, that lay within the jurisdiction of their courts.

Ah. I think I see what he's getting at here; it only applies to the Israelites, does it? In that case, then the verse would be totally irrelevant in a modern context.

Yeah.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 That would certainly be no problem for me; it would only be a problem for anybody who dared to say that God gave them this planet, their property etc.

But quite a lot of Christians do say that, don't they?

...What?

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote: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city that is here supposed to have become idolatrous is one that formerly worshipped the true God, but had now withdrawn to other gods, which intimates how great the crime is

...no, no it doesn't.

Although, "other gods"... do you think there are (or were) any other gods?

...yes, yes it does.

And no, I don't believe there were other gods, although those idolators apparently did.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 He really has lost me here. Why would serving a different god mean someone has no desire to be bound by laws, or any "manner of virtue"?

They're just picking a different set, aren't they?

Why would anyone cease serving a God, knowing they would incur his wrath, if they were only changing a few things? If they weren't changing their laws or virtues, they'd be better off staying...

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Secondly, are non-theists thrown into the same category, I wonder?

Since atheists don't believe in a god, I'd say yes.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 So it's ok to flatten an entire city if some of its inhabitants commit a crime, because anyone who was innocent would "no doubt" have already left.

If they knew what was going on in the city and didn't leave, they are at the least tolerating it, which hardly makes them innocent, does it?

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote: 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. And does he still expect that?

No, because it's no longer necessary today.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote: 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.

Ah, so that means someone who does not take all occasions to show their just indignation against atheism and idolatry is not a faithful worshipper of the true God?

Yes...

But how, do you think, is 'indignation' defined here?

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote: 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)

I wasn't sure what was originally meant by Gibeah, so I looked that up. I do recognise the story, though not as 'Gibeah'. The one about the baying mob who want to rape the male visitor, and the decision by the men to throw the young women to the mob to save themselves. So the visitor's woman gets raped to death. That one. It's similar to the Lot story, isn't it? The similarity of the narrative, the almost identical speech reported, and the fact that modern Christians seem to draw some really odd moral lessons from it, i.e. homosexuality is evil, but if you find yourself faced by a mob of rapists, just throw a defenceless young girl at them and save yourself.

Are you implying that God OK'd this?

From what I read, this incident got the city destroyed by the Israelites shortly after.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote: 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 its apostasy from God, was utterly destroyed and laid waste, and lay in ruins seventy years.

What's he saying here?

I think he's referencing a real or hypothetical situation where the Israelites didn't destroy a city of idolators, and that city rose up and destroyed the Israelite's Jerusalem.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 So, idolatry, serving other gods etc, they're things which absolutely infuriate God. Yes, the old testament makes that clear... and it doesn't exactly work in his favour. There are plenty of evil actions he either doesn't mind or positively recommends - slavery, for example - but if you have a different religious opinion, you'd better watch out.

So there must be a law against this "crime" in the Old Testament. But as he says here, in the New Testament, the law is not binding anymore, but it still infuriates God and he'll still punish people who do it? So why repeal the law?

The 'no idols' law is one of the Ten Commandments, which are in effect today (except Sabbath).

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 This all assumes that the person doing the "tempting" has evil intentions... what if they're just someone like you, evangelising? Someone who genuinely believes in their God, and wants to spread the good news?

How does it 'assume evil intentions'? It only warns against those who'd turn you from God, no matter what approach.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 as an aside, do you really believe that the snake in the garden was Satan?

Yes.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote: Concerning the false gods proposed to be served

Define "false god", please.

I'm pretty sure you know what it means.

Feel free to make a point out of it if you were planning to.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote: II. It is our duty to prefer God and religion before the best friends we have in the world.

Including your children?

What would be your response to the Abraham test, do you think?

Same as Abraham's.

Thankfully, I have never been commanded to sacrifice a child to God, in fact nobody has (except Abraham of course, but as you said, it was a test.)

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Again, the author is recognising that people might,

unbelievably, have a problem with this commandment. Their compassion might get in the way. I certainly hope so. I wonder why I've never heard a Christian say that compassion was a work of Satan.

Because it isn't. Compassion can compel towards sinful action, is the point here.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Suppose I said the following.

You, Altzan, are certainly my worst enemy that would thrust me from reason, my best friend.

Whatever draws me to religion, separates between myself and my reason, is a design upon my mind, to be resented accordingly.

Well, if you did say that to me, I'd be saddened by the fact.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 It's not actually so far from the truth, although I wouldn't say this would justify me killing you for trying.

We're agreed then?

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 k, but the other opinion is crap, isn't it?

It's no more crap than yours. Opinions are just that, opinions. So naturally you'd think an opposing opinion is crap... heck, it's what I think of yours.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 the catholic church is still spreading its evil doctrine against contraception even now.

Ahh.

You've only mentioned it in historical context up to this point, so I assumed it wasn't ongoing.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 I will give you credit where credit is due. I think this is the most honest and reasonable thing I've seen you say in these religious debates.

It goes a bit wrong from there, though... you ask me how do I know they weren't inspired by god. well, i've been waiting for quite some time for anybody to explain what they even mean by god, and prove his existence, and demonstrate that he's worth listening to.

Once they've done that, then I'll be sure to give due consideration to whether a book claiming to be inspired by him actually is. Otherwise I don't really see the point.

In other words, you won't believe unless you have certain proof.

Is this the basis of your earlier argument? That some people simply cannot believe God's word because there's not enough evidence? The vast majority of the human population believe with faith, which shows it's NOT impossible (disregarding whether or not the faith in question is well founded, seeing as how you'd try and make that a counterpoint). If you've told yourself that it's impossible for you to believe in anything without proof, then you're lying to yourself. Simple as that.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote: 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?

The contents of the bible aren't laws at all; nobody's ever demonstrated that they come from any position of authority.

Similar to what you said near the beginning of the post.

Still, though - "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 Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 That's the legal side. On to the moral side. What if the majority thinks the law is wrong? Can it be changed democratically?

If the majority is a part of the lawmaking process, then yes.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote: 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...

you've lost me there.

A 'mad scientist' would be in a lab, located in a universe where other beings existed with their own laws and morals. Wouldn't the people created by the mad scientist be subject to the laws of that universe?

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

No. Although they should take responsibility for your early life to insure survival.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 what do you think will happen to the other kinds of Christian after they die? i.e. everyone outside your denomination who says they're a Christian but, in your church's view, are mistaken.

If they've broken Biblical commandments, the same will happen to them as others who do the same.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 firstly you don't seem to be challenging my statement that his moral standards are absolutely shit.

secondly it really is cryptic, or at least too cryptic for humans, otherwise the vast majority of the world wouldn't have a problem with it.

I won't challenge your 'statement' since it's your opinion and that would be pointless. And what's so cryptic about the 5-step plan or what God considers sin?

---