

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Fri, 02 Apr 2010 05:18:05 GMT

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

---

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 Let's call this concept what it is; a complete and unchallengeable dictatorship.

Dictatorship - a form of government where the single leader has sovereignty.

So yeah, it's a dictatorship.

Too bad that word comes with a negative connotation.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 The argument from authority doesn't fly with me, especially when nobody's even managed to demonstrate that there is any authority at all in this case.

Nobody's managed to prove God exists.

We all know that, yet you keep stating it repeatedly...

Why?

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 But if you're going to take the "god says it, and that's all i need to know" line, then I have a hypothetical question for you. Let's say it was somehow proven that the Islamic revelation was correct. Mohammed claimed to be inspired by the same god you believe in. I expect you don't believe that any more than I do, but let's suppose it was conclusively proven. Would you then abide by the Islamic code of behaviour? Some of them aren't so pretty; there are hundreds of verses in the Islamic scriptures speaking of Allah's (same god, remember) fury and contempt towards non-believers, and quite a few instructions to fight non-Muslims and either convert them to Islam, subjugate them under Islamic rule, or kill them. So if it turned out that Mohammed really was inspired by god, you'd grab a sword and have at it, would you?

If it was proven that Islam's beliefs were fact, then yes, I would obey them.

Is that any worse than your statement that you'd challenge an almighty God, if you knew for fact he existed, because you don't like his authority? (In your case, I notice, you mainly rally against Old Testament authority.)

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 well, it doesn't really seem like we can just say that only applies to the israelites.

what's the justification? "god's obviously talking to the israelites because they're the people he gave this land to". well, a lot of christians say ad nauseum that god gave them whatever they have.

I don't know any Christians myself who claim that.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 Well, if just saying "god says it's wrong, case closed" is all the moral justification that's necessary, I wonder why Christians ever try going any further than that and explain why certain actions are wrong, what harm could be caused by them. Don't

get me wrong, I approve of the moral debate.

God didn't make up his moral code for giggles. He has reasons for his moral code. That's why Christians try to explain why - there is a why.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 That's not the original point... the original point was Henry's implication that someone serving a different god must mean the person does not want laws, does not want any virtue in his life. That's obviously nonsense.

Why?

As I said, these people wouldn't have served a different God if they didn't have a different idea of laws or virtue; the notion that they would is indeed nonsense.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 But as to your question... why would anyone cease serving your God? Two major reasons spring to mind; either because they find it unconvincing or because they object to it on moral grounds.

Another I can think of is wanting something that God can't give them or that God considers a sin. An addiction, for example... some people can get so attached to what God declares a sin that they decide it's easier to discard belief and keep what action they have... mainly because it's more physical and immediate than their belief.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 so presumably the same commandment would apply if there were some atheists in the city too, i expect?

Yes.

Do you think those ought to be spared?

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 Quote: Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote: 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.

How do you know that? Or, if you prefer I rephrase the question, why do you think that?

The Israelites had to defend against those who would destroy them, and the faith was small at the time.

Nowadays, it would be pretty hard to destroy every Christian and wipe the story off the face of the Earth (not that some wouldn't want to try) so a defense isn't necessary.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 Well, the severity of the punishment usually depends on how serious you think the crime is, doesn't it?

Yes.

Go on...

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 am I implying god approved of that? no. however, i

couldn't find any condemnation of the actions of the man who threw the defenceless young girls at the rape mob so the men would survive.

I don't know for a fact that he was condemned for that action, but if he was caught and his crime known, I'm sure he was.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13speaking of rape, i've got a question for christians. what, in your view and in the view of your church, is the worse act of these two:

- a man rapes a woman
- two men, consenting adults, choose to have a sexual relationship

No sin is worse than another.

Quote:yet for the neglect of the execution of it upon the inferior cities that served idols God himself

They didn't exact the punishment upon the idolaters as they were commanded

Quote:by the army of the Chaldeans, put it in execution upon Jerusalem

The Chaldeans instead were the attackers

Quote:the head city, which, for is apostasy from God, was utterly destroyed and laid waste, and lay in ruins seventy years.

The head city was destroyed by them alongsides.

Note that that's my guess as to what it means, I could be wrong.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13So Matthew Henry was wrong, then, to say it is no longer binding according to the gospels?

I haven't seen him claim that.

He says we shouldn't be going around executing idolaters anymore, but idolatry is still a sin.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13Read the commandment and the commentary; the contempt is very clear. It doesn't attempt to find out why the person is saying this, and doesn't seek to make a distinction if that was known.

Reasons are unimportant - it warns against false doctrine, nothing more. If a Catholic advocate tried to convert me, I'd either simply deny or I'd sit down with him and discuss why I don't believe in Catholicism.

No violent response is called for.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41as an aside, do you really believe that the snake in the garden was Satan?

Yes.

and where did you read that?

Genesis.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13I'll just repeat the question. Define a false god, please. It's not clear at all to me whether the god of the old testament knows of the existence of other gods or not. So what's a false god? Some entity that claims to be a god but isn't? Some entity that does have supernatural power but isn't "good"? Some entity that does have supernatural power but didn't create the whole world? I'd really like to know.

A false god is the god that is behind an idol being worshipped by a person or persons. If a group of Israelites decided to worship images of a God named "Balahama", then that "Balahama" would be a false god.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13you're the second christian i've asked this question to, and you're the second to give the wrong answer.

Who made you the judge of whether this answer was right or wrong? Since when do you have authority?

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13the right answer is telling god to go to hell, no i won't murder an innocent child for you, you evil, evil fuck. and if you want to punish me for disobedience, then go ahead, you twat, because i'd rather have that than murder an innocent child.

Then you'd fail the test. TEST being key word.

Note that God has never required human sacrifice. Abraham was asked this as a test to see whether he was truly faithful to God. If he had said no, then that meant he wasn't faithful enough to obey.

It's not about what he was asked to do, it was about whether or not he would obey.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13And why would compassion get in the way? Why are some of us wired so that would happen?

We're all 'wired' to feel compassion. Unfortunately, compassion can compel us to do something wrong - a temptation.

Example - your friend has finally broken his alcohol addiction, but he is miserable as a result, and keeps desiring just 'one more drink'. You might feel pity and wish to fulfill his wish just to make him happy again. After all, it's just one more drink right? And it'd make him feel better! But it would be a sin.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13no, because i'm not the one here justifying murder on the grounds of a religious disagreement.

Good, because i have no desire to murder anyone because they don't share my belief.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41k, 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.  
feel free to explain why, although remember what i said about arguments from authority.

Why should I explain it? You don't agree with my opinion, I don't agree with yours.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13those two will suffice as religious claims you simply don't believe, so if you stop and think about why you don't believe them, you might begin to understand why someone else might not believe the same stuff as you.

I have, thankfully.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13Quote:If you've told yourself that it's impossible for you to believe in anything without proof

Uh, no, I didn't say that. My friend told me last night about his recent trip to Istanbul. I didn't ask him for proof.

I guess I was too literal here.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13Whether I want proof for a claim depends on its believability and its implications. If you just wanted to claim that there was a man called Jesus who had some radical ideas on morality and ended up getting crucified, then fine. I don't need proof of that, I'll be quite happy to read his ideas and judge them on their own merits. If instead you try telling me that he was the son of God, that he rose from the dead, and that if I believe in him I can get everlasting life after death and that if I don't I'm in for an eternity of torture, then that needs proof.

"Oh, dear."

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13Again, when a Muslim tells you that Islam is inspired by God, the God you already believe in, you don't believe that without proof. (although, i wonder if you would even seriously consider any proof that could be shown to you)

I don't want conclusive proof to believe their claims.  
However, I find the Biblical story more convincing than the Qoran's.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13Here's what needs to happen before anything in the Bible can be seriously considered a 'law'.

1. Prove this god exists.
2. Prove this book is an accurate depiction of his views; i.e. prove he actually said what the bible says he said.
3. Successfully make the case that god is of such extraordinary moral brilliance that a dictatorship under him would be better than a democracy
4. Win the vote to discard our current democratic systems

Heh, if 3 was proven then 4 would be unnecessary.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13Quote:If the majority is a part of the lawmaking process, then yes.

So basically no, then?

I didn't say no, so what do you mean?

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13Quote:If they've broken Biblical commandments, the same will happen to them as others who do the same.  
so it's all about actions rather than beliefs, is it?

I didn't say that. You can easily break Biblical commandments with both actions and/or beliefs.  
Stealing - breaks a commandment  
Believing baptism is unnecessary - breaks a commandment

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13then i wonder why you went to the trouble of trying to answer my earlier criticism by posting the matthew henry crap.

You were quoting scripture. That wasn't an opinion of yours, that was a point of yours you tried to back up. That's why i responded.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13what is the 5-step plan, though? i could look it up, i'm sure, but i may as well hear it from you.

Strage, I'd have thought you'd be familiar with it, seeing as you're familiar with other scripture.  
But OK:

1. Hear the message (Romans 10:17)
2. Believe it (Mark 16:16)
3. Repent of your past sins (Acts 2: 38)
4. State that you believe christ is the son of God (Romans 10:10)
5. Be baptized (Acts 2: 38)

Also, there's a sixth step I neglected to include (I really don't know why it isn't commonly called the 6-step plan)

6. Live faithfully until Death (Revelations 2: 10)
-