

---

Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 02 Apr 2010 12:45:14 GMT

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

---

Altzan wrote on Thu, 01 April 2010 23:18 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.

a negative meaning, not a negative connotation. dictatorship sucks by definition. and yet i don't know of any human dictatorship that managed to become as all-encompassing, unchallengeable and inescapable as the depiction in christianity.

Quote: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?

because until you've gotten past that square one, most of your assertions are at best a waste of time.

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

so in a nutshell, the only reason you're not acting in the bloodthirsty, merciless way islam commands its followers to act is because you don't think it really came from God... there's no moral compunction holding you back, and there wouldn't be if it turned out you were wrong?

Quote: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?

yes, it is. i'm objecting to christianity because -a- i don't believe any of it and -b- i don't want a dictatorship and -c- i think his rules are absolutely shit.

your only objection to following islam's rules is you don't believe it. well, it's good you've laid out for us what at least two people reading this thread had already guessed... i.e. that you have no morals.

Quote:(In your case, I notice, you mainly rally against Old Testament authority.)

not really, the most evil thing in the bible is probably the doctrine of hell.

Quote: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.

my word. i hear it all the time. saying that god gave them the world, saying they have god-given rights (such a stupid thing to say, but nvm for now), saying grace before a meal...

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13Well, 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. not a very good one, clearly.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13That'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.

henry implied that if a person serves a different god, than that means they have NO virtues and wants NO laws. he didn't say it means they have different moral values... he said it means they have NO moral values.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13But 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.

"wanting something god can't give you" sounds like a pretty good reason to turn away from religion; if it can't give you basic human rights, democracy, and intellectual freedom, for example. wanting something god won't give you doesn't put the person at fault instead of the god. nor does wanting to do something god considers a sin.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13so 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?

i'm not sure why you felt you needed to ask that, i thought i'd made two things quite clear

- 1- it's immoral to punish someone for the crime of someone else
- 2- having a different religious opinion is not even a crime at all

it's not really important that i am an atheist; if the intended slaughter victim was a muslim (a religion i find even more repellent than christianity), i'd still be against it.

Quote: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. odd to use the word "defense" to explain the supposed behaviour of the israelites...

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

Yes.

Go on...

we were talking about how all truly faithful followers of god must show their "just indignation" to idolators, atheists etc. well, you've said that these things are actually crimes that can justify not only the slaughter of anyone doing it, but the slaughter of anyone in the same city, including children.

must be pretty heinous, then, as crimes go. sounds worse than murder; i don't recall there being a story in the bible where god destroys an entire city (or orders his followers to destroy it) because someone in the city was a murderer.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13am 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.

why are you sure? i didn't find god saying the guy shouldn't have done it. you'd think a book perpetually trumpeted as an ultimate moral authority might have something to say against someone who throws a defenceless girl to a mob of rapists to save himself.

but speaking of rape...

Quote: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.

well, firstly punishments differ. the punishment for homosexual sex is death. the punishment for a man who rapes a woman is that he must marry her and pay her father off. so if one sin has a more severe punishment than another, doesn't that imply that one sin is more grievous than the other?

secondly, you don't think there's anything wrong with that rape rule? the man has to marry the woman and pay off her father. doesn't seem like a terribly severe punishment for the man. more to the point, it makes the woman's predicament even worse. she's just been raped, and then she's told she must marry the bastard who attacked and violated her. is it safe to assume you don't know any women who have been raped? who, in a modern civilised country, would seriously hold a moral position as shitty as this if they didn't get it from religion?

thirdly, you basically said that an adult man who enters into a consenting sexual relationship with another man is just as bad as a man who rapes a woman. i guess you don't know any gay people either. it really is sad to see someone's moral compass completely destroyed by religion.

Quote: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.  
i think i'm beginning to follow it, it's worded terribly... it seems like because the people of jerusalem didn't carry out the punishment, god punished the people of jerusalem.  
"God himself, by the army of the Chaldeans, put it in execution upon Jerusalem"

fair assessment? or if you prefer we can just leave this passage out, cos it really is incoherent

Quote: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.

"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."

Quote: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.

uh, the bible actually intructs an extremely violent response, and you quoted matthew henry's tripe to try to justify it.

Quote: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.

did you really?

perhaps you could quote the verse(s) in Genesis, the first book in the bible, that explain just who this Satan is and make it clear that the snake who tempted eve is indeed this character Satan.

Quote: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. doesn't necessarily exist at all, then?

Quote: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?

my moral authority is higher than your god's. for starters, you haven't even proven he exists at all, let alone that he is supremely "good". it's also higher than yours. i'll justify that just by reminding everyone that you have

-a- justified the slaughter of innocent people for the crimes of others

-b- been given two clear opportunities to register any objection to the slaughter of innocent children

-c- asserted that a homosexual who has sex with another consenting adult is as bad as a man who forcibly rapes a woman

don't get me wrong, i don't claim to be some ultimate moral authority. i will however claim that my morals are better than your god's and better than yours.

Quote: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.

oh, if it's a test of whether you will do whatever your boss tells you no matter how evil it is, then sure, abraham passes and i emphatically won't. but like i said, some of us actually have morals.

also, "god has never required human sacrifice"? how are you defining "sacrifice"? according to the bible he wipes all huge numbers of innocent people, including children, and also instructs his

followers to do the same.

Quote: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.

compassion can compel us to do something wrong, like refrain from murdering a close friend or family member who tells us their religious views.

three cheers for compassion, i say.

Quote: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! uh no, because moral considerations are based on a little more than just immediate happiness.

Quote: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. and yet when i say these particular bible verses are evil, you justify them.

Quote: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. indeed. anyone reading this thread can see the difference between our moral standards.

Quote: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.

no, i don't think the problem was that you were too literal, i think the problem is that you don't understand how the mind works.

remember the first religious debate between you and i? you kept saying that if you won't believe anything without proof, you're a "hopeless case". you said that anyone who finds your religion unconvincing is "desperately trying to find an excuse because they want an easier path".

Quote: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."

oh dear what? you don't see my point? saying that there was this guy who had these moral ideas, that doesn't need much evidence. the moral ideas can be considered on their own merits, and that could happen even if the entire Jesus story was entirely made up and someone just wrote down the story including the moral teachings from their own imagination.

but that's not what Christians claim, is it?

whether proof is required depends upon the believability of the story and the importance of its implications. in the case of Christianity we have an absurd story that isn't even internally consistent and whose authorship is dubious, and we have monumentally large implications. with that combination, extraordinary proof is required.

we don't even have ordinary proof. however, earlier you said there was... that didn't go very well, did it?

Quote:Spooky wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 Again, 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 Quran's.  
so Muslims have greater faith than you, basically?

Quote:Spooky wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 Here'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.  
so you basically think yourself above democratic laws?

Quote:Spooky wrote on Wed, 31 March 2010 02:13 Quote: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?

my question was: if the majority of us don't want to live under a religious dictatorship, can we change it? you answer: if the majority is part of the lawmaking process, then yes. well, the whole

concept of a dictatorship is that what the majority wants is entirely irrelevant. it's what the boss wants that counts.

Quote: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  
blast. i thought you were on the verge of actually improving your morals there. no such luck.

Quote: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.  
i have absolutely no idea what you're trying to say here.

Quote: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. We'll put this down to the sheer incompetence and absurdity of the revelation.

Quote: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)
- hmm.

1. Hear the message (Romans 10:17)  
So faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ.  
what exactly is the message?

2. Believe it (Mark 16:16)  
Whoever believes and is baptized will be saved, but whoever does not believe will be condemned.  
carrot and stick! shame we're talking about thoughtcrime here. see my earlier objections. and shall we be really clear about what is meant by "saved" and by "condemned"?



### 3. Repent of your past sins (Acts 2: 38)

And Peter said to them, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins, and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.

what if the sins themselves are bullshit?

what if i do do something wrong, but i don't accept that god or jesus has any place to forgive me?

i'm reminded again of our earlier religious debate. you said that you'd done things which you would deserve to go to hell for if you hadn't "repented". well, that's quite a daring admission, telling us that you'd done something so evil that it would justify the most horrific punishment of all. (unless you're arguing that god and his punishments are unjust, and you've never seemed to think that)

well, i couldn't help but ask what those things were. what were these horrific crimes you committed? you wouldn't say. i also asked how you define "repented". you said that it basically means asking for forgiveness in private prayer or in church.

interesting, that. if i thought i had done something so appalling evil, so damaging to the world around me that it would justify me receiving the very worst punishment imaginable, i can't imagine how just saying sorry in a church could possibly make up for it.

finally... "and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit". what's that then?

### 4. State that you believe christ is the son of God (Romans 10:10)

For with the heart one believes and is justified, and with the mouth one confesses and is saved.

well, i don't believe that. i do have a question, though.

what would you prefer?

person A doesn't believe this, and says so honestly.

person B says he believes this, and you don't have any way of really knowing whether he's telling the truth or just wants you to shut the fuck up.

### 5. Be baptized (Acts 2: 38)

uh, same as step 3?

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

Do not fear what you are about to suffer. Behold, the devil is about to throw some of you into prison, that you may be tested, and for ten days you will have tribulation. Be faithful unto death, and I will give you the crown of life.

it's 'Revelation', not 'Revelations.' i'm not usually this pedantic, but it's astonishing how many times christians wrongly use the plural.

anyway.

is this only addressed to people who are about to be thrown into prison, or about to encounter the devil? or can we ignore the first two sentences and it's the third that applies to everyone at all times?

well, "be faithful". define that for me, please. you'd also better explain what "the crown of life" is.

---