
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sun, 04 Apr 2010 04:41:51 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45a 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.

Why does it suck by definition? And under what circumstances?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45because until you've gotten past that square one, most of your assertions are at best a waste of time.

Then yours are too, because you haven't proved he doesn't exist. And I see no reason why anyone's assertions are valid until one or the other is proven... based on what you said anyway.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45so 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?

One of the main reasons I don't think it came from God is the morals themselves.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45Quote: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.

-a- OK

-b- That's been plainly obvious for awhile... even if there's a higher power, you want to be in control.

-c- I've only heard you challenge OT rules so far.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45your 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.

No, that you THINK I have no morals, which is helped along by you twisting my words so often.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45my 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...

I see no problem with saying grace, but the others I don't agree with.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45"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.

"basic human rights"

Which ones do you think he denies?

"democracy"

Mmm-hmm.

"intellectual freedom"

And what would that be?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45wanting 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.

It is if you shouldn't want it at all, if it is wrong.

Of course, you probably don't think they're wrong... ah, morals.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45having a different religious opinion is not even a crime at all

You still haven't answered my question regarding that...

Why should anyone go free of a law, ANY law, just because they don't agree with it?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45odd to use the word "defense" to explain the supposed behaviour of the israelites...

Why? Do you think the other groups wanted to live in peaceful tolerance with them?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45why 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.

Right, the Bible really has space to say things about every sinner in history.

Besides... man throws girl to save self, girl dies... how is that NOT murder?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45well, 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?

In Old Testament, yes. Sins we do today won't have a ranking system in judgement.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45secondly, 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?

Who today holds that moral position?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45thirdly, 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.

No, I did not say that. I said that God won't rate either act a worse sin than the other in judgement. I didn't say I thought neither act was worse in itself than the other.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45i 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

Incoherent it is... yeah, let's just leave it out.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45"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."

Yeah, it's no longer a law to put idolaters to the sword.

But it's still a sin, and they'll be judged by it.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45perhaps 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.

Genesis 3 explains it pretty well, especially the prophecy made in verse 15.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45oh, 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.

Yet you think that morals came from basically nowhere in particular... and that that isn't ridiculous.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45compassion 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.

Kinda conflicts with your above quote...

So much for morals.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45Quote: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.

Once again, you read too far into the example to avoid acknowledging it.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45remember 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".

I was wrong to say that.

Also, I said it once, not "kept saying".

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45you said that anyone who finds your religion unconvincing is "desperately trying to find an excuse because they want an easier path".

Quote me, since I have no idea what you're referring to.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45in the case of christianity we have an absurd story

Opinion.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45that isn't even internally consistent

I have yet to see evidence it isn't...

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45and whose authorship is dubious

I'll give you that, but it's safe to say any ancient writing has dubious authorship.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45and we have monumentally large implications.

What?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45we don't even have ordinary proof. however, earlier you said there was... that didn't go very well, did it?

No, it didn't. Because you didn't even read the entire thing. You skipped all the -ology sections.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45so muslims have greater faith than you, basically?

Implying that less proof = more faith?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45Quote: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.
so you basically think yourself above democratic laws?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45my 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.

That wasn't what you asked, unless I misread you.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45it's what the boss wants that counts.

And you've basically said you want to be that boss, or at least one of them.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45Quote: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.

You quoting scripture and pointing at it is NOT an opinion, it's a point you were trying to make. So I replied in kind.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:451. Hear the message (Romans 10:17)
So faith comes from hearing, and hearing through the word of Christ.
what exactly is the message?

Basically, the plan.
And the Bible as a whole.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:452. 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.

I have, believe me.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:453. 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.

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)

"so evil"? It doesn't have to be "So evil" to trigger that.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45well, i couldn't help but ask what those things were. what

were these horrific crimes you committed? you wouldn't say.

Well, if someone asked you to list the morally unjust things you've done that have violated your moral code, would you list them all?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45 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.

"appallingly evil"? "So damaging to the world"?
Your whole sentence hangs on those two vague and unexplained phrases.
Care to interpret?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45finally... "and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit".
what's that then?

Heaven?

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:454. 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.

What I'd prefer?
Person A, myself.
Because with Person B, I don't even have a chance to save them.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:455. Be baptized (Acts 2: 38)
uh, same as step 3?

Same verse, yeah, but not same step.
There are other verses though.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45[b]6. Live faithfully until Death (Revelations 2: 10)
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?

He was speaking to the imminent prisoners at the time, but the message is not addressed to just specifically them, but to everyone.

Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45well, "be faithful". define that for me, please. you'd also better explain what "the crown of life" is.

"be faithful"

Follow the commandments in the Bible, like weekly worship, Lord's Supper, behaviour and conduct, avoidance of sins...

"crown of life"

Same as "gift of the Holy Spirit".

snpr1101 wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45Now I'm not really sure as to how Altzan came to the conclusion that one is worse than the other (maybe there's some sort of point system in the bible that i missed aka 10 points for rape, yay I win!), but I think in his view, they are both sins.

Yeah, Spoony didn't give me much of a chance to justify my statement, did he? Jumped all over it and spread it around before I could tell him he was wrong.

As I said earlier, "I said that God won't rate either act a worse sin than the other in judgement. I didn't say I thought neither act was worse in itself than the other."
