
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2010 03:27:56 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote:No, that you THINK I have no morals, which is helped along by you twisting my words so often.

and in what instance did i "twist your words"? you said you would murder your innocent child if god instructed you to. you justified the slaughter of innocent children if someone else in the city had a different religious opinion. you said homosexuality is as bad as rape. i don't need to twist anything here.

You just did.

I did not, NOT, say homosexuality is as bad as rape.

I'll get to that later.

You also asked what I believe I should do if I sinned. I replied saying I'd make a public confession at church. Next, you describe me as someone who thinks they can do horrible actions and not have to apologize to anyone but my congregation and God, and not to whoever I might have harmed or wronged.

You twisted my words there, since you did not mention anyone else in your question... if I wronged somebody, then a sincere apology and request for forgiveness from them is due and needed. But you represented me as one who did not think that.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47did god give you anything? life, health, prosperity etc?

I don't think God has given me anything more than what he has given others... I don't get special treatment from him, physical-wise, just for my faith in him.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote: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.

i really feel sorry for you... i really, really do. you've been completely corrupted by religion.

Maybe you should reply to my point instead of making mocking comments.

If something is morally wrong, then why is it God's fault for condemning it?

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote: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?

i did answer that, actually.

You didn't, really. You first made a point out of the specific situation, and I replied by generalizing it. Then you started asking me questions about democracy.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47so you're saying the only reason the bible does not condemn this man is thanks to lack of space? well, firstly the bible rambles on and on and on and

on. secondly the story basically happens twice (this one, and lot/sodom and gomorrah), and the man who decided to throw defenceless girls at the mob of rapists got off without so much as a slap on the wrist both times.

Lot (the Sodom/Gomorrah man) didn't 'throw defenseless girls at mobs of rapists'... although he came close to. And he was wrong to make the offer.

I also wonder how you know the other man didn't get punished.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote:Besides... man throws girl to save self, girl dies... how is that NOT murder?

you're admitting the guy was morally wrong, so why doesn't the bible condemn it?

He committed murder, yes? (I don't see how it couldn't be.) God condemns murder.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47do you think that is a good rule for cases of rape?

Of course not, we live in different times now. Civilization was a lot different back then. I have never lived in those times so I can't say how good or bad that law was.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47here's what i asked.

"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"

you answered:

"No sin is worse than another."

and that's all you said on the subject. you said neither was worse than the other. it's right there.

You asked what was worse in terms of sin.

I said that God will not condemn a man for one act more than over another.

I made no comment regarding which act was worse.

How can you confuse the two?

Do you think it makes sense to 'rank' sins?

But let me satisfy your curiosity. Sins and laws aside... which do I think is worse? Definitely rape. By far.

Nothing to twist there.

And if you in all honesty misinterpreted my post, or did not make your query clear, I will admit it could be my fault as much as yours that it happened. But there are my views, and I will clarify if needed.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47quote it all, hmm? everything in genesis explaining who satan is and explaining that the snake was satan.

The Bible does not explicitly name the snake as Satan, but basic logic confirms it.

For one, animals couldn't talk, and no human possessed the snake and made it speak.

That leaves three options, God, Satan, or some other diety. Obviously it wasn't God. And if

another diety existed, the Bible either would have made no mention of it at all or would have gone on in further detail.
So it must have been Satan.

Also, the prophecy made (not that you believe they're valid, but anyway) said, as God was cursing the snake, 'You and man are now enemies, and man will bruise your head, and you will bruise his heel.'

The bruised heel represents Jesus dying on the cross, and the bruised head represents Jesus' resurrection.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47nowhere? the human species has existed for hundreds of thousands of years. we learn more all the time. for example, our moral standards are a lot better than they were two thousand years ago. just look at how crappy the morals were of the men who wrote the bible, look at what shitty ideas they had.

You didn't say anything about the origin of morals. They didn't just 'appear' when humans did, did they?

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote: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.

this was the same post or nearby as the "hopeless case" remark

That doesn't help much.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45that isn't even internally consistent

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

the gospels can't agree on almost anything.

I've read from each many times and I have no idea what you might be referring to.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45and we have monumentally large implications.

What?

heaven and hell?

Ah, I suppose that was obvious, sorry.

I'll use the dictionary next time.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47lol? i replied to everything i saw, and all of it horribly feeble.

"Everything you saw" didn't include hyperlinks in the article?

But Okay, here you go.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47well, yeah. their religion is even more incomprehensible

and absurd than yours, so they must have more faith if they believe in it, right?

Faith isn't a measurable concept, you know.
You can't have more or less faith. You have it or you don't.
What you have faith IN, is a different matter.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote: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.
i'm still confused as to your point

sigh Let me try once more.
I said I wouldn't attempt to refute an opinion.
You asked why I tried to refute your verses/claim with Matthew Henry.
I said it was because your verses/claim was not an opinion.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 02 April 2010 06:45i'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.
and doesn't that suck?

Duh, no.
"OK, don't sin or you'll suffer the consequences!...well, unless it's a really small sin, you know, those don't count."

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote: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?
whoah there. i didn't say i'd done anything so bad that it would justify me receiving the very worst punishment imaginable. even if i had committed murder, the penalty would be less harsh than hell.

Ok, but...
Why am I a bad person for not wanting to list actions I have done that I don't feel proud of?

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote: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.
save them from what?

Hell?

In other words, if you outright said no, I don't believe this, I'd try and talk to you about it, and if you continued to decline and ask me not to bother you anymore with it, etc, I'd do so.

But if you said you did believe, got baptized, worshipped with us and so forth, but you really didn't, I would have no way of knowing, and couldn't do anything.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Quote:He was speaking to the imminent prisoners at the time, but the message is not addressed to just specifically them, but to everyone.

how do you know? remember, you said earlier that a particular verse is only applicable to the israelites.

Right, because they were in different circumstances. They had to move about and interact with other groups, and that was one of God's commands regarding that.

Here, he was speaking to them about how to remain faithful and be saved. Seeing as how that is the same thing we are to do today, the statement applies to us in today's time as well.

Spoony wrote on Sat, 03 April 2010 23:47Spoony 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.

are you sure that's what "faithful" means? usually "faith" seems more to do with believing stuff without evidence.

I meant in terms of "be faithful and obey". Yes, faith does involve belief in the unseen, which is included in the meaning of the verse, but it also means obeying his commandments, such as what I listed above.
