
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 06 Apr 2010 15:14:55 GMT

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

Altzan wrote on Mon, 05 April 2010 22:27Spoony 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.

of the three really sick moral opinions of yours i posted, you only seem to feel defensive about one of them...

Quote: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.

dude, do yourself a favour, don't lie. don't act like i twisted your words, don't act like i misrepresented your statement. you won't get away with it and you make yourself look much worse by trying.

i asked you very clearly how you define "repenting" if you do something wrong. you said: ask forgiveness in church if it's a public sin, ask forgiveness through prayer if it's a private sin. i immediately responded by saying: what, so nothing about apologising to the actual people you affected, nothing about trying to rectify a situation you made worse? you didn't reply with ANY indication that you thought either of those was important.

Quote: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. what has he given others?

Quote: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?

and what if it's not morally wrong? what if it's a basic human right god is condemning? it's not automatically bad just because your monster of a god doesn't like it.

Quote: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.
on what basis do you say he was wrong to make the offer?

Quote:I also wonder how you know the other man didn't get punished.
i found no report that he did, and neither did you.

Quote: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.
actually, the bible gives plenty of situations when murder is positively recommended and a few when it's flat-out ordered. same goes for slavery and rape.

Quote: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.
what a cowardly, euphemistic answer.

the law is sick and immoral, there's no two ways about it. and if it came from god, then god's sick and immoral too.

yes, civilisation was different back then. they had really shitty morals. you can tell just by reading books written at the time, most obviously the bible. thank god we don't have huge numbers of people trying to live their lives based on the moral standards of primitive middle-east barbarians.

oh wait, we do, don't we

Quote: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?

firstly, god condemns homosexuality worse than rape. the punishment ordered for homosexuality is worse than rape, and the punishment for the woman victim of rape is worse than for the male offender.

secondly, do you really want to say your god condemns all sins equally? that would not put god in a good light.

Quote: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.
rollseyes

it's time to admit you were totally wrong again, dude.

Quote: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.

there's no mention of satan at all in genesis, and very little mention in the entire old testament. it isn't until at least a thousand years later than men decide to invent the idea of "satan" as you probably think of him now. you really have to try very hard to apply the much later inventions to the much earlier passages, and like you said about deities, if the writers of genesis said the snake was possessed by insert-power-here, they would have said so. what was all that about don't add anything into the bible?

Quote: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.

again, you're trying way too hard here. god's obviously just pissed at the snake, and he's punishing all snakes, not just the one who was there. as, of course, is his unjust and vindictive nature.

Quote: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?

if you read the statement you just quoted you'll see i actually did answer the question.

Quote: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.

here it is:

"Actually, the people wanting proof are those desperately looking for a reason not to believe something they don't want to believe because they want an easier path."

Quote: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.
are you kidding?

i'll be generous and give you a version of events from someone claiming to be a christian.

http://www.religioustolerance.org/xmas_lib.htm

Quote: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.

sigh... this is nearly as bad as the stuff i've already debunked. there's nothing there that some other book couldn't have said. for a lot of it you really have to struggle to "interpret" (the christian euphemism for "it looks wrong, let's see if we can change it so we get the answer we wanted"), plus there are plenty of cases where the scientific assertions of the bible are flat out wrong, like when it says pi is 3, for example.

finally, all this dodges the most important question i asked. if you find something in the bible that turns out to be useful knowledge, why does that vindicate the entire bible?

Quote: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.

that doesn't answer my question.

Quote: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.

you're talking complete bullshit here, dude. it seems very obvious to me you're just trying to avoid the fact that there were a lot of things i said you simply couldn't think of an answer to.

Quote: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."
and yet you admitted that you did "sin"...

Quote:Ok, but...
Why am I a bad person for not wanting to list actions I have done that I don't feel proud of?
that's not the part that makes you a bad person.

Quote: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?
i.e. the thing you originally threatened them with? calling that "saved" is like using the word "protection" to describe a mafia give-us-money-and-we-won't-kill-you deal.

Quote: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.
Do you seriously believe that everyone claiming to be a Christian actually is?

Don't you think that the endless threats and bullying and intimidation might be a big part of why so many people don't feel secure being honest about their religious views?

And don't you think that this would be an evil climate to perpetuate, since it would mean that a huge number of people would end up going to hell just because they were too scared to actually speak up about their doubts?

Quote: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. You are entirely choosing for yourself, on no basis whatsoever, which parts of the bible apply to you. Just be honest with yourself and admit that this is what you are doing.

Quote: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.

k.

so, you asked earlier what i thought of the five-step plan? it's shit.
