
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Thu, 08 Apr 2010 10:00:22 GMT

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

Altzan wrote on Wed, 07 April 2010 23:00 You never gave me a chance.

I didn't mention apologies to people because you didn't ask. I focused on the sin itself and not on who I might have committed it against - it never even crossed my mind, to be honest, since you gave no indication whatsoever that one was involved.

Of course it didn't cross your mind, and that says it all.

Quote:After I replied, you didn't ASK anything. You said this:

Quote:This is what I expected, which only reaffirms my earlier statement that you really don't know right from wrong. You say nothing of actually apologising to people you wronged, nor of trying to make amends for a situation you affected. No, never mind that - you just try to please your imaginary friend.

That's not a query, it's a label, and a wrong one. You can't call me out on something you NEVER MENTIONED.

And you didn't challenge it.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14 Quote: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?

No, no, I meant that I don't get anything extra compared to others, based on belief. just answer the question.... what has god given your average person?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14 Quote: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?

Those morals you mention?

which come from you, not the bible. there's no condemnation of his action in the bible, and plenty of opportunity to. remember, lot's basically saved from the destruction of the city on the grounds that he's the only righteous man there, right?

incidentally, i recall they were told to just get the hell out of there without looking back at the carnage. lot's wife turned back to look, and for this terrible crime she was turned into a pillar of salt (?!)

if god can take the time to kill (presumably) a woman just because she took a glance back while fleeing from a collapsing city, you'd think he could take the time to say "lot, you shouldn't have offered those girls to the rape mob to save yourself"

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14 Quote: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.

I'm not understanding what you're getting at here.

i don't know why.

you keep saying god won't punish one sin worse than another even if one act is worse. the bible seems to contradict this view. homosexual sex, never mind if it's consenting adults (the idea that this makes no difference shows just how crap the bible's authors' morals were), entails a much worse penalty than the penalty for a man who rapes a woman.

(indeed, it seems like a man who particularly wants to marry a woman doesn't need to worry about whether she or her family approves of the marriage. he can just rape her, and then boom, she's forced to marry him. all he's gotta do is pay off her dad.)

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14secondly, do you really want to say your god condemns all sins equally? that would not put god in a good light.

I'd love to hear why you think he should condemn certain sins less than others.

basic moral sense?

shouldn't the jail term for murdering a child be longer than for smoking a joint in the privacy of your own home?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14there'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?

He's mentioned in the Old Testament more than 'very little'. God even has a conversation with him regularly, in Job.

of course, and the depiction there is not at all like the current idea of satan. he comes across as like a prosecutor in a heavenly court, who needs god's permission to do anything to torment the faithful job. god freely and repeatedly gives it, f course.

Quote:Quote: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.

Defending the snakes? How appropriate.

"the snakes"... tell me, why are all snakes guilty of a crime committed by one snake?

i'm not really defending snakes, i'm criticising the idea of punishing innocents for the crimes of someone else, which happens over and over and over again in the bible. need an example? when the ten commandments are given, it is stated that god won't just punish people who break them, he'll punish their succeeding generations, their sons, grandsons etc. what the fuck is moral about that?

in the old testament it says that a child born out of wedlock can't enter the kingdom. well, why's that the child's fault?

and do you believe in the concept of original sin?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14Quote: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.

You explained how they evolved over time. Not their origin.
read what you just said there buddy

Quote:Unless you are saying man made up morals as he went along...

But how does that make sense?

why doesn't it make sense? the men who wrote the bible did the same, and our modern understanding of morality is a hell of a lot better than theirs was.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14here 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."

I am wrong with that statement too, then.
good of you to acknowledge that.

Quote:He sure seems to comment a lot on Jesus' birth... but nothing concrete.

One gospel says Joseph was his father, another that he was the son of a virgin. Well, calling Joseph his father hardly means his biological one, does it?

Another doesn't even mention the birth... well, how does that indicate that they didn't believe in it? you'd think they could at least get the details of Jesus' life right, considering how crucial they must have thought it was.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14sigh... this is nearly as bad as the stuff i've already debunked. there's nothing there that some other book couldn't have said.

Yet they didn't.

how do you know? the christian authorities went on a rampage against the greek schools of philosophy, for example...

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14all 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?

I never said it would.

then my original question still remains unanswered: where's the evidence supporting the account as reported in Genesis?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14Quote: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.

I did. The answer is no, because faith isn't measurable.
surely you'd need more faith to believe something if there was less evidence for it?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14i.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.

How? The mafia's the one setting up the danger they'll protect you from.
BINGO!

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14Don'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?

Don't you think I'm just as opposed to these types of bullies as you are?
how often and how loudly do you say so?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Tue, 06 April 2010 10:14And 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?

Yes, I do.
i'm glad you agree.

Quote:Quote: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.

I won't 'admit' that because it's wrong.
So, go on if you like.
Of course it's true.

I hear all the time from Christians that certain parts of the Bible are either "metaphors" (meaning "we used to take it literally but it's just too ridiculous for modern people to believe), or "don't apply to modern life" (meaning "it's morally repulsive, we get that now")

They usually don't all come to the same conclusion about each thing, though.

Take the rape rule, for example. The really sick one, that forces a rape victim to spend the rest of her life as the semi-property of the bastard who violated her. Tell me, at what part in the New

Testament does Jesus say "by the way, that old rape rule, well, god's really embarrassed at inflicting such an evil doctrine upon you. it doesn't count now and i hope you'll forgive god for enforcing such a repulsive law upon you, and we're incredibly sorry for the women's lives that have been completely ruined by it", because I must have missed that in the gospels.
