
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Altzan](#) on Sat, 10 Apr 2010 02:18:45 GMT

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

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00Quote: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.

Again, because you never gave me the chance. Or perhaps it's better to say you set the impression that I couldn't... it was awhile ago. But I distinctly remember reading that accusation and wanting to reply to it, yet could not.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00just answer the question.... what has god given your average person?

...Whatever the average man gets today?
I know it varies greatly, thanks to combination of ancestors' actions and plain luck, though.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00which come from you, not the bible. there's no condemnation of his action in the bible, and plenty of opportunity to.

'Plenty of opportunity to'. I don't see how you came to that conclusion. If there was, there'd be plenty of opportunity to condemn every sinful action, not just particular ones.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00remember, lot's basically saved from the destruction of the city on the grounds that he's the only righteous man there, right?

Yes, him and his family.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00if 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"

He wasn't trying to save himself, he was trying to save the angels that were visiting him (although I wonder why he thought angels needed saving).

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00you 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.

That's physical punishment, not spiritual. Hell isn't a Dante's inferno, with specific levels for each magnitude of sin.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00shouldn't the jail term for murdering a child be longer than for smoking a joint in the privacy of your own home?

Yes, provided it is a jail term.
The Spiritual jail won't have terms, though...

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00i'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?

I assume you're referring to this verse?

"Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God [am] a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth [generation] of them that hate me;"

That's referring to idols.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00and do you believe in the concept of original sin?

I looked it up, and assuming it means "we inherit the sins of our ancestors, including Adam, along with our own", then no, I do not.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00Quote: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.

The chicken lays the egg, yes. Morals grow over time, improve over time (I hope). But there has to be an origin.

So are you saying that when man was created/born/whatever, they started out with a basic sense of morals already implanted within his conscience?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00Quote: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...

I was going to say, because they just haven't, but you did just raise an interesting point here.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00Quote: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?

Well, what about the rock layers where literally thousands of fossils are all in the same area, as if

they had all died at once, or created at once?

What about the flood fossils?

Dr. John R. Horner in Digging for Dinosaurs stated, "Judging from the concentration of bones in various pits, there were 30 million fossil fragments in that area. At a conservative estimate, we had discovered the tomb of 10,000 dinosaurs. There was a flood. This was no ordinary spring flood from one of the streams in the area but a catastrophic inundation. . . That's our best explanation. It seems to make the most sense, and on the basis of it we believe that this was a living, breathing group of dinosaurs destroyed in one catastrophic moment."

Or,

"When the carbon-14 dating method is "correctly" calibrated, and 25-thousand radiocarbon dates are graphed, the result shows evidence of a great peak of deaths about 4-thousand years ago."

Or,

"Thousands and millions of fish fossils which retain all the body parts indicating very rapid burial. Under normal conditions, fish do not fossilize. Dead fish are torn apart by scavengers and disintegrated by bacteria. There are the existence of fossils with soft tissue like jellyfish and sponges. There are the preservation of animal tracts, fish odors, amino acids, proteins, epidermal bark in plants, cell details, chlorophyll, etc."

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00surely you'd need more faith to believe something if there was less evidence for it?

No, you would need faith but not more faith.

Still, I'm not the authority on faith and measurement, so I guess faith can be considered measurable.

But that's not how I view it, because then the question remains of how much is enough? What amount of faith just doesn't cut it?

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00Quote: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!

The analogy still makes no sense. The mafia in this case isn't the only danger out there, there's many other dangers that can happen that are totally unrelated to the mafia. And the mafia aren't the ruling body in the situation.

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00Quote: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?

I have little opportunity, since those types of radicals are rare around here. The closest one I know

of (different state too) is the Baptist group in Kansas (Fred Phelps) who state that the deaths of US soldiers in Iraq was caused by God as punishment for committing homosexuality (which is ridiculous).

They've also said that the recent mining accident was caused by God because of America's "tolerance".

Spoony wrote on Thu, 08 April 2010 05:00I 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.

I did some looking into this.

One man I found said that the laws can be views in different lights... such as the "civil" view, where the laws of the time don't apply today because they were for a specific people of a specific time, like today's taxes, road laws, and such.

Another view was the "moral" one, where the only laws from the OT we should obey are ones not repealed by the NT and the Ten Commandments (Except Sabbath which was repealed).

He also said that the OT was mostly for our understanding while the NT was for application... and that "All of the Bible is FOR us but not all of it is TO us".

I'm not specifically siding with his views, although I think the "moral" view sounds the most plausible.
