
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sat, 10 Apr 2010 05:29:33 GMT

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

Quote: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.

do you think you have god to thank for your life, for example?

Quote: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.

see re: god has time to turn lot's wife into a pillar of salt (wtf? plenty of god's punishments are creatively vicious, but that one's just weird) just because she looked behind her.

Quote: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.

so after god and the angels save him, don't you think god ought to say hang on lot, i got you out of there because you were the only good man in the city, now i find you throwing defenceless girls at a mob of rapists so the men will survive?

Quote: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).

not much of a difference, it's just an indicator of how backward the men who wrote the bible were.

Quote: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.

give me a complete description of hell, please.

i.e. tell me everything you 'know' about it.

[quote]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...[/quote
why?

Quote:"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.

yes. punishment of innocents for the crime of someone else, assuming that worshipping something other than this particular god actually is a crime.

plus the other example i mentioned (i.e. children can't enter the kingdom of god if their parents were not married. it's hardly the kid's fault, is it?). plus the egyptian firstborn, there's another example...

Quote: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.
good

Quote: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?

well, consider morals like intelligence. some animals are more intelligent than others, right? some animals are also more 'moral' than others, i.e. concerned for their family, for their fellow creatures acting in a group, etc.

it seems quite likely that the reason for that is simply evolutionary. it suits them to work as a team so they become naturally pre-disposed to thinking that way. same with us... most of us generally have a sense of human solidarity.

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

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?

Exactly... what about them? If you're trying to vindicate noah's flood, that wouldn't vindicate the rest of genesis... creation is what i was asking about.

still...

Quote: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."

"catastrophic inundation" != "deliberate flooding of the whole world, covering the entire planet up to the highest mountains, with a few of each animal and a handful of humans intentionally permitted to survive by the psycho who carried out the genocide"

Quote: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." even more vague

Quote: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."

fish were killed in the flood? first time i've heard that from someone who actually believes in it.

Quote: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?

it's a stupid question about an extremely stupid subject, really, isn't it?

Quote: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. you said the danger that you need "saving" from is hell.

two questions.

1: who created hell, and who is responsible for deciding whether we go there?

2: who is telling us about this punishment?

Quote:And the mafia aren't the ruling body in the situation.

hey, might makes right doesn't cut it for me, but earlier on in the thread it seemed to be good enough for you...

Quote: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".

Well, I can easily call that ridiculous, but on what basis do you call it ridiculous? in the bible, natural disasters like earthquakes and plagues are always because god's pissed at something. when did god announce he was not going to do that anymore?

Quote: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.

this just brings me back to my earlier point. there are differing views, and you don't seem entirely clear yourself... so couldn't the "revelation" have been made a bit more clear?
