
Subject: pawkyfox's Another Thread

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 10 Oct 2008 21:24:02 GMT

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

pawkyfox wrote on Wed, 08 October 2008 21:10 Do you believe in God?

Yes, I am Christian. A prophecy was written and Jesus came and fulfilled the prophecy; it could not have been an accident. I would like to talk more about my beliefs but maybe in another thread. so... here's the another thread. where to begin?

let's ignore the rather awkward fact that we have no real proof Jesus existed at all... take the bible as proof, if you like. so let's look at that proof.

the four gospels, which in any case were written long, long after Jesus' supposed death, wildly disagree on every single major event of his life. the virgin birth, Jesus' lineage, the 'flight into Egypt', the sermon on the mount, Judas' betrayal, Peter's denial, the crucifixion and the resurrection.

it isn't hard to figure out that the new testament is full of lame attempts to make the original messiah prophecies come out right; there's a very telling sentence in Matthew where he actually says so. "All of this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet." this was referring to Jesus' travel into Jerusalem riding an ass, 'prophecied' back in the old testament. another example, Luke makes an ultimately vain attempt to make the whole business take place around the right time by giving three historical references happening at the time of Jesus' birth; the name of the king of Syria, the fact Herod ruled Judea, and the fact Emperor Augustus was running a census at the time. problem is, though, these don't even match up to the right date. nice try, but historically it falls on its face.

moving on the virgin birth itself; read the new testament and please point out a verse for me where Jesus says his mother was a virgin, or her apparently having recollection at all of giving birth without first having sex (cos you'd think that was remarkable, wouldn't you...?), or being visited by angels and so on.

and where did the virgin birth take place? Bethlehem, right? in John's gospel, people very specifically say how surprised they are that Jesus was not born in Bethlehem like the prophecy said he would be. the other gospels say he was born in Bethlehem, but can't agree how his parents got there. again, this is your basis for believing in Christianity?

what else? well, Jesus was descended from kings, wasn't he? right back to the line of David? shame the gospels wildly disagree on that too, a massive difference in the number of generations stretching back from Joseph. that's if we're assuming Joseph's lineage means a damn thing, cos I thought he had no part in the conception in any case?

I could go on; the point is obvious. the only 'evidence' for Jesus' existence at all (never mind his supposed divinity and ability to redeem and so on) is a book which horribly contradicts itself at every turn, is full of historical wrongness, and quite evidently contains a bunch of usually feeble contortions to make the original prophecies look like they've come true.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Jamie or NuneGa](#) on Fri, 10 Oct 2008 21:29:12 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

my position on christianity = some people need that belief to help them get through life. Others don't.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 10 Oct 2008 21:31:11 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Actually, there is proof that Jesus existed and that he did consider himself to be the messiah. Problem is, he wasn't the only one, nor was he the only one to actually be crucified for it.

Oh, and you forgot to mention the part where it states, in the gospels (I forget which one, specifically), that Jesus was the only one to ever ascend into Heaven, yet in the Old Testament, Ezekiel is ascended.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [KIRBY-098](#) on Sat, 11 Oct 2008 03:13:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Apparently you've never heard of the Roman historian Josephus.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [R315r4z0r](#) on Sat, 11 Oct 2008 03:18:15 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Actually Jesus did exist and was a major contributor to the spread of Christianity in his time. The fact he actually considered himself as the messiah is a totally separate matter.. but he existed none the less.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Nukelt15](#) on Sat, 11 Oct 2008 05:06:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quote:Actually Jesus did exist and was a major contributor to the spread of Christianity in his time. The fact he actually considered himself as the messiah is a totally separate matter.. but he existed none the less.

I'd normally not poke my head into somebody else's religion like this, but Jesus could not have contributed to the spread of Christianity in his own time. Certainly, his legacy contributed to the

spread of Christianity, but the religion simply didn't exist before Saul of Tarsus (better known as Paul) came along. Until that time, "Christianity" was nothing more nor less than a reformist movement within Judaism. That is what Jesus contributed to the spread of during his lifetime. The fact that his movement took root and later split with Judaism to become its own faith was not the result of any action he took before being crucified.

Whether or not he made any direct contribution after being crucified depends greatly on your sources and beliefs, but it is an incontrovertible fact that there were no Christians while Jesus was alive. His followers and their followers neither called nor considered themselves such until long afterwards.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sat, 11 Oct 2008 09:15:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

jesus christ
he might cry when he reads this

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Quackpunk](#) on Thu, 16 Oct 2008 01:21:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 10 October 2008 16:31 Actually, there is proof that Jesus existed and that he did consider himself to be the messiah. Problem is, he wasn't the only one, nor was he the only one to actually be crucified for it.

Oh, and you forgot to mention the part where it states, in the gospels (I forget which one, specifically), that Jesus was the only one to ever ascend into Heaven, yet in the Old Testament, Ezekiel is ascended.

Jesus ascended into heaven to sit at the right hand of God, and begin his messianic kingdom through active-love. Elijah and Ezekiel (was it Ezekiel?.. I think it was Enoch) both ascended to heaven in physically human form.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 16 Oct 2008 13:27:45 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

So they all had their physical bodies ascend into heaven. Funny how that doesn't change what I said.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Quackpunk](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 05:06:25 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 16 October 2008 08:27 So they all had their physical bodies ascend into heaven. Funny how that doesn't change what I said.

It is not the physical aspect that the gospel is talking about. It's the spiritual nature of the ascension. I hate when people make this ridiculous arguments against the Bible, and they really have no evidence other than what they read on another I-Hate-Christianity thread.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 05:23:41 GMT

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

Jesus' physical body ascended into Heaven. I went to Catholic elementary and fundamentalist Christian high school. I used to be a Christian until the past few months. Trust me, I am not just pulling shit out of my ass from some random Christian-bashing site.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread

Posted by [Quackpunk](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 22:54:38 GMT

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

I know his physical body ascended to heaven, but that is not the aspect the gospel is referring to that makes the ascension of Jesus a first. Read my post above. And what made you quit your faith?

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 23 Oct 2008 23:11:44 GMT

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

How does one's spirit not ascend with their body, though?

As for leaving my faith... the realization that the God that is in the Bible can't possibly exist and be loving, logical, and just. Also, what kind of God would want his creation to ignore the pleasures of the world? Promises of a higher purpose that cannot possibly be proven? Pfft.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread

Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 02:16:33 GMT

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

don't say shit you know they're not going to understand, that's just mean

To put it another way... in the form of song lyrics...

Sure enough can't figure out
Why all that's good is sin
Why people choose to grovel at
The feet of some dreamed up king

Too scared to fight their own way
So easy to be sheep
Alive but dead inside
Holier than thou

Condemning all around them
They're the chosen ones
Now hypocrisy's king
Defiling everything
And at judgment's hour crumble, yeah
Crumble you mountain of power

Still signs of hope are many
Reason covers ground
Two thousand years of twisted lies
Soon just a burial mound

Too scared to fight their own way
So easy to be sheep
Alive but dead inside
Holier than thou

Condemning all around them
They're the chosen ones
Now hypocrisy's king
Defiling everything
And at judgment's hour crumble, yeah
Crumble you mountain of power

Now hypocrisy's king
Defiling everything
And at judgment's hour crumble, yeah
You mountain of power

Now hypocrisy's king
Defiling everything
And at judgment's hour crumble, yeah
You mountain of power

You mountain of power
Yeah
Mountain of power
Yeah, you mountain of...

I'd like to thank Grand Magus for this beauty of a song.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Quackpunk](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 20:01:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 23 October 2008 18:11 How does one's spirit not ascend with their body, though?

As for leaving my faith... the realization that the God that is in the Bible can't possibly exist and be loving, logical, and just. Also, what kind of God would want his creation to ignore the pleasures of the world? Promises of a higher purpose that cannot possibly be proven? Pfft.
Pleasures of this world? You mean sin? Sin is present to give man a choice between the temporary pleasure of this world verse the eternal gifts awaiting in heaven (God doesn't want robots following him). Have you ever read Brothers Karamazov, or any article related to the Grand Inquisitor Chapter in the book? God is loving and just, but who he is what he does is by NO means logical. In fact, the love that God displays towards us is of the most irrational sense out there. Trying to prove its existence based on sense and reason will only arouse more confusion and doubt. The only way to grasp this active love and the promise of eternity is by turning to Jesus Christ and his unconditional love.

Mystery is a evident characteristic of God, and if everything concerning him was proven, there would be no drive in people to know more, thus why he chooses to keep his promise, in an essence, unproven.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 20:26:06 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's just hilarious that everything that IS pleasurable is deemed as sin in the Bible. That sounds more like it's nothing more than a way to control the masses. It just fits well with the human psyche that always wants more. Like on a game show, the person can either walk with the \$5000 or jeopardize that money for more money or a better prize. Of course, you're going to get people to follow that way.

What love? The fact that he's using us as pawns in a game with Satan over our souls? What about the horrible things he's done to mankind, apparently "His" greatest and most prized creation (ie. Flood, Sodom & Gomorrah, Job, etc...)? "I love my car, so let me hit it with a brick."

Plus, I can't possibly imagine that a just God would allow billions of people to suffer for eternity

because they failed to believe in the correct faith. I'm supposed to believe that a collection of books, written by man, is somehow the absolute truth and somehow inerrant, and if I don't, I am damned for eternity? Give me a break.

Either Christians/Muslims/Jews are mistaken about the identity of their Creator or their Creator doesn't exist.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 21:22:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Think of it as training wheels. We say that our God is a loving and caring God. You would probably be a loving and caring parent right?

Think of it this way, Us (the human race) are like a 4 year old on our bike. God would be the parent running along side and helping them. So, would you rather have him continue running along side of you to catch you incase you fall? Yes, but God knows that in order to become a proficient bike rider, we have to learn to ride without having him catch us all the time when we fall. I hope you figure out where I'm going with this, as it was explained better in the book I read.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 22:02:03 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

There's a clear difference between letting you fall off of your bike and violently PUSHING you off of the bike.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Ryan3k](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 22:19:43 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I refuse to believe that the zenith of divinity is to create a giant human ant farm with the sole purpose of separating the good from the bad.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 23:45:44 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quackpunk wrote on Fri, 24 October 2008 21:01cheesesoda wrote on Thu, 23 October 2008 18:11How does one's spirit not ascend with their body, though?

As for leaving my faith... the realization that the God that is in the Bible can't possibly exist and be

loving, logical, and just. Also, what kind of God would want his creation to ignore the pleasures of the world? Promises of a higher purpose that cannot possibly be proven? Pfft.

Pleasures of this world? You mean sin? Sin is present to give man a choice between the temporary pleasure of this world verse the eternal gifts awaiting in heaven (God doesn't want robots following him). Have you ever read Brothers Karamazov, or any article related to the Grand Inquisitor Chapter in the book? God is loving and just, but who he is what he does is by NO means logical. In fact, the love that God displays towards us is of the most irrational sense out there. Trying to prove its existence based on sense and reason will only arouse more confusion and doubt. The only way to grasp this active love and the promise of eternity is by turning to Jesus Christ and his unconditional love.

Mystery is a evident characteristic of God, and if everything concerning him was proven, there would be no drive in people to know more, thus why he chooses to keep his promise, in an essence, unproven.

yeah but you only get one life, not fair if we can't experience it how you want to.

Muad Dib15 wrote on Fri, 24 October 2008 22:22 Think of it as training wheels. We say that our God is a loving and caring God. You would probably be a loving and caring parent right?

Think of it this way, Us (the human race) are like a 4 year old on our bike. God would be the parent running along side and helping them. So, would you rather have him continue running along side of you to catch you incase you fall? Yes, but God knows that in order to become a proficient bike rider, we have to learn to ride without having him catch us all the time when we fall. I hope you figure out where I'm going with this, as it was explained better in the book I read.

So you're saying.. if I fall off my bike, I'm fucked? because I sinned but God doesn't come down and give me advice (Advice being a bandage for the fall)..?

flawed if you ask me.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 23:54:47 GMT

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

RyuSo you're saying.. if I fall off my bike, I'm fucked? because I sinned but God doesn't come down and give me advice (Advice being a bandage for the fall)..?

flawed if you ask me.

No, that's not what he's saying. He's saying God lets bad things happen, so we learn. However, he didn't really address what I brought up. I was talking about where God actually participated rather than let it happen.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread

Posted by [Ryu](#) on Fri, 24 Oct 2008 23:57:13 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Sat, 25 October 2008 00:54RyuSo you're saying.. if I fall off my bike, I'm fucked? because I sinned but God doesn't come down and give me advice (Advice being a bandage for the fall)..?

flawed if you ask me.

No, that's not what he's saying. He's saying God lets bad things happen, so we learn. However, he didn't really address what I brought up. I was talking about where God actually participated rather than let it happen.

ahuh.. better wording is needed if you ask me.

ugh I hate religious topics, brb moving topic.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread

Posted by [Muad Dib15](#) on Sat, 25 Oct 2008 19:04:49 GMT

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

As I said before, it was explained better in the book Angels and Demons, which is written by the guy who wrote The Davinci Code and is the book before it.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread

Posted by [Quackpunk](#) on Mon, 27 Oct 2008 06:20:24 GMT

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

cheesesoda wrote on Fri, 24 October 2008 15:26It's just hilarious that everything that IS pleasurable is deemed as sin in the Bible. That sounds more like it's nothing more than a way to control the masses. It just fits well with the human psyche that always wants more. Like on a game show, the person can either walk with the \$5000 or jeopardize that money for more money or a better prize. Of course, you're going to get people to follow that way.

What love? The fact that he's using us as pawns in a game with Satan over our souls? What about the horrible things he's done to mankind, apparently "His" greatest and most prized creation (ie. Flood, Sodom & Gomorrah, Job, etc...)? "I love my car, so let me hit it with a brick."

Plus, I can't possibly imagine that a just God would allow billions of people to suffer for eternity because they failed to believe in the correct faith. I'm supposed to believe that a collection of books, written by man, is somehow the absolute truth and somehow inerrant, and if I don't, I am damned for eternity? Give me a break.

Either Christians/Muslims/Jews are mistaken about the identity of their Creator or their Creator doesn't exist.

God does not commit evil on man, the enemy does. Everyone is in a spiritual war. And the Bible says, one way or another, every man and woman has had the opportunity to accept faith of Jesus

Christ, just like you have had yours.

When you say pleasures of this world do you mean sex, alcohol, and drugs, etc..? God designed sex, and he wants man to have sex, but with only one other human (your wife) of the opposite gender. Hence when people have sex with multiple humans, disease spreads and people's lives are screwed up, simply because God did not design sex to operate that way. As for alcohol and drugs, etc., what pleasurable outcome do they result in? Sure you can live in the moment for a while, but even by earthly standards, they are destructive and life ruining

The Bible is absolute truth, it is also infallible, but I do not believe it is inerrant. I believe the human authors have made mistakes, but these mistakes do not contradict the ultimate message that God is trying to get across.

If we are meant to be controlled pawns, than why didn't God create robots? Why would he instill free choice? Have you read the story of the flood, or Sodom and Gomorrah? These people had no spiritual guidance or discernment, so God's wrath was thrown upon them. Man is not designed to sin, man is designed to worship God, and when man refuses to do so, he is bestowing punishment on himself.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread

Posted by [Herr Surth](#) on Mon, 27 Oct 2008 12:07:09 GMT

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

bla.

bla.

bla.

If god would exist he wouldnt be half as boring and humanlike.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Mon, 27 Oct 2008 14:11:38 GMT

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

Completely missed my point.

I'm not talking about given the chance to believe in Christ. I'm talking about actively believing in something else. Am I to believe that those billions (trillions?) of people that believed in something else are damned for eternity because they didn't or don't believe in the "correct" faith?

Yes, I know man sins. I know they do it themselves which only leads me to believe that God could just destroy Satan. Since the Bible teaches that Satan isn't infinite, he can only be in one place at a time. Thus, he cannot possibly be the source of man's temptation. If he isn't the source of human temptation, then it's human nature causing the sinning, and Satan is nothing more than an opponent of God's in a game for our souls. Otherwise, Satan would have been destroyed, already.

As for godlessness, that doesn't change the fact that "God" actively killed his Creation. If a woman has 5 kids, does she have the right to kill 3 of them as punishment and warning to the other two?

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Sun, 09 Nov 2008 03:49:20 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Quackpunk wrote it is not the physical aspect that the gospel is talking about. It's the spiritual nature of the ascension. I hate when people make this ridiculous arguments against the Bible, and they really have no evidence other than what they read on another I-Hate-Christianity thread. What can be asserted without evidence can be ridiculed without evidence.

To quote you...

Trying to prove its existence based on sense and reason will only arouse more confusion and doubt. The only way to grasp this active love and the promise of eternity is by turning to Jesus Christ and his unconditional love.

Mystery is a evident characteristic of God, and if everything concerning him was proven, there would be no drive in people to know more, thus why he chooses to keep his promise, in an essence, unproven.

I always chuckle when I hear the religious make absurd statements like this. They really have no clue how ridiculous they sound. But that's only half the hilarity; what makes it even funnier is you apparently think the above rules only apply to one of the two sides.

Quackpunk wrote on Mon, 27 October 2008 00:20 God does not commit evil on man, the enemy does.

God doesn't commit evil on man? Have you actually read the nightmare that is the Bible?

Quackpunk wrote on Mon, 27 October 2008 00:20 Everyone is in a spiritual war. And the Bible says, one way or another, every man and woman has had the opportunity to accept faith of Jesus Christ, just like you have had yours.

Everyone's had the opportunity to accept faith of Russell's teapot and the invisible pink unicorn too. That is perhaps not a fair comparison, because I personally find Russell's teapot a bit less fantastically improbable than Christianity, and certainly a great deal less immoral.

Quackpunk wrote on Mon, 27 October 2008 00:20 When you say pleasures of this world do you mean sex, alcohol, and drugs, etc..? God designed sex, and he wants man to have sex, but with only one other human (your wife) of the opposite gender. Hence when people have sex with multiple humans, disease spreads and people's lives are screwed up, simply because God did not design sex to operate that way.

Let's start by pointing out that your entire argument is based on an utterly baseless assumption, namely: 'God designed sex'. No. Nature designed sex. Sex was going on long before man created God (that's not a typo, before you ask).

Moving on to the disease part. You say STDs are some kind of divine punishment for promiscuity and homosexuality. (For a moment I thought you might actually be Pat Robertson, but it would surprise me if he could figure out how to use a computer)

I've got a little challenge for you. Answer this question. Don't dodge it; answer it or admit you can't answer it. Why don't lesbians contract AIDS during sex? Why are they less vulnerable to STDs than a heterosexual couple?

Quackpunk wrote on Mon, 27 October 2008 00:20 As for alcohol and drugs, etc., what

pleasurable outcome do they result in? Sure you can live in the moment for a while, but even by earthly standards, they are destructive and life ruining
That's rich coming from a religious apologist. I would be very interested in comparing the death tolls: religion vs drugs. I would hazard a guess that your team's score is a few orders of magnitude higher.

Quackpunk wrote on Mon, 27 October 2008 00:20The Bible is absolute truth, it is also infallible, but I do not believe it is inerrant. I believe the human authors have made mistakes, but these mistakes do not contradict the ultimate message that God is trying to get across.
Again, let's skip over the absolutely baseless assumption you're making in this statement (the 'ultimate message'). I must state it plainly; when a book contradicts itself as many times as the Bible does, don't say it's 'absolute truth' or 'infallible'.

Quackpunk wrote on Mon, 27 October 2008 00:20If we are meant to be controlled pawns, than why didn't God create robots? Why would he instill free choice?
Why are you convinced he did?

Quackpunk wrote on Mon, 27 October 2008 00:20Have you read the story of the flood, or Sodom and Gomorrah? These people had no spiritual guidance or discernment, so God's wrath was thrown upon them.
Yes, I have read them - have you?

First off, let's assume the Noah's Ark story is basically true. That is, of course, an incredibly generous assumption, considering what a ludicrous story it is. (I know I'm repeating myself somewhat, but this point needs grasping... by you more than anybody). The first time you hear the Noah story, you don't really click what an absolutely horrific story it is; either because you're just a child at the time or because of the way it's told (which says a lot about religion, frankly, and is a good example for the case against indoctrination of children). God's WIPING OUT THE ENTIRE POPULATION OF THE PLANET, except for a handful of humans and two of each animal. You call this moral? You think "God does not commit evil on man"? If this absurd story happened, it would be the single greatest act of genocide in history; presumably including a lot of children, perhaps some still in the womb (ouch... God doesn't seem to mind abortion)

Quackpunk wrote on Mon, 27 October 2008 00:20Man is not designed to sin, man is designed to worship God
wow, I really do need to repeat myself a lot with you, don't I...

Quackpunk wrote on Mon, 27 October 2008 00:20and when man refuses to [worship God], he is bestowing punishment on himself.
What a disgustingly evil statement. No Islamic demagogue could put it better.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [liquidv2](#) on Sun, 09 Nov 2008 08:44:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

god told me to tell you guys to shut up

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Ryu](#) on Sun, 09 Nov 2008 09:26:23 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoony, Lesbians don't get STD's 'cos bath tub water goes into a womans minge.

I thought that one out throughly and have come to the conclusion that, soap and water truly is a work of God.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Starbuzz](#) on Sun, 09 Nov 2008 13:54:16 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

liquidv2 wrote on Sun, 09 November 2008 02:44god told me to tell you guys to shut up

Gold quote.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Ma1kel](#) on Mon, 10 Nov 2008 21:50:55 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Spoiler: There are no gods.

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [Spoony](#) on Tue, 11 Nov 2008 17:45:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

liquid's post is more incisive than I think he meant it to be...

Subject: Re: pawkyfox's Another Thread
Posted by [ErroR](#) on Sun, 23 Nov 2008 19:26:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Ma1kel wrote on Mon, 10 November 2008 23:50Spoiler: There are no gods.
what's with 3 guys having same avatars are there more that i don't know here?
