
Subject: Re: The Passion of the Christ
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Sat, 30 Jul 2005 01:44:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

amid_tha_rubble wrote on Fri, 29 July 2005 21:20

The thing that i find funny is that you take the bible to be the be-all-end-all. If you accept the bible as the absolute authority on all things related to Jesus, then don't you have to accept the absolute authority of the Church which uses it as it's official canon?

No, you don't. The "absolute authority" of the catholic Church lies entirely on one single misinterpreted line in the entire logos. ONE! On top of that, lol, is that such line never establishes an absolute authority! It doesn't establish anything at all! The Papacy and the cardinals did that themselves, and like much of the world, they played you all really good. REALLY good.

The worst part is that the Church, (more specifically, Constantine) opted that Jesus must have implied that a hierarchal construct is to be created as a result of him using a metaphor on Peter. What's even funnier though, is the way that organization is run. I mean, it is really a ridiculous thing! Conclave?! Where is conclave inferred from in the Bible? Where is this self proclaimed immutable correctness of a man elected through the redundant democracy of a bunch of old men who vote amounst themselves in the Bible? How exactly is nepotism something that you, me, or anyone else alive today have the authority to call truth when God never said--OR IMPLIED-- anything even REMOTELY like that.

The problem with your interpretation of scripture is that your Church has created their own doctrine, called it dogma, and somehow calls it infalliable-- kind of like what Stalin and Kim Jong II did in their respective nations.

The Catholic Church consistently uses inverted Aristotilian logic to validate themselves. A highly generalized but accurate example is as follows: "God exists, therefore Jesus exists, therefore the Church exists, therefore the legitimacy of the Papacy exists, therefore whatever the Papacy says is capital T Truth....because God exists." And it is a flat out idiotic thing that, has only existed this long because of the very popular and powerful influence of faith based on the one good man who lived and died. It seems to be one of the very few things that Catholicism has gotten right-- the existence and nature of Jesus.

I ask you to prove to me, using the ancient texts, that Peter was given absolute authority in such a fashion (and this is important, because I know exactly what you're going to say) that it unarguably implies that Peter's nepotismic decendants are to inherent this authority and that these decendants are also to be elected by old men ordained by God and God alone. Because you know as well as I that no one has the power to embue the power of God into man but God Himself.
