
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Fri, 26 Mar 2010 17:53:05 GMT

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

Altzan wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 10:08 "Let he who is without sin cast the first stone."

"This is another counterfeiting of the Scriptures many have tried to use to shame us for what we do in his name. "Let he who is without sin cast the first stone" is not speaking to judging. Let me explain.

Using the KJV this time, in John 8:1 - 11 scribes and Pharisees had caught a woman in the act of adultery (the woman commonly referred to as the prostitute) and told Jesus who was teaching in the temple that the Mosaic Law required she be stoned to death. Trying to make an opportunity of this to trick Jesus that they might accuse Him, they, with stones in hand, asked Jesus what He says about the Law. After Jesus tried to ignore their repeated questioning, He told them "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." One by one each man dropped his stone and walked away.

Jesus was not arguing with the judgment. Nor was Jesus arguing the law nor the woman's guilt. Jesus was arguing with our right to execute the woman. Once all the men had dropped their stones Jesus confronted the woman and asked her if any of the men were still there to condemn her. When she answered "No man, Lord", Jesus told her that neither did He - He forgave her of her sin. He did not excuse the sin of adultery/prostitution, he forgave her of it. All behavior and thought that is sinful before forgiveness is still sinful after forgiveness. Not only was Jesus not afraid to call a sin a sin, He was not afraid to call a sinner a sinner. He even reminded her of the sin of adultery/prostitution by telling her "Go and sin no more."

The point? Jesus did not argue the act of judging the chosen behavior of the adulteress/prostitute."

i'm not seeing how this refutes my point?

the woman gets away with it because sinful people are supposedly not allowed to punish offenders. we're told we're all sinful, so what's the point the law being there if it's unenforcable?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 24 March 2010 04:14it's not exactly much of a jump to get from "all jews are responsible of the murder of our god" to actually doing something nasty to jews, is it?

God didn't say it, one man did. One man said that all Jews should be responsible. That doesn't translate to a Biblical command.

and yet throughout the bible we have innumerable cases of god eagerly punishing or threatening to punish innocents for the crimes of others. you've even defended that bullshit yourself.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 24 March 2010 04:14What about it? My question was: where's the evidence supporting the account given in Genesis? So how does this support the account given in Genesis?

I wasn't providing evidence supporting Genesis, I was asking in terms of evolution. firstly, i said: where's the evidence supporting the account given in genesis? you said the second

law of thermodynamics/entropy.

so if that wasn't intended to provide evidence supporting genesis, what IS your evidence to support that version of events?

secondly, i don't give a shit whether you or anyone else is convinced by the theory of evolution or not, and i'm not aware of anyone saying "you MUST believe this or you'll suffer horrific punishments for eternity". but still, i'm not sure exactly why you think the second law of thermodynamics is supposed to be a counter-argument to the theory of evolution?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 24 March 2010 04:14i can't match verses to numbers off the top of my head, but i would have thought an avowed christian would at least have read the bible through.

How does that make sense? Yes, I study the Bible, but I don't know all of its contents. It would take years to effectively read and study every Bible verse.

k, then here's the one i was talking about we are. Deuteronomy 13:12-16

If you hear that in one of the towns which Yahweh your God has given you for a home, there are men, scoundrels from your own stock, who have led their fellow citizens astray, saying "Let us go and serve other gods" hitherto unknown to you, it is your duty to look into the matter, examine it, and inquire most carefully. If it is proved and confirmed that such a hateful thing has taken place among you, you must put the inhabitants of that town to the sword, you must lay it under the curse of destruction, the town and everything in it. You must pile up all its loot in the public square and burn the town and all its loot, offering it all to Yahweh your God. It is to be a ruin for all time and never rebuilt.

Another noteworthy statement along the same lines: Deuteronomy 13:7-11

If your brother, the son of your father or of your mother, or your son or daughter, or the spouse whom you embrace, or your most intimate friend, tries to secretly seduce you, saying "Let us go and serve other gods" unknown to you or your ancestors before you, gods of the peoples surrounding you, whether near you or far away, anywhere throughout the world, you must not consent, you must not listen to him, you must show him no pity, you must not spare him or conceal his guilt. No, you must kill him, your hand must strike the first blow in putting him to death and the hands of the rest of the people following. You must stone him to death, since he has tried to divert you from Yahweh your God.

Spoony wrote on Wed, 24 March 2010 04:14for starters, you could ask god to make his "revelation" a little less ridiculous, or you could ask god not to be such a bastard that he feels the need to dish out the worst crime imaginable just for the "crime" of disbelieving in his existence or disagreeing with his religion.

There are plenty of people who think the revelation was just fine, and don't see how his commandments are ridiculous. So, why should your opinion be any more important than theirs?[/quote]

Firstly, there are not quite as many such people as you think. Christians are by no means a majority in this world, and that's even if we count all the sects who claim to be real Christians - many of whom I'm sure you think are not.

Secondly, I'm not seeing why someone else thinking that the Christian revelations were crystal clear and think there's nothing immoral about his commandments justifies the horrific punishment threatened to anyone who disagrees with them.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 24 March 2010 04:14Quote:Apparently you do... If you're going to say that they were spreading lies about condoms, it would be a good idea to know the intention behind the act, right?
i'm more concerned with the fact millions of people are dying.

So you only care for the act and not the motive? Isn't that an ignorant viewpoint?
Not really, the catholic church has had plenty of time up till now to defend its absurd and immoral position on contraception, and it hasn't done so.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 24 March 2010 04:14how do you even know they said that?

once you've answered that, how do you know they were correct, as opposed to crazy or lying or just plain wrong?

once you've answered that, how do you know this wasn't the case for the rejected gospels?

1. They said it in the gospels they wrote.
2. I don't "know" that, but as you said, odds - if that many people (the writers) all claimed the same thing, they either are telling the truth or a coordinated lie.
3. I don't, since I haven't read said gospels.
 1. you mean the gospel says so - not the same thing at all. how do you know that everything in there is exactly what the writers wanted to say?
 2. they didn't all claim the same thing. the gospels contradict each other about almost every major event in jesus' life.
 3. ah. i remember you saying you hadn't read the qur'an or hadith either. well, these all claim to be revelations from the god you believe in... don't you think you should at least read them before deciding they're not the real deal?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 24 March 2010 04:14it wouldn't be the first time i've made the assertion that it's plain evil to threaten someone with horrific punishment just for the "crime" of disagreeing with you or doubting what you say, would it?

No, it wouldn't be. It's your motto, I guess. By that logic, though, you shouldn't punish a child molester because he doesn't agree with the anti-pedophilia law.

Firstly, you seem to be affirming that you don't think there's anything wrong with threatening someone with horrific punishment for nothing worse than disagreeing with you.

Secondly, are you drawing a parallel between 1. disagreeing with someone, and 2. raping a child? we have laws to protect children from paedophiles because raping a child is a genuine crime with potentially severe consequences for the victim, and because basic human decency leads most of us to think vulnerable children need to be protected from predatory adults. i hardly see how this is the same situation as someone who is not convinced that a particular religion is correct or disagrees with its teachings?

Quote:I'm referencing to actions made by the people in the Old Testament, and you keep turning it

around to "Look what GOD did!"

actually a lot of my criticism of the moral evils of the old testament are reported to have been carried out by the god character himself. certainly his followers do a lot of evil things, certainly he ORDERS a lot of evil things, he also DOES a lot of evil things (ordering them can count in this column too)

And it wasn't "complaining about your religion" as you quoted me.

Quote:I'm in favor of democracy and human rights among humans.

I'm suprised that you think that a people completely created by another being by his will alone should have exact and equal rights as that being and should be left to their own devices and be allowed to shun their creator.

you misunderstand me. i didn't say humans should have equal rights to 'god'. i don't see any reason why this 'god' should have any rights, since nobody's even managed to demonstrate that it exists at all.

secondly, i seem to recall having this argument with you before. apparently we're stuck as slaves to anyone who created us? well, what if you found out that you were created by a mad scientist in a lab, a modern-day dr. frankenstein? would that make you his slave, like it or not?

if we were to find out that the origins of life on earth was because some aliens 'seeded' the planet a few million years ago, would that mean we have to be slaves to them?

if instead you decide that you were created by your parents in the traditional way, do they rule you for your entire life?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Wed, 24 March 2010 04:14isn't god a bit of a prick for making his message so ludicrously cryptic that only a small proportion of the population get it right, and punishing everyone who gets it wrong?

Is it really that hard to "decrypt"?

if the only people on this planet who've gotten it right are in your particular denomination, then apparently it is.

Quote:It also is pretty simple to understand what God says is a sin and what is not.

sure, doesn't mean we need to listen to him, considering how absolutely crap his moral standards seem to be.

but that's no surprise; he was, after all, created by bronze-age middle-eastern barbarians.
