
Subject: Re: Catholic adoption agencies and homosexuality

Posted by [Spoony](#) on Wed, 31 Mar 2010 08:13:33 GMT

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

nothing much to quarrel with in starbuzz's posts.

Quote:Nobody actually knows what happens when we die Spoony....so nobody actually knows what is "good for us" if we die. It may very well be that believing in god your entire life is the key to a happy afterlife, but i very highly doubt it. Like i said, i'm not worried about what will happen when i die, i'll focus on life for now, and take my chances then. I'm not going to live like someone who may or may not exist tells me to live.

I don't claim to know for certain what happens to us after we die; just said it looks to me like that's the end for us in any conscious sense, and for all the people who've asserted otherwise they've never made a convincing case of it.

it's like god, really. i don't say there definitely isn't one; i just say nobody's ever made a convincing case that there is.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41Quote:"Here the case is put of a city revolting from its allegiance to the God of Israel, and serving other gods.

I. The crime is supposed to be committed

oh dear. already i've got to stop you. i don't accept that a crime has been committed here.

Why should I care?

God created all, including the laws. He is the lawmaker. So if he says it's a crime, it is.

Let's call this concept what it is; a complete and unchallengeable dictatorship. The argument from authority doesn't fly with me, especially when nobody's even managed to demonstrate that there is any authority at all in this case.

But if you're going to take the "god says it, and that's all i need to know" line, then I have a hypothetical question for you. Let's say it was somehow proven that the Islamic revelation was correct. Mohammed claimed to be inspired by the same god you believe in. I expect you don't believe that any more than I do, but let's suppose it was conclusively proven. Would you then abide by the Islamic code of behaviour? Some of them aren't so pretty; there are hundreds of verses in the Islamic scriptures speaking of Allah's (same god, remember) fury and contempt towards non-believers, and quite a few instructions to fight non-Muslims and either convert them to Islam, subjugate them under Islamic rule, or kill them. So if it turned out that Mohammed really was inspired by god, you'd grab a sword and have at it, would you?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41Quote:The crime is supposed to be committed, 1. By one of the cities of Israel, that lay within the jurisdiction of their courts.

Ah. I think I see what he's getting at here; it only applies to the Israelites, does it? In that case, then the verse would be totally irrelevant in a modern context.

Yeah.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41That would certainly be no problem for me; it would

only be a problem for anybody who dared to say that God gave them this planet, their property etc.

But quite a lot of Christians do say that, don't they?

...What?

well, it doesn't really seem like we can just say that only applies to the israelites.

what's the justification? "god's obviously talking to the israelites because they're the people he gave this land to". well, a lot of christians say ad nauseum that god gave them whatever they have.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41Quote:The city that is here supposed to have become idolatrous is one that formerly worshipped the true God, but had now withdrawn to other gods, which intimates how great the crime is
...no, no it doesn't.

Although, "other gods"... do you think there are (or were) any other gods?

...yes, yes it does.

And no, I don't believe there were other gods, although those idolators apparently did.
Ah, the argument from authority again.

Well, if just saying "god says it's wrong, case closed" is all the moral justification that's necessary, I wonder why Christians ever try going any further than that and explain why certain actions are wrong, what harm could be caused by them. Don't get me wrong, I approve of the moral debate.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41He really has lost me here. Why would serving a different god mean someone has no desire to be bound by laws, or any "manner of virtue"? They're just picking a different set, aren't they?

Why would anyone cease serving a God, knowing they would incur his wrath, if they were only changing a few things? If they weren't changing their laws or virtues, they'd be better off staying... That's not the original point... the original point was Henry's implication that someone serving a different god must mean the person does not want laws, does not want any virtue in his life. That's obviously nonsense.

But as to your question... why would anyone cease serving your God? Two major reasons spring to mind; either because they find it unconvincing or because they object to it on moral grounds.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41Secondly, are non-theists thrown into the same category, I wonder?

Since atheists don't believe in a god, I'd say yes.
so presumably the same commandment would apply if there were some atheists in the city too, i expect?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 So it's ok to flatten an entire city if some of its inhabitants commit a crime, because anyone who was innocent would "no doubt" have already left.

If they knew what was going on in the city and didn't leave, they are at the least tolerating it, which hardly makes them innocent, does it?
Oh, dear.

So we're making the assumption that non-belief, or different religious viewpoints are crimes, and we're making the further assumption that everyone in the city is either committing these 'crimes' or knows about them.

What you're doing here is drawing a moral equivalence between the two. Both groups are going to get the same punishment, aren't they?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote:Let men know that God will not give his glory to another, nor his praise to graven images. 2. He expects that magistrates, having their honour and power from him, should be concerned for his honour, and use their power for terror to evil doers, else they bear the sword in vain.
And does he still expect that?

No, because it's no longer necessary today.
How do you know that? Or, if you prefer I rephrase the question, why do you think that?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote:The faithful worshippers of the true God must take all occasions to show their just indignation against idolatry, much more against atheism, infidelity, and irreligion.

Ah, so that means someone who does not take all occasions to show their just indignation against atheism and idolatry is not a faithful worshipper of the true God?

Yes...

But how, do you think, is 'indignation' defined here?

Well, the severity of the punishment usually depends on how serious you think the crime is, doesn't it?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 Quote:Lastly, Though we do not find this law put in execution in all the history of the Jewish church (Gibeah was destroyed, not for idolatry, but immorality)

I wasn't sure what was originally meant by Gibeah, so I looked that up. I do recognise the story, though not as 'Gibeah'. The one about the baying mob who want to rape the male visitor, and the decision by the men to throw the young women to the mob to save themselves. So the visitor's woman gets raped to death. That one. It's similar to the Lot story, isn't it? The similarity of the narrative, the almost identical speech reported, and the fact that modern Christians seem to draw some really odd moral lessons from it, i.e. homosexuality is evil, but if you find yourself faced by a mob of rapists, just throw a defenceless young girl at them and save yourself.

Are you implying that God OK'd this?

From what I read, this incident got the city destroyed by the Israelites shortly after.

am I implying god approved of that? no. however, i couldn't find any condemnation of the actions of the man who threw the defenceless young girls at the rape mob so the men would survive.

speaking of rape, i've got a question for christians. what, in your view and in the view of your church, is the worse act of these two:

- a man rapes a woman
- two men, consenting adults, choose to have a sexual relationship

i've got a few questions like this. for example, here's one for catholics, so you needn't answer it though i'd be interested in hearing Muad_Dib's response. what would be the worse of these two hypothetical situations?

- condoms became freely available all over the world
- one child, just one, is raped by a priest

(i'd love to ask the pope that, but i'd also like to see him dragged before an international court)
Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41Quote:yet for the neglect of the execution of it upon the inferior cities that served idols God himself, by the army of the Chaldeans, put it in execution upon Jerusalem, the head city, which, for is apostasy from God, was utterly destroyed and laid waste, and lay in ruins seventy years.
What's he saying here?

I think he's referencing a real or hypothetical situation where the Israelites didn't destroy a city of idolators, and that city rose up and destroyed the Israelite's Jerusalem.
i dunno, it's really unclear to me.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41So, idolatry, serving other gods etc, they're things which absolutely infuriate God. Yes, the old testament makes that clear... and it doesn't exactly work in his favour. There are plenty of evil actions he either doesn't mind or positively recommends - slavery, for example - but if you have a different religious opinion, you'd better watch out.
So there must be a law against this "crime" in the Old Testament. But as he says here, in the New Testament, the law is not binding anymore, but it still infuriates God and he'll still punish people who do it? So why repeal the law?

The 'no idols' law is one of the Ten Commandments, which are in effect today (except Sabbath). So Matthew Henry was wrong, then, to say it is no longer binding according to the gospels?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41This all assumes that the person doing the "tempting" has evil intentions... what if they're just someone like you, evangelising? Someone who genuinely believes in their God, and wants to spread the good news?

How does it 'assume evil intentions'? It only warns against those who'd turn you from God, no matter what approach.
Read the commandment and the commentary; the contempt is very clear. It doesn't attempt to find out why the person is saying this, and doesn't seek to make a distinction if that was known.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41as an aside, do you really believe that the snake in the garden was Satan?

Yes.

and where did you read that?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41Quote:Concerning the false gods proposed to be served

Define "false god", please.

I'm pretty sure you know what it means.

Feel free to make a point out of it if you were planning to.

I'll just repeat the question. Define a false god, please. It's not clear at all to me whether the god of the old testament knows of the existence of other gods or not. So what's a false god? Some entity that claims to be a god but isn't? Some entity that does have supernatural power but isn't "good"? Some entity that does have supernatural power but didn't create the whole world? I'd really like to know.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41Quote:II. It is our duty to prefer God and religion before the best friends we have in the world.

Including your children?

What would be your response to the Abraham test, do you think?

Same as Abraham's.

Thankfully, I gave never been commanded to sacrifice a child to God, in fact nobody has (except Abraham of course, but as you said, it was a test.)

oh dear.

you're the second christian i've asked this question to, and you're the second to give the wrong answer.

the right answer is telling god to go to hell, no i won't murder an innocent child for you, you evil, evil fuck. and if you want to punish me for disobedience, then go ahead, you twat, because i'd rather have that than murder an innocent child.

if that had been abraham's response, and god had then shone a beam of light down on him and said well done, that was the right answer, you've passed the test... then that would be a moral story i could actually respect.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41Again, the author is recognising that people might, unbelievably, have a problem with this commandment. Their compassion might get in the way. I certainly hope so. I wonder why I've never heard a Christian say that compassion was a work of Satan.

Because it isn't. Compassion can compel towards sinful action, is the point here.

And why would compassion get in the way? Why are some of us wired so that would happen?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41Suppose I said the following.

You, Altzan, are certainly my worst enemy that would thrust me from reason, my best friend.

Whatever draws me to religion, separates between myself and my reason, is a design upon my

mind, to be resented accordingly.

Well, if you did say that to me, I'd be saddened by the fact.

Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 It's not actually so far from the truth, although I wouldn't say this would justify me killing you for trying.

We're agreed then?

no, because i'm not the one here justifying murder on the grounds of a religious disagreement.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 k, but the other opinion is crap, isn't it?

It's no more crap than yours. Opinions are just that, opinions. So naturally you'd think an opposing opinion is crap... heck, it's what I think of yours.

feel free to explain why, although remember what i said about arguments from authority.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41 the catholic church is still spreading its evil doctrine against contraception even now.

Ahh.

You've only mentioned it in historical context up to this point, so I assumed it wasn't ongoing. not at all. anyone can mention the historical evils of the catholic church... the crusades, the inquisition, the forced conversion of indigenous populations, the enthusiastic collaboration with fascism... anyone can do that. but right now it's probably more worthwhile to talk about the evil things it's still doing. the most obvious two would be the systematic coverup of the child rapists, and its position on contraception.

Quote:In other words, you won't believe unless you have certain proof.

Is this the basis of your earlier argument? That some people simply cannot believe God's word because there's not enough evidence? The vast majority of the human population believe with faith, which shows it's NOT impossible (disregarding whether or not the faith in question is well founded, seeing as how you'd try and make that a counterpoint).

This is a point against your side, not mine.

It is probably true that the majority of the human population seem to believe religious things on faith. But the proportion of humanity who believe the same things you do are a minority. And that's talking about people who do think faith is a virtue. I've never heard a convincing argument that faith is ever a good thing, but consider those that do think faith is worthwhile. Even most of them don't believe, for example, that Jesus was the son of God. There are some things that are so ridiculous that even "people of faith" don't believe them. No doubt you don't believe for a moment that Mohammed was really inspired by your God, as he claimed to be. No doubt you don't believe that the Emperor Hirohito was a god, as he claimed to be. I could give you a great many more examples, but those two will suffice as religious claims you simply don't believe, so if you stop and think about why you don't believe them, you might begin to understand why someone else might not believe the same stuff as you.

Quote:If you've told yourself that it's impossible for you to believe in anything without proof

Uh, no, I didn't say that. My friend told me last night about his recent trip to Istanbul. I didn't ask

him for proof.

Whether I want proof for a claim depends on its believability and its implications. If you just wanted to claim that there was a man called Jesus who had some radical ideas on morality and ended up getting crucified, then fine. I don't need proof of that, I'll be quite happy to read his ideas and judge them on their own merits. If instead you try telling me that he was the son of God, that he rose from the dead, and that if I believe in him I can get everlasting life after death and that if I don't I'm in for an eternity of torture, then that needs proof.

Again, when a Muslim tells you that Islam is inspired by God, the God you already believe in, you don't believe that without proof. (although, i wonder if you would even seriously consider any proof that could be shown to you)

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41Quote:I could use ANY exmple here if I wanted. I'm not talking about the act in particular. Let's change it to whatever law then - the lawbreaker disagrees with the law at hand, and doesn't think it's a proper law and should not be enforced. Should we punish him anyway, or should we let him be, since it isn't fair that we punish him for breaking a law he doesn't think is fair or right?

The contents of the bible aren't laws at all; nobody's ever demonstrated that they come from any position of authority.

Similar to what you said near the beginning of the post.
Well?

Here's what needs to happen before anything in the Bible can be seriously considered a 'law'.

1. Prove this god exists.
2. Prove this book is an accurate depiction of his views; i.e. prove he actually said what the bible says he said.
3. Successfully make the case that god is of such extraordinary moral brilliance that a dictatorship under him would be better than a democracy
4. Win the vote to discard our current democratic systems

all of the above need to happen, but i think only one of them ever could.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41That's the legal side. On to the moral side. What if the majority thinks the law is wrong? Can it be changed democratically?

If the majority is a part of the lawmaking process, then yes.
So basically no, then?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41Quote:Also, if we were made by a mad scientist, we'd be wherever he was (unless he was completely alone in the universe) and would be subject to his existence as well, so...
you've lost me there.

A 'mad scientist' would be in a lab, located in a universe where other beings existed with their own laws and morals. Wouldn't the people created by the mad scientist be subject to the laws of that universe?

ah. it was "his existence" that confused me.

well, i'll just repeat my earlier question about how you know the details of the genesis account of creation, and why it makes such a difference anyway.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Fri, 26 March 2010 11:53if instead you decide that you were created by your parents in the traditional way, do they rule you for your entire life?

No. Although they should take responsibility for your early life to insure survival.
well done.

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41what do you think will happen to the other kinds of Christian after they die? i.e. everyone outside your denomination who says they're a Christian but, in your church's view, are mistaken.

If they've broken Biblical commandments, the same will happen to them as others who do the same.
so it's all about actions rather than beliefs, is it?

Quote:Spoony wrote on Mon, 29 March 2010 02:41firstly you don't seem to be challenging my statement that his moral standards are absolutely shit.
secondly it really is cryptic, or at least too cryptic for humans, otherwise the vast majority of the world wouldn't have a problem with it.

I won't challenge your 'statement' since it's your opinion and that would be pointless.
then i wonder why you went to the trouble of trying to answer my earlier criticism by posting the matthew henry crap.

Quote:And what's so cryptic about the 5-step plan or what God considers sin?
when i said cryptic, i was using the word to encompass all objections people - the majority of the human population - have against christianity.

what is the 5-step plan, though? i could look it up, i'm sure, but i may as well hear it from you.
