

---

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 00:20As 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.

---