

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Don't read if you're eating!****Don't read if you're eating! - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/3/2 7:30**

In the film "Alive" the passengers that survived had to eat the dead passengers to survive. :-o

Is this wrong?

**Re: Don't read if you're eating! - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/2 11:05**

During the destruction of Jerusalem as recorded by Josephus there are accounts of starvation being so great that the Zealots would move in and reach into the peoples mouths to pull food out before the person who had been hiding it could swallow it. They hid food in any where they could. ( as an interjection they sold dung by weight for food in the O.T.) The Romans taunted the people outside the city by putting bushels of food on the ground on the outside part of the walls. One woman in a horrific state of delusion from hunger actually said something to her child like this "be food for me" and proceeded to cook and eat a portion. The zealots smelled something cooking and came in to see what it was..... even they were HORRIFIED as worn and hardened as they were at the sight they saw as they dipped the kettle. Jesus foretold of it in Matthew 24.

To answer your question was it wrong? Who can tell UNDER SUCH HORRIBLE circumstances? Otherwise it would be of a demonic wickedness the likes of which are reserved for the most darkened and depraved of reprobate souls.

When you consider Jesus saying the great tribulation will be such as the world has not seen and we know what history has already witnessed.... I must ask... what are we willing to do to have REVIVAL to avoid such unimaginable suffering and madness?

God Bless and best regards in Christ,

-Robert

**Re: Don't read if you're eating! - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/3/2 11:35**

"Why do the nations rage, and the people plot a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves and the rulers take counsel together, **against** the Lord and **against** His Anointed, saying, Let us break Their bonds in pieces and cast away Their cords from us. He who sits in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall hold them in derision. Then He shall speak to them in His wrath, and **distress** them in His deep displeasure; Psalm 2:1-5

Nothing is new under the sun.

In Christ

Jeff

**Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/3/2 12:54**

Jeff:

Maybe it's just me, but I fail to see the significance of your biblical quote in the context of the ethical discussion here. I have got a friendly advice for you: consider *expounding* on the verses you cite in your posts? ("The *unfolding* of your words gives *light*; it gives understanding to the *simple*."-Ps. 119:130) I guess I am one of the "simple", you will have to open up God's word more in order to enlighten me. :)

Back to the original question.

I really don't know. I think eating human flesh is a horrible idea to most civilised culture. For instance, Chinese considers human beings as distinct from animals, and eating your own kind would definitely be considered a beastly behaviour.

However, like the movie cited, these unusual circumstances did arise in history. When survival becomes *the* issue, civility is not at the top of the agenda.

During the Second World War in China, some Chinese families were in extreme starvation to a point where they seriously considered eating human flesh. Families would exchange their children for this purpose (it's easier killing and eating of her's children than your own). It tells you how extreme the conditions were.

Of course, it is wrong. But who are we to judge? We should be thankful that God had not put us in similar dilemma. Indeed, He gave us his own son.

**Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/3/2 15:15**

Sorry Agent001, I missed the first post some how and just read the second.

My quote was based on the outcome of man's striving against God, and the results of that striving. And then I thought of the great tribulation. How men will still deny God. So this was the Scripture that came to mind.

In terms of the thread, I am clueless in regards to that plane crash or the Donner party etc. I can only imagine that maybe some cried out to God.

Sorry  
Jeff

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/3/2 18:25**

Quote:  
-----However, like the movie cited, these unusual circumstances did arise in history. When survival becomes the issue, civility is not at the top of the agenda.  
-----

**Matthew 6:25-26** - Therefore I tell you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or drink; or about your body, what you will wear. Is not life more important than food, and the body more important than clothes? Look at the birds of the air; they do not sow or reap or store away in barns, and yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not much more valuable than they?

**Psalms 37:25** - I was young and now I am old,  
yet I have never seen the righteous forsaken  
or their children begging bread.

The Scripture clearly shows us that to have faith in God for our food provisions is pleasing in His sight. 'Are you not much more valuable than they?' of course we are and God watches over us and ensures we are fed. Even in a point of survival, I would rely on God and pray to Him. If I had no relationship with God then I could see myself doing abominable things such as eating children to survive, but as a Christian and servant of God if I was to starve to death then I would give glory to God for that, as it is His will and look forward to the eternity with Him. We need to trust first that God is our provider and then obey as He provides for us.

**Re: - posted by moreofHim (), on: 2004/3/2 18:33**

Greg,

You are on the right track here. As Christians, we would do things differently than those who do not have the Lord living in them.

I am sure the Lord would take care of this- even if that meant no food.

Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/3/2 18:48

Quote:  
-----Of course, it is wrong. But who are we to judge? We should be thankful that God had not put us in similar dilemma. Indeed, He gave us his own son.  
-----

I don't feel this would be judging brother. Forbid the thought of me being in a situation where there is absolutely no food, but I know I would rely on God not on the flesh (literally) ewww. :-P

Quote:  
-----I am sure the Lord would take care of this- even if that meant no food.  
-----

Yes! Jesus and Moses fasted for 40 days so that's quite awhile. God provided food for Elijah divinely a few times, and also the oil for the widow through Elijah's words. If God has given us His Son, He will also **with** Him give us all things. Notice it says 'with Him' if we are apart from Christ we are enemies of God and the abundance of protection and blessings are foreign to us.

Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/3/2 19:28

38And he who does not take his cross and follow after Me is not worthy of Me. 39He who finds his life will lose it, and he who loses his life for My sake will find it.

24 Then Jesus said to His disciples, "If anyone desires to come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me. 25For whoever desires to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for My sake will find it.

8"If your hand or foot causes you to sin, cut it off and cast it from you. It is better for you to enter into life lame or maimed, rather than having two hands or two feet, to be cast into the everlasting fire. 9And if your eye causes you to sin, pluck it out and cast it from you. It is better for you to enter into life with one eye, rather than having two eyes, to be cast into hell fire.

I realize these verses don't say "Thou shalt not eat man flesh." What I don't understand, however, is why a Christian would be so worried about prolonging his life that he would stoop to such disgusting behavior. I know you're going to tell me that I've never starved before and I might change my mind. I'd like to think, however, that I've prepared myself for death and am ready to go any time. If that means laying down and folding my hands in prayer for days while starving to death so be it. I'd rather let somebody bludgeon me and eat me than vice versa. I won't miss this world a bit.

Christ called us to be ready to die whether it be beheading or upside-down crucifixion. I'd hope that when your plane is going down and one parachute is missing you'll stay behind for the sake of the lost.

Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/3/3 9:21

See my previous post for the context.

I do not think the morality of eating human flesh is in question here! I cannot conceive of any human being let alone Christian doing such a detestable act at all.

**However**, we are all humans, weak and frail. In extreme conditions like wars, poverty and starvation, humans do commit extreme acts. This is true of Christians too.

It is easy for some well-fed American Christian sitting comfortably in his room eating his favorite snack to say how we should rely upon God's provision! (I can do that too... and preach ten sermons on it) However, you just might be the first one to fall when a severe situation arises.

We have all heard about the bravery of many Chinese Christians risking their lives for God and for their faith. But the reality is, there are *a lot more* who had succumbed to the temptation of wavering in their faith--many of them well-known Bible teachers and preachers, who were no doubt genuine and fervent Christians. But even they may lapse into moments of

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Don't read if you're eating!**

f weakness under the severe pressure from the Communists. (I thank God, who eventually restored many of them by reminding them of their first love; some Christians are not as forgiving).

Even the apostle Peter in his moment of weakness denied the Lord three times. His story proved that it is easy to say, "Even if I have to die with you, I will never disown you." (Matt 26:35) But to do it when the moment calls for it is quite another story.

**Re: - posted by nobody, on: 2004/3/3 18:07**

I agree, but would also like to point out that Peter's weak moment was pre-Spirit filling. After Pentecost he was ready to be crucified upside-down with no regrets.

Most people expect that God will have mercy on actions that are committed in total complete weakness. This is why many question the teaching of suicide always being a ticket to hell. I think if I get into a jam like that I might just trust God to have the same mercy on my suicide that I'd expect Him to have on my murder. If you're gonna kill maybe it is best that it be yourself.

**Re: - posted by sermonindex (), on: 2004/3/3 19:04**

Quote:  
-----We have all heard about the bravery of many Chinese Christians risking their lives for God and for their faith. But the reality is, there are a lot more who had succumbed to the temptation of wavering in their faith--many of them well-known Bible teachers and preachers, who were no doubt genuine and fervent Christians. But even they may lapse into moments of weakness under the severe pressure from the Communists. (I thank God, who eventually restored many of them by reminding them of their first love; some Christians are not as forgiving).  
-----

Great words of wisdom brother! yes we are agreed on the biblical standard and morality of the issue of cannibalism. But as you said the practical experience of extreme situations could have people (christians included), falling to levels that are not worthy to be mentioned.

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/3/4 5:37**

Quote:  
-----yes we are agreed on the biblical standard and morality of the issue of cannibalism.  
-----

I don't think anyone has given me any biblical evidence of non-cannibalism.

What is wrong with it?

Why is it different to eating an animal?

The body will rot in the ground or be cremated, will it not?

Please note I am talking about eating a person who has died of 'natural' causes, i.e. someone hasn't just killed them.

**Re: It took a little time, but... - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/4 8:20**

I waited to see when this thread would reach the true essence of what was being asked. The danger in making ANY exception to a law is that the EXCEPTION revises the law and all expect the same privilege as the one in the extreme situation. So you ask... what is that law? Cannibalism is rejected on the same grounds as **Transubstantiation**. It is not far from vampirism. Cannibalism has always been contrary to the law God has written on our hearts and to partake of such is to thrust God from the mind and beg reprobation (Romans 1). It also finds itself in the category that Paul used for such cases that may find themselves wildly beyond realm of reasonable human beings saying "And if there be any other thing that is CONTRARY TO SOUND DOCTRINE" (1 Timothy 1:10). In what greater measure could a person "Defile the self with mankind?" Our body is sown in CORRUPTION... that means in some way they are corrupted with sin itself. Otherwise we would not need to be resurrected with a "spiritual" body. I am not suggesting gnostic and dualistic views of "the flesh" I am simply pointing to the fullness of the meaning of the Greek word SARX. We must put off this our tabernacle.

le- because there is some element of sin that it is tainted therewith after the fall- though it was created to be good in the beginning. Otherwise the resurrection is nonsensical.

II Kings 6:24-30 reports the disgust of the King of Israel hearing that a woman had eaten her own child under great distress in agreement with another woman who now refused to cook and share hers. The king RENT his clothes- which is a knee jerk reaction to utter vexation of soul. Underneath his clothes he was wearing sackcloth which is another sign of extreme distress and humility before God and the prelude to going before God with great humbleness of mind to beg for mercy (sackcloth & ashes).

Cannibalism is a pagan practice and gross violation of the 1st commandment. Pagan's believed that by eating a dead person they could acquire the characteristics of that person depending on the body part that was eaten. Why do you think the Pharisees (perushim) accused Jesus of blasphemy? One reason is that He said in metaphors "Unless you eat my flesh and drink my blood." Obviously He did not mean to infer paganism on the people and I believe the Pharisees knew this-- they saw Him as a threat to their authority that they had with the people (another issue). LAWS AGAINST these pagan rituals are among the FEW things that were placed upon believers at the FIRST CHURCH COUNCIL MEETING chaired by James the half brother of our Lord - the first president of the Church at Jerusalem. They were Gentiles (goyim) and were in the midst of this madness and could be tempted to participate. The 613 laws that the Jew was raised to believe strictly steered a person from such conduct by forbidding much lesser forms of meat (no cloven hoof, etc.). The Gentiles were pagans who had no law but the law of conscience and the laws upon their hearts which Paul (Shaul) wrote that they rejected and snuffed out in Romans 1 and 2. Enough said.

Consider his ruling:

Acts 15:19 Wherefore my sentence is, that we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles are turned to God:  
20 But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.

Acts 15:28 For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things;  
29 That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well.

Acts 21:25 As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication.

Old Testament:

Zechariah 9:6,7 And a bastard shall dwell in Ashdod, and I will cut off the pride of the Philistines. And I will take away his blood out of his mouth, and his abominations from between his teeth: but he that remaineth, even he, shall be for our God, and he shall be as a governor in Judah, and Ekron as a Jebusite.

"Abominations between their teeth?" If God so detested these things in the OT and He does not change... surely we have not so yielded to seducing spirits and doctrines of demons as to think that the cleansing of every creature for food extends to human flesh (I Timothy 4:4)? What madness and searing of the conscience would yield such a doctrine?

God Bless and Brotherly Love in Christ,

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/3/4 9:37**

RobertW, I am assuming the last post was directed to me, if it was not then please tell me.

The danger in making ANY exception to a law is that the EXCEPTION revises the law and all expect the same privilege as the one in the extreme situation.

Which exception am I making?

Cannibalism is rejected on the same grounds as Transubstantiation.

Which grounds are these and how are they connected?

It also finds itself in the category that Paul used for such cases that may find themselves wildly beyond realm of reasonable human beings saying "And if there be any other thing that is CONTRARY TO SOUND DOCTRINE" (I Timothy 1:10).

Which doctrine are you referring to?

II Kings 6:24-30 reports the disgust of the King of Israel hearing that a woman had eaten her own child under great distress in agreement with another woman who now refused to cook and share hers.

You are getting confused, these women were murdering their sons so to eat them, what I am talking about is eating a human who has died of 'natural' causes, e.g. like the plane crash in 'Alive'.

Pagans believed that by eating a dead person they could acquire the characteristics of that person depending on the body part that was eaten.

Just because pagans believe something about a certain action that does not make that action wrong, e.g. if a pagan thinks that when a fire is lit the god of fire gives that person strength, this does not make lighting fires wrong.

Why do you think the Pharisees (perushim) accused Jesus of blasphemy? One reason is that He said in metaphors "Unless you eat my flesh and drink my blood."

Unless I'm mistaken, the bible does not say that the pharisees accused Jesus of blasphemy for saying this.

In regards to your other comments about meat, are you a vegetarian? and if so for what reason?

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/4 11:56**

The fact that this is even being debated strikes me as a sure sign of depravity the likes of which are paralleled only by having to defend the sanctity of marriage as being only between a male and female. If your desire is to debate for the love of polemic- I'm not really interested. If you desire to know truth- God Himself teaches you that this is wrong! No? Who am I to add to what He has already written on your heart?

If you are looking for a "Thou Shalt Not Eat People" you will not find it; but that does not excuse the behavior. The "LAW" and "Sound Doctrine" I'm referring to is the unwritten common sense that only this generation seems to want to challenge. To make an exception in saying that it is OK to eat people if you are hungry enough leaves the door open to people eating people if they are hungry, then craving man's flesh, etc. What madness is this? Have you not read in Daniel 7:25 "And he shall think to change times and laws"? Everything is up for grabs with the Spirit of Antichrist that exists today and to even crack the door in this matter sets us up for a flood of wickedness.

Cannibalism is rejected on the same grounds as Transubstantiation.

You ask:

Which grounds are these and how are they connected?

I already answered this to a good degree; however the connection is clear. Eating man flesh and drinking man's blood? Oh the people who have laid down their lives during the counter reformation for the belief that this (transubstantiation) was heresy (See John Fox and the Martyr's Mirror, etc.).

True the women did murder and eat their children because of the great famine in Samaria; however, the logic of the woman I mention in my first post from the destruction of Jerusalem was that "the child was dying anyway?" Why should we both die? This is EXTREME starvation at its worst. The people are literally out of their mind with hunger.

As for the Pharisees- I concur that there may be no exact instance when they called his remark blasphemy; but rather, the whole of His teachings- which included that. No need to debate that- he was crucified? Many of his disciples remarked in John 6:53 that it was a HARD saying and many (not the 12) stopped following him over the remark.

No I am not a vegetarian and nor am I a cannibal. Consider I Corinthians 15:38,39...But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body. All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds. There is a distinction between the flesh of animals and that of man. Scripture does not lump them together and it would be demonic to teach the lawfulness of cannibalism.

The only hope for such a thing is in the case when David ate the shewbread when he was in need that was not lawful for him to eat. He never again took occasion to roll into the Holy Place and eat shewbread thereafter. It was an isolated case. Such would be the case in SEVERE famine. However, to open the door and begin suggesting that scripture allows for it is to open a flood of people wanting their right to cannibalize.

Best Regards in Christ,

**Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/3/4 13:04**

Nasher and others:

I never thought even the immorality of cannibalism is in dispute among Christians \*sigh\*.

So here are the direct references to cannibalism in Scripture taken from Nave's Topical Bible:

- \*\* Leviticus 26:29
- \*\* Deuteronomy 28:53-57
- \*\* 2 Kings 6:28,29
- \*\* Jeremiah 19:9
- \*\* Lamentations 2:20; 4:10
- \*\* Ezekiel 5:10

My observations:

Almost all references--Ezekiel 5:10, Lamentations 2:20, Jeremiah 19:9, Deuteronomy 28:53-57 and Leviticus 26:29--concerns the eating of children's or each other's flesh as a result of the punishment of the Lord. The image is that of being under siege by the enemies; extreme starvation thus led inevitably to cannibalism.

The rhetoric question in Lamentations 2:20 makes it clear that cannibalistic practices are considered negative, full of terror and horror.

Note however, that it is *assumed* in scripture that being sieged and in starvation will *definitely* lead to the horrible consequence of cannibalism. It is human nature to try to survive by all possible means.

I want to stress that Christian ethics is not always clear-cut in practice. We live in an imperfect world which often present

s to us options that all have some evil in it.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/4 13:17**

I agree. The thought I had at lunch (no pun intended) that I "bounced off" my brother brought back a response that I think that is worth considering. To what extent do human beings love life? Paul said once "I have a desire to depart and to be with Christ which is far better." Not that we are fatalistic in our thinking; but to what extent will a person go to save their life in a tribulation type situation. Would they also deny Christ? On the other hand Richard Wurmbrand in his book "Tortured for Christ" shows the great love that can come from severe persecution both for the Lord and our fellow believers.

God Bless,

-Robert

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/3/5 4:32**

The fact that this is even being debated strikes me as a sure sign of depravity the likes of which are paralleled only by having to defend the sanctity of marriage as being only between a male and female.

What are you saying, that I am depraved?

If you desire to know truth- God Himself teaches you that this is wrong!? No? Who am I to add to what He has already written on your heart?

God has not revealed to me that it is wrong.

The "LAW" and "Sound Doctrine" I'm referring to is the unwritten common sense that only this generation seems to want to challenge.

I prefer to trust in the Lord and lean not on my own understanding.

To make an exception in saying that it is OK to eat people if you are hungry enough leaves the door open to people eating people if they are hungry, then craving man's flesh, etc. What madness is this?

What I am referring to is a survival situation, like a plane crash etc., not if Tesco's run out of food for a while.

Eating man flesh and drinking man's blood?

The difference here is that one is done in the belief that red wine will supernaturally turn into Christ's blood, the other is eating a man's flesh who has died of 'natural' causes.

however, the logic of the woman I mention in my first post from the destruction of Jerusalem was that "the child was dying anyway?" Why should we both die?

True they were both dying and if I was the parent I would give my life for the child, not the other way round.

As for the Pharisee's- I concur that there may be no exact instance when they called his remark blasphemy; but rather, the whole of His teachings- which included that.

The whole of Christ's teachings were not all considered blasphemy.

There is a distinction between the flesh of animals and that of man.



**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Don't read if you're eating!**

You are paraphrasing, the verse says there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds. Four things are mentioned here.

However, to open the door and begin suggesting that scripture allows for it is to open a flood of people wanting their right to cannibalize.

I don't believe I have ever suggested that scripture allows for it, rather I have asked the question does scripture prohibit it.

**Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/3/5 10:51**

Nasher,

It seems to me you are a little irritated. Calm down. We are one family though we may disagree. :)

See my previous post for the relevant scriptural verses on cannibalism. Let me know what you think.

S.

**Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/3/5 11:38**

Was waiting for this:

Quote:  
-----I have a desire to depart and to be with Christ which is far better." Not that we are fatalistic in our thinking; but to what extent will a person go to save their life in a tribulation type situation.  
-----

It is only the fear of death that could cause someone to go to such an extreme.

Here is another to consider:

*"1Ki 17:12 And she said, As the LORD thy God liveth, I have not a cake, but an handful of meal in a barrel, and a little oil in a cruse: and, behold, I am gathering two sticks, that I may go in and dress it for me and my son, that we may eat it, and die."*

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/5 14:25**

God have mercy on us all!

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/3/8 7:43**

Hi Agent001, I am calm, you don't spend 3 years on beliefnet.com without learning to remain calm with people!

Regarding your post, do you believe these instances of "cannibalism" refer to a person killing another person in order to eat them, or do you believe it refers to the person already dying of "natural" causes and then they eat them?

**Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/3/8 10:25**

Quote:

-----you don't spend 3 years on beliefnet.com without learning to remain calm with people!  
-----

Nasher, bless you, it takes a special work of the Lord to engage in that battlefield, I had to be moved to a desk job ;-)

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/8 10:54**

Nasher,

Perhaps I should ask what the real question is again as to not misunderstand you and we talk past each other. It seems to me that you want definitive evidence against cannibalism.

I am most troubled by one comment you made earlier:

God has not revealed to me that it is wrong.

Do I understand that correctly?

-Robert

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/3/8 11:06**

Robert, I refer you back to my original post:

In the film "Alive" the passengers that survived had to eat the dead passengers to survive.

Is this wrong?

Since we are in the scriptural debates forum I would suggest any argument for or against must come from the bible.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2004/3/8 12:18**

Nasher,

I believe we are in danger of displeasing the Lord to continue on with strifes of words to no profit (I Timothy 6).

I Corinthians 11:14 Paul tells us that there are some things that nature itself teaches us (in this case about hair). I will not withdraw my comments concerning the laws of God written on our hearts, I will STRESS them (Jeremiah 31:33), because that is a major part of the covenant we are under and there are certain things that are universally KNOWN (Romans 1:19-32). Ask 10 Christian people you know and then see their reaction. I have done this and everyone is in utter DISBELIEF (to say the very least).

Lets follow this out logically based upon what God HAS revealed-- If it is unlawful to defile your bodies among yourselves-- how could it be possible to believe God would allow eating of human flesh?

Send Hank an email at equip.org and see what he says. I'll be interested to know.

This was my last post in this debate.

-Robert

**Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/3/8 14:04**

Nasher,

Quote:

-----Hi Agent001, I am calm, you don't spend 3 years on beliefnet.com without learning to remain calm with people!  
-----

I shall speak the truth in love: I do find a lack of grace and respect in some of your postings.

Quote:

-----Regarding your post, do you believe these instances of "cannibalism" refer to a person killing another person in order to eat them, or do you believe it refers to the person already dying of "natural" causes and then they eat them?  
-----

Some instances indicate that the former is in view. In some other ones, it could well be either one. Regardless, the idea of having to eat human flesh in all of these references (see my earlier post) were abhorred by the authors. Having to resort to such acts was considered a judgement from God.

On another note, tobacco was never prohibited in Scripture, but that does not mean it is right. The Bible is not an ethical code book that covers all cases of ethical choices.

In the hypothetical situation described in your first post, I do think the extreme situation might call for such an extreme choice. However, if my grandma die in my home today, I do not think it is right (nor respectful) to treat myself to her flesh for dinner. :)

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/3/9 4:54**

Robert, Lets follow this out logically based upon what God HAS revealed-- If it is unlawful to defile your bodies among yourselves-- how could it be possible to believe God would allow eating of human flesh?

Robert, although you have stated that this was your last post in this debate I must respond to your remarks with a question:

In what way does eating human flesh (from a person that has died from natural causes and you need their flesh to survive) defile a person?

Agent001, I shall speak the truth in love: I do find a lack of grace and respect in some of your postings.

Please tell me which postings you find this in.

Some instances indicate that the former is in view. In some other ones, it could well be either one. Regardless, the idea of having to eat human flesh in all of these references (see my earlier post) were abhorred by the authors. Having to resort to such acts was considered a judgement from God.

You may be correct, however I think the punishment was that they (out of hunger) were going to kill each other to survive, what do you think?

On another note, tobacco was never prohibited in Scripture, but that does not mean it is right. The Bible is not an ethical code book that covers all cases of ethical choices.

Tobacco has been recently found to cause many diseases, I don't know what the long term effects of eating human flesh would be, but since it would only be done in a crash / survival time, it would only be done for a short period of time.

In the hypothetical situation described in your first post, I do think the extreme situation might call for such an extreme choice. However, if my grandma die in my home today, I do not think it is right (nor respectful) to treat myself to her flesh for dinner. :)

I agree with you!

BTW, it may surprise you that I am a vegetarian (not for any particular reason) but would kill an animal to survive!

**Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/3/9 10:19**

Quote:  
-----You may be correct, however I think the punishment was that they (out of hunger) were going to kill each other to survive, what do you think?  
-----

It is equally possible that some have starved to death and the others ate their flesh for survival (as had happened throughout human history).

Quote:  
-----Tobacco has been recently found to cause many diseases, I don't know what the long term effects of eating human flesh would be, but since it would only be done in a crash / survival time, it would only be done for a short period of time.  
-----

The example of tobacco was cited to illustrate that not all ethical decisions had to have direct Biblical references, as some of your posts seemed to demand (However, from your current response, it is clear that I was mistaken).

Your present response also clarified your position. You said *"it would only be done in a crash / survival time."* You did not mention this part of your argument in your previous posts; so it sounded like you are advocating that eating human flesh is alright *at all times*, as long as it is obtained from deceased persons dying of natural causes. I am guessing that is what upset RobertW. If you check his first response, his position is similar in that he did allow for this to be done in extreme conditions.

Even though this case is rather bizarre, I think it's beneficial in that it forces us to re-think what Christian ethics is. Ethical situations are complex; so the common "Bible is an ethical code book" is not adequate. I also think we must allow room for the Spirit to guide us in muddy situations.

Just curious, are you a vegetarian for religious reasons?

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/3/9 11:06**

Your present response also clarified your position. You said *"it would only be done in a crash / survival time."* You did not mention this part of your argument in your previous posts; so it sounded like you are advocating that eating human flesh is alright at all times, as long as it is obtained from deceased persons dying of natural causes. I am guessing that is what upset RobertW. If you check his first response, his position is similar in that he did allow for this to be done in extreme conditions.

I'm sorry that you have both got the wrong stick of the end ;-), but if you look at my very first post you can see where I was coming from:

"In the film *"Alive"* the passengers that survived had to eat the dead passengers to survive.

Is this wrong?"

Even though this case is rather bizarre, I think it's beneficial in that it forces us to re-think what Christian ethics is. Ethical situations are complex; so the common "Bible is an ethical code book" is not adequate. I also think we must allow room for the Spirit to guide us in muddy situations.

I totally agree, and I'm not saying that eating human flesh is acceptable, I'm just wanted to know what the bible said about it.

Just curious, are you a vegetarian for religious reasons?

From the age of about 2 I have never been a normal person when it came to eating. I didn't eat (and still don't) any vegetables except potatoes and sweetcorn, I very rarely ate meat and if I did it was always

s sausage rolls!

From the age of about 14 I decided to become a vegetarian (it wasn't hard because I didn't eat much meat anyway!), I thought at the time it was wrong to eat animals.

Some time after this I realised that it wasn't wrong to eat animals because Jesus ate fish (or at least he helped Simon catch fish) and because since Noah, man was allowed to eat meat.

However I still don't eat meat now and the reason is complicated, here are a few reasons:

1. I don't need to eat meat to survive (yet ;-)
2. I don't like the way animals are treated (I am a hypocrite in this respect because I wear leather and eat eggs etc.)
3. I generally don't like meat

I have nothing against people eating meat however, my wife eats meat and I will not discourage my children (God-willing, when they are born) from eating meat either.

I do have one bone to pick though, when some people say "God created animals for us to eat", I disagree, from what I gather from Genesis 2, God created animals to have some sort of fellowship with man, however none of them were good enough, this is why God created Eve out of Adam.

Please tell me if you disagree.

One more thing, I'm not trying to cause trouble, but can you answer my question from my previous post:

Agent001, I shall speak the truth in love: I do find a lack of grace and respect in some of your postings.

Please tell me which postings you find this in.

**Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/3/10 11:34**

Nasher:

Quote:

-----I totally agree, and I'm not saying that eating human flesh is acceptable, I'm just wanted to know what the bible said about it.  
-----

The discussion would not have been so heated if you had stated this more explicitly at the beginning. But it wouldn't have been this interesting though. \*wink\*

We better not have dinner together. You know about Chinese--many animals that Westerners don't eat are delicacies on our dining table. \*smile\*

As for the postings, it's the general tone in your responses to RobertW. I could have misunderstood though.

**Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2004/3/10 11:53**

Hi Agent001, I think it was explicit at the start but people went off course and I should have spotted that!

If the tone of my responses to RobertW changed then it may have been from this comment he made:

The fact that this is even being debated strikes me as a sure sign of depravity the likes of which are paralleled only by having to defend the sanctity of marriage as being only between a male and female.

To me it seemed like he was accusing me of being depraved!

Re: - posted by Zaphycat (), on: 2004/3/14 5:29

Wow, what a lively debate!

I thought I'd throw my 2 cents in. Now, \*\*\*I KNOW THAT THIS SCRIPTURE DOES NOT PERTAIN TO CANNIBALISM\*  
\*\* But I'm going to quote it anyway. So please, don't rant about how the scripture has nothing to do with cannibalism:

John 6:56 - He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

Now, this is Jesus talking. He is talking about being one with him. He is talking about communion. He is talking about his spirit, and eternal life... these things. But I thought it a relevant scripture to bring to you.

I will say this: the practice of eating the flesh of a human being in any situation is unappealing, disgusting and utterly revolting. Sadly, there are some depraved peoples that don't have a problem with it.

However... would you do it, in a survival situation? When a plane crashes in the mountains with nothing but snow around you, or when the Donners are stuck in the high Sierra's with no supplies around... if you were there, what would you do? This isn't about killing another human, this is about taking a human who has died from other reasons (an plane crash for instance) and cutting up his frozen flesh and eating it. I will note that I don't know of anyone in either group (Donner or Alive), no matter what the moral or ethical problems they had with it, that refused and starved to death. On the other hand, I don't think there was anyone in either group that was a die hard evangelical christian. There were many that were christians, and I remember the reference one man made to justify it to another man in Alive, he said "\_\_\_\_, the spirit is not in the body, it has left the body". I truly see my flesh as simply flesh, it's made of atoms and molecules the same basic way as birds and beasts of the field. It \*IS\* different, however, for 1 Corinthians 15:39 says: "All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds".

What am I trying to say? That under survival, non-murder situations, it may very well be acceptable, an alternative to a gruesome death of starvation. I read the "Donner" story and accounts, and I do remember that in the record of the happenings, that it said that each member of the Donner Party knew what they had done, and went on to live completely normal lives, just wanting to forget that such an episode had ever happened. This is understandable, there is nothing physically wrong with you if you are forced to eat such in a survival situation, whether it's spiritually wrong.... well, that's what we're debating here. My personal take is "No". It's not wrong I don't believe. It's just flesh. Did you ever hear of the (True) story of that butcher in Britain that killed people and served them up in a diner...? Was there anything wrong with the people that ate there? No!

If I were put in a place like that, I would react the same as anyone else that actually did go through that... I would want to forget about it and get on with my life as best as I could. These people are not vampires or abominations, they are regular people pushed to do something horrible and gruesome for the sake of survival. Maybe there is something spiritually wrong with them, maybe RobertW is right in saying that it's the law of God and it's written on your heart. But if so, maybe it's written on HIS heart (I do believe there are personal convictions that God lays on the heart of people that they have no right to condemn everyone on).

As for me, I don't know what I would do in that situation (does any of us truly know...?) But I feel as if the situation is that incredibly desperate, it just might be something that may have to be done. Then again, maybe I'd feel a conviction against it then. Either way, I think God would lead me to do what which is right (if he even cares...!) and if I made the wrong choice, I believe he would have grace to forgive me.

This is quite a disgusting thread...

:-P

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/3/14 12:35

Hey Zap, long time no hear brother!  
Great reply!

Quote:  
-----Now, \*\*\*I KNOW THAT THIS SCRIPTURE DOES NOT PERTAIN TO CANNIBALISM\*\*\* But I'm going to quote it anyway. So please, don't rant about how the scripture has nothing to do with cannibalism:  
-----

Actually the hearers thought so...

Joh 6:60 When many of his disciples heard this, they said, "This is a difficult statement. Who can accept it?"

Joh 6:61 But Jesus, knowing in himself that his disciples were grumbling about this, said to them, "Does this offend you ?

Joh 6:66 As a result, many of his disciples turned back and no longer associated with him.

From Gills Exposition:

when they had heard this; that his flesh and blood were truly and really meat and drink, and that none had life in them, or should have eternal life, but such as eat and drink the same:

said, this is an hard saying; or it is to be objected to; so  $\&\#1511;\&\#1513;\&\#1497;\&\#1488;$ , "an hard thing", the word here used in the Syriac version, and  $\&\#1511;\&\#1513;\&\#1492;\&\#1492;\&\#1493;\&\#1488;\&\#1506;\&\#1500;\&\#1497;$ , "it is to me a hard thing", are phrases used to express an objection in the Talmudic writings, where they are often met with: or it is difficult to be understood and received; so  $\&\#1492;\&\#1491;\&\#1489;\&\#1512;\&\#1492;\&\#1511;\&\#1513;\&\#1492;$ , "an hard saying", or "an hard cause", is a cause difficult to be tried and determined, Exo\_18:26, and is used of that which seems incredible and absurd, and is surprising and unaccountable

is it a difficult thing with you? does it seem absurd to you? or are you surprised at it? anything difficult, or which seems irreconcilable, is so called: so the slaying the passover between the two evenings is called by Aben Ezra, in Exo\_12:6,  $\&\#1502;\&\#1500;\&\#1492;\&\#1511;\&\#1513;\&\#1492;$ , "an hard saying". In like sense the phrase is used here; and the allusion may be to food that is hard of digestion, since Christ had been speaking of himself under the metaphors of bread and meat. As some of the doctrines of Christ are comparable to milk, which is easy of digestion; others are like to strong meat, which belongs to those of full age, and cannot be digested by children, by babes in Christ, and much less be received, ate, and digested, with ease and pleasure, by carnal minds; who therefore say, as these Capernaïtes did,

who can hear it? this saying, or doctrine, concerning eating the flesh, and drinking the blood of Christ; or "him" Christ, who delivered this doctrine: such preaching, and such a preacher, are intolerable; there is no hearing, nor bearing them: hence we afterwards read, that these withdrew from the ministry of Christ, Joh\_6:66.

(z) Misn. Nidda, c. 8, sect. 3.

Pretty easy from a comfy chair to say 'I wouldn't' as I believe I did earlier. If I had any say in it would prefer that they kill me and then...

Quote:  
-----This is quite a disgusting thread...  
-----

No doubt ;-)

Can say this much, not to shy around here...

Re: - posted by Zaphycat (), on: 2004/3/14 15:58

Hey Crsschk :)

Yeah I've been gone for a little while, after I submitted that "should I get married" thread, I promptly decided that I loved her and I thought I should get engaged, so a lot of my time's been spent with her... wonderful praying woman.

Anyways, I know that the "Jews" of that day also had issues, as even before my quote, they "strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" (v52). It is indeed a sickening and disgusting thread, but someone brought it up and wanted to know people's takes on it...

I may say that I would rather them eat me first.... if I died. If it came down to killing, the whole issue is changed. The fact with the Donner party and the "Alive" crew is that no one had to kill anyone else, they were already dead.

The Apostles commandments in Acts Ch 15 and 21 are in reference to normal times, so I don't even think that God would care if the meal was "strangled" or what... maybe that's getting a bit too disgusting.

I guess for me, I would have to #1 be IN that situation before I could decide, and I'd have to weigh a number of other factors... like, is there a possibility that I might get rescued? How long? Is there anything else halfway edible around?

I read a humorous story (fake) about this group trapped in an elevator that, after 20 minutes, consumed one of their number before being rescued. I thought it was mildly humorous (just had to share it with you, the title was "In retrospect, we may have resorted to cannibalism a bit early").

But I know the "Alive" group had this dilemma: They tried hiking out but could not because they were so weak. It had been weeks and weeks, and they were given up for dead, yet they were alive. They had to get word out, so what could they do? They decided to get strength to cross the mountains, they would need energy and protein. So they did the unthinkable.

To throw another wrench into the works... if they hadn't of done this, would it be considered suicide, if they gave up? Would they be judged for \*NOT\* eating...?

Just a thought...