

## God Idea advocates Extreme Asceticism

The Catholic Church has canonised many saints who were ascetics. They made themselves suffer for God. They didn't find life painful enough so they set out to create new horrors for themselves. The Catholic idea that we must love God more than ourselves implies that we should welcome suffering. The teaching of Jesus Christ that we must value only God suggests it far more strongly. Deranged Saint, Therese of Lisieux, taught about celebrating suffering as a gift.

### EXTREME SACRIFICE PLEASE!

Every moment of your life is absolutely valuable in itself and to you because it is a moment of life and life is so precious. To suffer a moment for a human being is okay because you will see the benefits and you see and touch who you are doing it for. It is not a waste. But God wants you to suffer as part of his plan for his sake! This is an outrage and a disgrace for he is not like a human person in the sense that we can only believe in him or have the opinion that he exists. You can't be totally sure he exists. You cannot be as sure he exists as you are that your neighbour exists. Because life is so valuable to pain yourself to help others is always extreme but if you do it for God or if you help them for God then this is excessively extreme. It implies that God wants you to suffer unreasonably and excessively. He could hardly want you to sacrifice for him at all without wanting you to sacrifice yourself as cruelly as possible. Intelligent people realise these things so God religion is dangerous and causes a lot of harm.

To love another is to freely make sacrifices for them because if you do something for them to benefit yourself or so that you can feel good you are really just loving yourself. So to help others you have to reject what is good for yourself in doing so. There would be no point in us being allowed by God to undergo suffering at all unless he wanted us to make sacrifices. And when he makes extreme suffering possible though when I am most sure I exist and what I am most sure of comes first he wants me to be prepared to face it for self-negating love. This teaching has been explicated in *The Life of All Living* by Bishop Fulton J Sheen (page 95) which speaks of love as something that hurts and wounds.

You only help yourself when it enables you to do more for others. It is them it is really all for. So it follows that if you are selfless, then you can always be selfless.

You have to be selfless all the time. Selflessness means putting another or a number of people before one person, yourself. Morality is doing the most good for others. To make yourself happy would be a sin when you can use the energy to make others happy instead.

If God exists, failures in the way of sacrificing to do good are more serious than they would be if he did not. To do wrong on A would mean doing wrong on God too for he is good. But if there is no God you would just be mistreating A. So God necessarily demands sacrifice. He asks you to adopt a belief that makes you as a flawed person, a person who goes out of their way to see less good in themselves all for the sake of a belief!

Devotion to God is not gained by strolling along paths of flowers but by hurling yourself along paths of thorns. By this principle alone, the priests and the clergy of Christendom, the leaders of the Muslims and the rabbis of the Jews who have a personal God who they believe is the only thing that matters are condemned as mistaken at best and hypocrites at worst for they do not do much suffering for God.

Would God be pleased with little sacrifices when you could make better and bigger ones?

Jesus told us to love God with all, not some of, our power. A small sacrifice is a sin when you can make a bigger one because the more terrible the sacrifice is the greater the act of love it is.

And if God is to be all, that makes self-esteem a sin for we should have God-esteem or we should like God working in us but not like ourselves. We should praise him for our good works and not ourselves. That is quite harmful. And God should not be all or even first when I can prove I exist but can't prove him. **GOD IS PERFECT AND WOULD COMMIT AN EXTREME SACRIFICE FOR ME SO IF I AM TO BE ALL FOR HIM, I HAVE TO BE LIKE HIM IN THIS. I HAVE TO REWARD HIS LOVE BY EXTREME PALLID SACRIFICE.** Christianity says that God went to the extreme of dying on the cross for sinners and would have rotted in Hell forever for us if he had to and if he could. God might say we are not degrading ourselves by extreme sacrifice because he is there to make sure we will be okay. Being okay in his world means being virtuous not necessarily happy.

If God is pleased when we please ourselves then we would not suffer. When you make yourself happy you are not even aware of suffering or sacrifice so it is possible for God to make you happy all the time. He does not so it is his will that you

suffer. So, the true believer has to suffer all the time, all the way.

If pleasure is good then the wrongness or malice (against God) of sexual sin is lessened the more pleasure you take in it. The pleasure however great does not necessarily have to make you sin again. And besides even good pleasure can make you weaker in relation to the pleasure of sin so the forbidden pleasure is not banned for that reason. The Church says that sexual sin is worse the more you enjoy it meaning that pleasure is considered to be a sin.

We all know it is easier to be bad when our life is going well. Religion denies that sexual or any sin is lessened in badness by the enjoyment you take in it. So how could pleasure be good when it fails to reduce the iniquitous intent? It has to be bad then when it cannot do that. Anything that seems good but fails to do good or reduce the wickedness or malice of sin is bad. Some wrongly say that it may not be bad but it is not good either. It's both. But even then how could you create a morality with an idea like that? The view that it is bad destroys morality altogether.

Religion says that God does not want us to suffer but when we have to suffer he has to tell us to do it. It is a necessary evil. But it is only a necessary evil if God was compelled to make us which religion denies. Belief in God is dangerous. You can see this from the fact that nobody should try for a baby when that baby will inherit a dreadful disability from her. You cannot excuse it on the basis that it will love and she will love it and suffering will deepen that love. Belief in God logically commands cruelty for he says we will inevitably tend towards godlessness. The more evil we do the more evil we make necessary.

Self-denial is, according to Christianity, not demanded for its own sake but for a greater good, for practicing love. But the problem is that this love is altruism, altruism just cares about rules and not happiness, and so it is not good. So self-denial is demanded for its own sake or the sake of evil. Love is self-denial in the Christian view. So it follows that it does indeed urge self-denial for its own sake. It obscures that for it does not really believe its doctrine.

If love is sacrifice and you can't commit a sacrifice for another person you have to get into asceticism, doing penance like whipping yourself until you cry with pain for that is the closest you can get to the kind of sacrifice that helps others. Penance helps God and others too when it is offered for them.

All self-sacrifice is unreasonable when you are most sure you exist and so don't say only reasonable sacrifices should be made. You can still live if you give away every penny. Altruism, if it is consistent, forbids the person helped to take pleasure in your kindness say you give them every penny. It demands that the person must give the money all away to somebody else. So you only seek help to give it away. That exposes self-sacrifice as slavery and meaningless activity.

We know that self-sacrifice is not necessary anyway. To help others to get something out of it for yourself such as a good feeling about yourself is better and is what we advocate as egoists.

When I am more sure I exist than that God does or my neighbour it follows that I should practice rational egoism. But God, even if he wants only a little altruistic love from me is telling me to degrade myself and do wrong which would imply I should suffer to the extreme if he is right. If it is right to degrade oneself by an act of will then the more will it takes to degrade yourself the better morally.

Christianity denies that our good works deserve infinite blessing though it says our bad works deserve infinite rejection by God in Hell which means that this cult is more concerned about our sins than our goodness. When sin is infinitely bad and when good works cannot atone for it for God does not look on them as infinitely valuable as Christianity says, then it is better to make up for sin than to do good works. We must do our best out of pure generosity even if Jesus has atoned. What is this best - helping others? No - extreme penance. This shows the hypocrisy of the Catholic confessional which gives three Hail Marys for sins as penance!

Altruism commands that if I injure a person I should make it up to them and they should accept this compensation even if they do not want it. It may not be wanted but it is needed for all evil has to be replaced by good. When I have injured others by leading them into infinite sin it follows that I owe infinite good to that person to make up for it. So nobody can say that any sacrifice is unreasonable. Carrying them on your back so that they may get to the shop without walking is reasonable. It is their duty to accept your help for you choose to atone and it is altruistic of them to accept. I will only believe in infinite sin if I believe in God so God means I believe or should believe that I should let others walk all over me and even kill myself by doing good for them.

When God offers me the choice between living in terrible agony for the rest of my life in order to donate some organs to my sick child and letting the child die, he wants to see if I will sacrifice myself for him or do the right thing no matter how terrible it is. Would it be fair for some to have to make this choice and not others? God of course would want the child to live and you to suffer for it. The incident testifies that extreme sacrifice must be practiced in all things by all people for God wants the best from all of us so when he asks some for extreme sacrifice he asks all. God comes before any child so we

should seek out extreme sacrifice.

Evil can only be explained as a punishment from a God who wants us to sin so he can punish us for he makes obeying him so damn unpleasant.

Catholics say you can go to Heaven after a life of sin by making a sincere act of perfect contrition on your deathbed. Protestants say that to be with God forever in Heaven all you have to do is to receive Jesus by prayer and you are saved forever without good works. When that is enough what is the use of sacrifice? They still demand it which makes their philosophies extremely cruel. They are travesties of godly morality.

God would want us to sin if he does not want sacrifice or altruism or if he would settle for what these Christians say is enough. A quick act of repentance costs nothing and does not deserve to be called altruism for it can be reversed when one is tired of being good. It cannot suffice. If we are to be saved we have to express and prove our sorrow by performing great sacrifices. We would not be using the sacrifices to earn forgiveness but we would be using them to express repentance. Repentance would be better expressed and more real and deeper this way. So you can't mock God by expressing repentance in prayer or by going to confession but you express it by making extreme sacrifice your prayer of, and expression of, repentance. You communicate your repentance to God through actions not words. Except you sacrifice to the extreme, the repentance cannot win forgiveness for it would be saying, "God I repent but I refuse to repent better and prove it though it is a sin." Deathbed conversions would be futile. Jesus was driving at all these teachings when he said that we must not try to please God without undoing the harm we have done first (Matthew 5:24).

God forgives which means he takes all your sins away and gives you Heaven and saves you from the endless Hell your sins deserve. So repentance brings you something infinitely valuable. Only undergoing extreme sacrifice and using it as a prayer for repentance, for actions can ask for things too, could be the proper and genuine repentance. If you want something infinitely valuable merely asking for it makes it very easy and cheap and cheapens the benefits. If you really want something you will prove your appreciation of it and desire for it. Asking easy for something isn't as much asking for it as would asking for it with extreme difficulty. Asking through severe penance would be taking repentance and sin very seriously.

It is blasphemy to say that sin is very seriously offensive to God and then to say that a few words of sorrow can reverse it. If you want your sin of murder forgotten by God then you should say it by a huge sacrifice. You would if you were not just after the feeling that you are not so bad anymore though you are. You would if you were not trying to steal a blessing you are not entitled to namely inner peace. I bet God would rather have us Atheists. Christian forgiveness deepens sin and nothing else. Christians and religionists condition people to accept an artificial morality which they want to follow even though its flaws are obvious. Some become clergy and missionaries to make sure the sickness is passed on. It is not about God it is about themselves. They are egotists not egoists.

A God who made us for extreme sacrifice should not have made us at all. To love him and tell people to love him would be to encourage evil and would not be love. He is unworthy of worship and religion is essential fanaticism even if not in practice.

If you believe that selfless love is the only real love as Christians state, then if you need pleasure as a bait to get you to do your duties then what praise do you deserve? Are you really any different from the person who has to be willed his dying father's money before he will attend to his father's sickbed?

If pleasure just happens to get us to do our duty then that shows that pleasure should never be an end in itself. When you take a drink you should do it to make you nicer to other people and not for the pleasure. That implies that enjoying yourself is wrong and that pleasure is an evil, a necessary evil maybe but an evil nonetheless. That means the less attachment you have to pleasure the better. Anyway, Christianity turns out to be a religion of killjoy after all. If the Bible did not intend us to be miserable sods it would not have contained so many rules. All it would have to do if it wanted us to be happy would be to tell us to increase the happiness of the majority as much as possible. If you believe in God the duties on your plate increase. If you believe in philanthropy you have only people to worry about.

Some would think that it would be better for God to make duties easier than to have hard duties which you will only perform with the help of pleasure. At least then it is all your own work and there were no desires being fulfilled to manipulate you and help you along. If they are right, then that is the way God should have arranged things. But the easy duty will involve pleasure which is why it is easy anyway so there is no difference.

God's doctrine that sin should be punished leads to the justification of extreme asceticism. God says anything I do to another person I do to him. If I stick out my tongue behind somebody's back I do not hurt that person. But I offend God who sees it. If there were no God I would deserve very little retribution but because there is a God for me to offend I deserve more. He wants me to wish that there was a God, even though it is worse for me if there is, so God implies that

extreme sacrifice is a duty for he wants to see us suffering. His wanting me to believe in him implies the same thing.

The Church may have it that you must love your neighbour as yourself but in practice what the Church believes in is just loving your neighbour. It is official Church teaching that the really good person doesn't want to be loved and respected but should love and respect others instead. Then the problem is, how can you really respect others if you don't want them to respect you? You don't want them to be virtuous. The love then is totally artificial. You have to want to be loved and respected to love and respect others. People want us to expect good of them.