

THE ABOMINATION OF INFANT BAPTISM

Infant baptism is often called Christening. In other words, it is reckoned to make a child a Christian. But if God commanded infant baptism he might not regard it as making a child a Christian or a member of the Christian family. He would demand it as something that the child could accept later on and which will not make the child a Christian until then. God has no respect for freedom if he makes a child a Christian when it cannot think for itself. He may need to force some things on a child like who its parents are and what kind of place it lives in but with religion and spiritual matters it is different for he has no need to force them on anybody. That is why it would be immoral. Unnecessary forcing is bad.

The Church says that we were made without our consent so we can be baptised without it to for baptism is birth into the family of God. It is us being regenerated or spiritually reborn.

But God could not ask us before he made us if we wanted to be made so that is different. He could ask us if we want to be born into his family. So he could let us die as babies and then ask us or he could let us grow up to decide for ourselves.

Dignity is seen as a gift from God and dignity is given in baptism too. Baptismal regeneration is linked to the notion of God making man in his own image. The baby becomes the icon of God in baptism. The unbaptised is an image of God in a sense but there is no qualification in how the baptised person images God. The unbaptised being the image of God is so vague that it is meaningless and as good as saying the unbaptised is nothing to God at all.

To baptise a child is to take advantage of her by putting her in a religion when she can't speak for herself. What happens is that the child is superficially a member for joining a religion is about what is in the heart. What happens is that a person who is not a member at all is counted as a member. Some would reply that it is theft or spiritual kidnapping. If the child is baptised as a Catholic, and then circumcised as a Jew then what religion does it belong to for it cannot belong to both. If it cannot belong to both then it belongs to neither.

To raise a child to believe in religion is conditioning and trapping her. No one has the right to do that to a child which is why infant baptism exists so that there might be an excuse for doing it. It fulfils its function for it makes people fail to see how abhorrent this is. Don't baptise babies and let them grow up to decide for themselves. When there are so many different religions about it has to be up to each person themselves. Infant baptism and other religious initiation rites performed on children are wrong. They are an insult to the child and no truly loving parents would put their baby through it. The Catholic tradition is particularly possessive and holds that once you are baptised an indelible mark is put on your soul forever marking you out as belonging to the Church of Christ even if you later want to remove it.

What makes it ten times worse is the fact that the vast majority of the children will grow up to reject most of what the Church teaches. They seem to reject it quicker if they know it well. Most know enough to make a negative decision. The Roman Catholic Church insists that the babies born in a mixed marriage must be made and raised as Catholics which is cruel towards non-Catholics. Why cause so much trouble over babies being baptised Catholics when they will more than likely cease to be authentic Catholics anyway? How can the Church with its cynicism based on Jesus Christ and Romans 3, which say we are more likely to do bad in God's eyes than good and more likely to refuse to accept the word of God, say that babies should be baptised for they will probably serve her as true followers anyway? This is the religion that decrees that babies should not be baptised if their "Catholic" parents will not make true Catholics of them. Church tradition says that babies should only be baptised if the parents or godparents will indoctrinate them.

Children are not given any real chance to freely accept the faith and have real belief for they are not told about any alternatives. And the Church says that free will to choose God or reject him is not conferred until about seven years of age. It converts children before that which amounts to manipulating them to serve God and herself without concern for their will or dignity. How could such faith be real when it is not free? The children were brainwashed. How can religion say that free will explains why God can love us and let us suffer when children who don't have it suffer and don't have a protective force field around them? Is it right to baptise children into a religion that is that inconsistent about the rightness of their being allowed by God to suffer?

Unfortunately, there is a great deal of prejudice against people who do not get their babies baptised. We must fight against prejudices against goodness instead of going along with them for they will always be around but will get fewer when our outrage gets more common.

Infant baptism is only a priestly scheme to win power. When people are baptised it is easier for the Church to get to them and influence them because they think of themselves as belonging to the Church. The Church is unsure of themselves when

they depend on exploitation of converts. The exploitation of children is the most cowardly method a religion can use to propagate itself. Not only is the child treated like a being that owes the Church allegiance but is encouraged by the mere performance of the rite to consider himself more likely to be true to God than a person who was not baptised. It encourages looking down on the unbaptised.

Infant baptism is diminishing the right of the child to be her own person. Your husband or wife or mother or father or politician or president will not claim the right to tell you what to think though they will at times tell you what it is your duty to do but the Church in the name of God will. Therefore infant baptism is intended to get the child dominated and controlled by the Church. Politicians are often corrupt and yet there can be no greater corruption than that in many of the clergy who claim the right to absolute power over the minds of their victims. Submission to God is really about submission to his representatives through whom he acts.

The Scientologists and the Moonies brainwash adults but it is far worse to brainwash children and the Christian clergy use baptism as the gateway to achieving that. The Roman Catholic Church has scarier doctrines than either of these two sects which is very worrying. I have heard it said that the only reason it is not recognised for the fanatical cult it is, is because it does not have the resources to instigate brainwashing, except in the case of children, and dares not install them with the whole world watching. If so then the Church is too powerful and high profile to get away with starting an obvious brainwashing program for adults. Yet it is undeniable that many Catholics are indeed brainwashed thoroughly but many are brainwashed a bit – consider the fear parents have associated with the thought of not getting their child baptised as an instance. The Church has injurious doctrines such as original sin and everlasting punishing to name but a few with which it hopes to brainwash to some extent by implanting fear so that the victims can't think for themselves. Evoking fear is a powerful way to brainwash and truth be known is the essence of what brainwashing is all about. That Catholics bring their babies to be handcuffed to a religion using underhand tactics is sufficient proof that they are indeed brainwashed themselves and warns us that religion is has potential for great harm and warps the minds even of those who only get involved a tiny bit. Religionists need help before the corruption does too much damage.

SACRAMENTAL BAPTISM UNREASONABLE

The doctrine of the Church is that baptism is not a right but a gift from God. Yet some seem to think they have a right to get their babies baptised or the baby has a right to get baptised! If the baby has a right parents have less right.

Rome teaches that when adults get baptised their original and actual sin is forgiven. It is blasphemy to say that God will delay reconciling with them until the priest pours water on them. If he loves them he will want to deliver them from sin and soon as they have the required dispositions of trust and repentance.

It is belittling God to teach that he keeps babies in original sin until the priest empties a jug on them. He does not love them when he is not anxious to make them his children as quickly as possible. Rome says he owes the children nothing so he can arbitrarily heal one of original sin and keep another in it if he wants to. So his forgiveness is just generosity. But it is an insult to be generous to one and not another for no reason. Generosity is a virtue so a truly perfect God cannot be mean like Rome's God. Rome has hidden her secret doctrine that God hates babies until they are baptised for too long. One could be forgiven for thinking the Church is the one that hates babies.

If you can't sleep in case something bad happens to your child without baptism then perform the baptism yourself. There is little harm in that but it is against the rights of the child. It is indeed far worse to take the child to a church for the Church makes you vow to brainwash the child as a Christian and to bring it to it for indoctrination. That is part of the deal. And you have to pay for it as well which is utterly degrading. Remember though by baptising your child you are promising to make the child a Christian for that is what baptism does, it is picturing the washing away of what God forbids and it is done in the name of the Father Son and Holy Spirit meaning you are bringing the child into the authority of God and his Church. That is actually wrong if you intend to let the child make her or his own decisions when she or he gets older.

It is not a very nice person who would praise a God who will not regard innocent babies as his friends and children until an eccentric in strange robes splashes them with holy water. The Catholic Church defends her this God claiming that the babies do not deserve salvation. But the babies haven't done anything. The Church agrees and then informs us that it is because they haven't that God has the right to look upon them with wrath. But he could look on them with love. When he has a choice he should pick the best. He would pick love if he were love.

The Church says that if you would be baptised but can't be God will understand and you will be made as good as baptised the very moment you die but under very strict conditions.

As long as you delay making your child a friend of God you are willing the child's separation from God and that must be a sin. And it must be child-abuse. Rome says it is worse to abuse the soul than to abuse the body. No wonder some feel that if

they have abused a child's soul they might as well abuse them sexually for they have done worse.

Why don't Catholics baptise babies in the womb with syringes as a rule?

At the end of the day, though baptised believers in infant baptism claim that they do not consider themselves any better or worse than an unbaptised baby they do. If you have God in your heart you are better than the person who has not. The doctrine of baptism they have is the stuff from which racism is made.

Religious fanaticism is when a religion fails to live and believe in such a way that no harm is done if the religion turns out to be untrue. This is fanaticism. It is no better than the spirit that leads the Catholic Church to inflict the fear of a priest not coming in time on a dying person.

Most so-called Christians have no problem contravening the rules of the Church on marriage so it is hard to see how they put so much emphasis on getting babies baptised.