

PARENTS DON'T PROPERLY CONSENT TO BAPTISM NEVER MIND THE CHILD!

It is odd how parents can see baptising a child into the Church as just a chance for a day out and something the child can reject or accept for themselves when old enough. The Church teaching is that baptism is a sacrament with its set of unchangeable obligations. There is a choice to reject it but the obligation to accept it is there and the child is calling for punishment or disadvantage down by not accepting it. In this scheme, baptism is not about the individual child or indeed any individual. It is about the collective, the community as in the Church. The child does not consent or have faith and baptism is a sacrament of faith so the child can be described as being baptised by the faith of the parents and by extension the Church as represented by the parents. Even if the child could have faith even that faith is not the point. It is the faith of the Church that matters.

Baptism makes babies a member of a religion without their consent. That is terrible enough. We know the child can't consent but what if it could? It would not be helped give informed consent either. Baptism does not care in principle about the informed consent never mind the consent.

Baptism is called Christening as well indicating that it is about committing to the Bible portrayal of Jesus and the Bible is seen has his book - he is the inspiration and helped man to write it. Christening in a sense is not given only to the baby but to the parents bringing her for baptism and the godparents. Christening is really collective. The baby is not the sole focus.

Baptism is done even without the informed consent of the parents. There is no concern for the parent's informed consent. The priests don't care if the parents hardly know Catholic doctrine so they don't really respect their choice either when it comes to baptising babies.

Parents would be told why or why not they should get babies baptised. They never are. Buddhism and Witchcraft believe in refusing those who wish to convert. This is not that they are rejecting the people, it is to ensure they are doing their best to make a convinced and final choice which can only be an informed choice. When such a choice is made, the person will be welcomed into the religion. No other religions are as respectful of those who come to them.

It is bad enough to put a child in a religion that way but it is worse to put them into Catholicism. That is because Catholicism makes the child a subject of its canon law by baptism. It is the most illiberal of many illiberal religions.

Baptism suggests that the religion is more important than the rights of the babies and what is best for them when their consent is so unimportant. The notion that there are many things we have to decide for our young without their consent does nothing at all to show that they can be baptised without their consent. If you have the right to have your child vaccinated without her consent, that does not give you the right to have her baptised. There is no evidence that baptism is going to do her spirit any good. You cannot have evidence the same way as you can have evidence that vaccination is best.

Baptism is, at least in Catholic thought, negatively a removal of supernatural powers that hinder the child from going to God and obeying him through his Church and positively a dedication to God and the teachings he has given the Church. It is a vow and marriage with God.

Nobody has the right to take a vow to what they don't understand. It is worse when they are forced to take the vow. And for most people baptism is claimed to open the child up to something - but when they don't know what they are being opened up to is that right?

You cannot assume that the baby would consent to a rite that accuses him of being unfit to go near God and offers him a relationship with a petty God who rejected him. The baptism is an attempt to force magical influences and abilities and religion on the baby. It is not just because she is a baby who can't consent but also because of the downside of the faith represented by the baptism.

In a tolerant society we respect other's principles. We respect the right of a Muslim to go to Mosque on a Friday even if it upsets lots of people and his employer. Some parents are against having their babies baptised as a matter of principle. They might be atheists. The Christians bully and pressure them to have the babies baptised. And those who argue, "But if you don't believe its only a harmless splash with water - don't be a weirdo and resist getting little Joanie baptised" are enablers of that bigotry. They are bigots themselves for they know society needs to progress and if you suppress a challenge to its superstitions you are holding it back and being unfair to the person's right to challenge.

Baptism is a promise to have them indoctrinated by the Christian religion when they are so vulnerable and easily

conditioned and by people who don't have the expertise or the honesty to look into religion objectively to see what is best for the child. There is a lot of harmful religion and harmful spirituality about. The philosophy with the least mysteries (eg how God could be one God in three persons or bread could be flesh without any discernable physical change) is the one that children should be exposed to if any. The less mystery the more credibility and security. Religion is full of rules that it says the human mind cannot understand but which God does for he knows best which makes it dangerous. What if a woman dies over not having an abortion though it was necessary to save her life? The Church says this is God's law for abortion is never tolerable or right. It adds that God knows what he is doing and he sometimes makes laws that seem odd just because he sees that having them pushes chance in such a direction that our spiritual betterment is implemented for everything that happens has direct and indirect effects and short-term and long-term effects. But what if the Church is wrong about God and what if there is no God? We have a woman that died over a fanatical so-called mystery. But God is only a belief and nobody has the right to die for it or ask others to die for it or encourage such deaths in any way.

The view that children need to be entered into a religion instead of doing the hard work to find a religion that suits them is invalid. It is learning to be good citizens that they need and that is simple. If religion should be at the heart of your life as the command of Christ suggested when he said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and all thy strength and all thy mind and this is the greatest commandment of them all" (Mark 12:28-31) then it is wrong to discourage searching no matter how hard the searching will be.

The doctrine of the Church that children have original sin which needs baptism to be forgiven and to undo the bias it causes towards sin is a sectarian and bigoted thesis. It accuses those who do not have their children baptised of harming them and risking causing them to harm others. It is accepted that people who believe people outside their sect are inferior are bigots and this is socially opposed these days so baptism should be opposed as well. And we see no difference between baptised and unbaptised children. In fact Muslims are often holier than baptised people. The doctrine is laced with bigotry.

If God is really good he can forgive original sin without baptism and should if he has any sense. By letting it effect us at all he proves himself worse than the Devil for the Devil only asks you to sin but God gives you the inclination to frequently rebel. God made the laws that caused original sin.

Original sin is in essence my self-will, I want my own way and not God's way. We never stop being like that. If God asked you to endure extreme torments forever and ever (Hell is the absence of God so I am not talking about Hell here) to save two strangers from eternal torture in Hell would you do it? Of course not. And yet you say you love the Lord your God with all your heart. So it is a deliberate lie for the Church to tell us that baptism takes original sin away and reduces its bad effects. What is the point of entering your child into an institution that gives it an example like that?

The Church demands that babies be baptised. It claims that baptism has mystical and supernatural power to heal the babies of spiritual harm. Where is the research to back this claim up? The priests are quacks. You only have to look around you to see that baptism makes no difference. If you subject your baby to a healing ritual that does nothing instead of looking for one that does, then do you love your child as much as you love the approval of the Church? The priests claim that spiritual health is the most important health of all for Jesus said that it profits a man nothing to gain the whole world and lose out spiritually. If they can be quacks then why should the medical quacks who look up to them worry? What a lovely example baptism sets for the world! Think of the poor child who finds no magical power in him because of baptism and he wonders why he cannot believe or do what the Church says.

If God wants us to be involved in religion then he will use his psychic influence on us to make us see the truth and the religion that teaches it which is one reason why the Christians say that faith is a gift from God that cannot be naturally explained. Baptism allegedly infuses faith so it supports this evil notion. This notion is responsible for the suspicion that exists between religions for it means there is no excuse for being wrong except being sinful and lazy and imprudent which is not an excuse. It helps cause violence. The truth is that theology is just human thinking and you should believe what you think is right which shows that Churches are just a scam to limit your right to think.

Sacraments, symbolic rites like baptism and communion that actually confer grace (the help from God that enables one to do God's will), are blasphemous and superstitious. Any decent God will give grace when you are open to it and need it and will not wait until you undertake a rite. If God comes first (and Jesus said he alone should be loved) you need to be totally sure the rites will work which is impossible. If we could be very good by effort and prayer there would be no need for sacraments so they urge you to be imperfect so that you will need them. You cannot put God first if you believe you should not be very good until you get his grace to improve your virtue in a sacrament which is not very inspiring! If we may believe that we need sacraments to get grace what is to stop us believing that we need to give the pope money or let him sleep with our children to get grace?

Religion encourages the deadly vice of credulity and has the nerve to deny it. For example, if the apostles satisfied themselves that Jesus did indeed rise from the dead which does not amount to much for they were ordinary men and were not expert psychologists, theologians and scientists then we should not believe them for it is more likely a mistake has been

made and/or a lie has been told. If we are going to believe them then we should believe all zany tall tales. Indeed, when religion is unable to control what its people are influenced by they soon go off the rails and pollute everything with nonsense and stupidity that is often even worse than the nonsense taught by the religion. This teaching about the apostles is not based on a bias against miracles. Even if you believe in miracles, you are not supposed to accept miracle claims that are flawed.

Baby baptism tries to make the child biased in favour of the faith if she never has to decide if she wants to continue with it or not. The child can feel she is dishonouring her family and parents if she rejects her baptism implicitly or explicitly.

From every angle, baby baptism as harmful and nice as it seems is worthy only of disdain and disgust.

There is an alternative to baby baptism.

The alternative respects their freedom. This alternative involves several things. The main, is not to have them baptised but to let them hear about different religions that they can make their own decision about religion later in life. Later in life, they will be more mature and better able to find out what faith or none suits them the best – everybody is so different. This alternative treats them as people not as statistics. It promotes thinking for themselves and helps prevent sectarian bigotry from getting a grip on them. It counsels that they be taught not by word but example about being good so that they will be noble because they are noble and for no other reason including god or baptism or religion.