

**RELIGIOUS "MORALITY" - ITS SO BAD THAT THE RELIGION SHOULD DISSOLVE**

Religious morality has rules about sex. Sex is only allowed in marriage. They condemn promiscuity. But if a woman was living in a dangerous area where any man she marries is soon assassinated she could end up with a different husband every year. Her being with all these men is approved as long as she marries them. Religion also has no problem with a virgin marrying a man who claims to be a reformed profligate who had been with hundreds of sexual partners. A woman who sleeps with a man like that may as well have been having sex with hundreds of people herself! To sleep with any person is in the disease sense to sleep with everybody else that person has slept with. Marriage is about religious control not concern about the person. Religion does not object to marrying HIV negative women to HIV positive men. It is not the harm promiscuity does that religion objects to at all. It lies and pretends it does to manipulate people into getting married before having sex.

Religion says you must abhor the sin and wish it didn't exist but love the sinner. But sin is not something a sinner just does. It is something that the sinner does that shows what KIND of person he or she is. Therefore to hate the sin is to hate the sinner. Religion is a dose of simpering whitewash and lies. Praying for sinners is a polite way of confessing hatred for sinners. A faith that isn't sincere about that kind of thing and then says that sinners who die divorced from God should go to Hell to suffer forever is vile. Religion makes extra rules - rules we wouldn't have otherwise and to defy them is sin so religion increases hate and hypocrisy. For example, its a sin to go into a Catholic chapel and not genuflect before the wafer god in the tabernacle. If you were a Protestant or a non-believer you wouldn't have this rule. That would make you a better person. The God of religion cannot hate sins and love sinners either so to worship him at all is malign.

You are to love your rapist or the person who beat you up or the person who murdered your parents as yourself. Nobody cares if the effort to love them and especially that much is actually worse than you hating them. Many Christians would admit they just give up for the stress of hating a person and being made to feel bad about it and the stress of trying to forgive and the stress of trying to love them as oneself is worse than the stress of merely hating. And forgiveness can be reversed so they have to try and renew it every day and sometimes every minute of every day. The self-righteous forgiving people boast about the freedom they have when they forgive.

To like is to value. You do not value money if you feel disdain for it or if you feel nothing for it. You do not value person A who you dislike as much as person B who you like. The Church says that you love your neighbour even if you feel intense dislike for them by doing good for them despite your feelings. They separate love from feelings. This is nonsensical. It is refusing to admit that intense feelings of dislike are hate, failure to love. The Church tells the lies in order to persuade people to hate each other as they proclaim themselves to be loving. The Church wants people to become fake and deceitful in the name of God. Nobody would bother with Christianity if it taught that we must like our neighbour as ourselves for that is a very demanding ethic. It sets people up for failure and is too harsh. It is so soul destroying that it will only wreck human relationships and asphyxiate people with guilt. The Church is thinking purely of itself and not the harm that a strict morality that nobody can live out and which will remove all pleasure from life can do.

Many believe that to say you may help others and that is love even if you can't feel any love for them is to contradict the command of Christ that we must treat others as we like to be treated and we like people to express the fact that they like us by doing things for us. That being liked is more important than anything they do.

Jesus and the Church commanded love of neighbour as oneself. To them you are a bad person if you don't keep it. It would be bad and vicious and hypocritical enough if it were simply advice but to make a command of it and an obligation is to double the badness.

The Church will say, "If you feel a great dislike for somebody do you expect us to command you to ignore them when they need help?" No but we ask them not to pretend that this is love. If everybody disliked you and endured you to do good deeds for you it would destroy you. You need to be liked and you see and feel that loving is a kind of liking. You can't enjoy or feel good if people who hate you give you a gift unless you think their feelings have changed. Their bad feelings towards you can be a source of fear for you. You know they can erupt under pressure and harm you.

The religionists can't prove that you choose to suffer forever in Hell if you die separate from God. They have no right to make such a serious charge against us without proof.

Do we choose eternal Hell at death? Why should death make such a choice irreversible? Yet the believers have the audacity to blame the sinner not God. God clearly does have something to do with this. They are bound to see that and yet they go

and praise their God! And God has made the influences that led a person to make the choice so God must take some responsibility for putting a person in Hell. Religion says it is your choice if you go to Hell. That seems to take the sting out of the doctrine a bit until you remember that they are not thinking of a murderer who gives himself up and goes to jail willingly. They are thinking of a person who does not want the punishment but who is forced to endure it as punishment for their sin. So the murderer who is caught and goes to jail is more like what they have in mind when they say you choose Hell. Why don't they let a person who believes that adulterers and homosexuals when they have sex make a final irreversible decision and go to Hell and that if they repent they are only faking go ahead and believe that? It is actually less vicious to say that a person chooses Hell in life than to say that they choose it by dying in sin for that is really saying that they go to Hell because they died not because they chose Hell.

Those who believe in Hell believe that all people could go there if they so wished which would mean we have wasted all that God has done for us. Hell proves that when believers try to justify God allowing evil, they do not really believe in those reasons at all. They don't for example believe that God makes diseases so that we might learn from those who suffer from them and learn from our suffering. That is inexcusable. They sacrifice the need to explain possible reasons why God may allow evil and suffering to happen for the sake of believing in Hell. That is turning their back on compassion in favour of a vindictive doctrine taught by Jesus Christ, namely that there is a place of eternal torment where people suffer the extreme agony that results from losing the God they need for he is all good and all desirable.

Religion pretends that a ball of cells in the womb is as much a human being with rights as a grown man or woman. That automatically makes you want to kill pharmacists who stock abortion pills. It makes you feel you should. Consistent non-hypocritical believers that abortion is wrong at any stage would go and kill.

Religion teaches that there is a being who sees what is best in the long run the long run being millions of years. That being can make laws for us on that basis. If he asks us to die on a cross like he did Jesus we should obey. Belief in a moral God goes hand in hand with autocratic law. Religion is autocratic and dangerous. A liberal autocrat is still an autocrat so be wary of liberal religion. It might not be as strict as fundamentalist religion but it still believes that rules supposedly revealed by God come before anything else - the basic stance of fundamentalism.

It is mainly the fear of suffering and death that the clergy draw on to get members into their religions or to keep existing members active. Without those fears there would be no religion. Those who play on such fears are the lowest of the low despite their standing in society and the good works they do. And the more they are paid and the more prestige they get the worse they are!

