

The Excuses for Bible preaching Violence

Christianity and Islam when challenged will try to excuse the murders commanded by God in their scriptures. Christians adore Jesus who clearly approved of the bloodletting laws of God even if he declared them no longer applicable (a Christian lie - he told the Jews off for doing away with the rule that those who curse parents are to be murdered by divine command). To worship a man who took responsibility for murder and commanding it through collaborating with Moses is to invite evil into your heart.

Attempts to say that violence commanded by God in the Koran or Bible means that it was only allowed in the circumstances that existed then but these circumstances don't exist now so we should not take them to authorise violence today are hypocritical. They cannot be totally inapplicable. They would still mean that you can think about violence in today's circumstances at least. They would mean that you must be willing to use violence if the circumstances of the past as recorded in the Bible or Koran were repeated. Also unless God intended to teach everlasting religious truths and considered them relevant for all ages they would not be in the Bible or Koran. There was lots of revelation left out anyway so why did he make sure that bloodletting stuff was retained? To give people bad reasons for being non-violent when they read violent texts that supposedly come from God is just another way of telling them to go out and slaughter.

The underlying assumption behind prophets who say God commands violence even in the name of a just war is that God sees the wider and bigger picture that we can never see. That is one hell of a dangerous idea if God has not spoken or is not there to speak. It is the reason why Christians without knowing all the facts claim that God was right to get his people to try and liquidate homosexuals and the Canaanites. So much for compassion and decency.

The Christians regard the Bible as having been authored by God and by man. It is fully the word of God and fully the word of man. They compare this to the mystery of how Christ is fully God and fully man. Without this doctrine, Christianity would have to say it is simply a man-made religion that is searching for the truth about God. It would have to claim to be man's thoughts about God and about what man thinks God has said. It would not be God's action to save and enlighten the world.

The Bible God explicitly commanded that certain sinners be stoned to death. There are many other evils - a priest's daughter can be burned to death for sexual sin.

Christianity generally does not carry out these executions today. A tiny minority do. The principle of giving certain sinners a terrible shaming death was observed until a few centuries ago by Roman Catholicism and other Christian systems.

The Church says the Bible murders were right and God's will.

The Church recognises the authority of Isaiah who wrote that anybody who does not speak according to the law of Moses and in agreement with it is a fraud (Isaiah 8:20).

The Church honours Jesus who said that the Bible is from God and does not err.

The Church takes its authority from the apostles - one of whom wrote that Jesus is the go-between between man and God and gave the law (Galatians 3:19-20).

The Church usually ignores the rules about killing today.

Its a worry.

If we look at human nature we worry more. The human being is selective in her or his compassion just like everybody else is! She or he can be glad that others are suffering and not loved ones. She or he can think that those who suffer deserve it. Human nature often condones terrible treatment of oneself and others for it relieves and keeps anger and hatred at bay and they are horrible emotions. Human nature does not love good - it loves good when it fits. Is that the kind of creature that should be respected for saying God lets evil happen for a purpose and even writes violent commandments for a purpose? And people are attracted by imperfection to one degree or another. Some like everything to have another side, an evil side. Are they in a religion that praises the God of the evil Bible because his commands were evil? Do you want to be the kind of person who deliberately condones? You may do it because you see many others doing it. Do you want to be the kind of person who sees inexcusable evil, useless evil, the suffering of little babies, and who imagines there is a divine purpose? That is very serious if there is no God. It means you fail to understand fully what happened to the babies. You are not trying to. You are excusing something that cannot be excused. You are hailing vicious ruthless nature as God. To worship a non-

existent God means you imagine that God has done what God has not done. If you are decent, you will expect to be told if you are making such a hideous mistake - the greatest one of all. Remember if you believe, "God is right to let that plague torment babies to death though I don't know why" you are saying you would do the same thing or try to if you were God or if God asked you to run things for a while.

The rules have not been officially repudiated - there is no apology for revering a violent Bible and no apology for condoning those murders.

An official repudiation would involve denying the Bible really is God's unerring book and asserting that it is responsible for great suffering. It would involve asserting that the Church does not wish to set up religious and social conditions that make it possible for such murders to resume. It is immaterial that the Church may not actually send people out to kill.

Whether the Christian knows it or not, he or she represents a faith that refuses to detest religious violence completely.

People do good works - sometimes big ones - but are not really good. A good doctor is not really a good doctor if he has abused a child in his care even once. People point to the good works of Moses and Jesus and call the Bible the good book. That is treated as a justification for not being put off by the violence and the acceptance of violence commanded by God through Moses and Jesus. It is a disgrace. The good is irrelevant. To use the good as an excuse for embracing the bad is a further insult to the people corrupted by those scriptures and to their victims. There is no excuse for not being in a religion with scriptures that abhor violence. Or you could be a secular humanist!

People of different religions do terrible things. Some religions revel in bloodletting. A faith with peaceful scriptures waging war in the name of faith would be strange. We do not find a faith like Christianity or Islam murdering people and endorsing violence to be very odd. You would not believe that a yoga group would murder and kill but you would believe a Christian group would. You would believe it easily.

When you praise the Bible as being unerring in its teaching and doctrine, you are saying it is right to say that God commanded that homosexuals be stoned to death. That is to mention one evil out of many that it commands. This is extreme evil. Respecting and approving of it makes you no better than those who picked up the stones. To praise the Bible is to indirectly respect and approve the evil. To praise the God of the Bible is to implicitly respect and approve the evil. The evil being implicit or indirect does not make it any less bad. It is still as reprehensible and intolerable. In one way, you are worse than the killers for they had more chance of feeling bad about it than you!

Many say that a religion is not to blame for everything that bad members do. It is to blame when it can stop them but won't or if its scriptures command them to wrong others. A religion is to be firstly judged by its source of authority be that a God or a Bible or a Prophet. An evil Bible for example is a foundation for either an evil religion or a hypocritical one if not both. Judge the authority. Then you may judge the role of the religion in the evil that its members do.

Another tactic to say that the scriptural violence was right in its time for it was done in self-defence or a just war or something. You need proof that it was a just war but all you get is speculation and weak evidence. Nobody has the right to approve a war on slender evidence even if that war happened in 10,000 BC. What does approving say about you?

Some say, "The bad things my faith has done and which its Bible says God did are in the past. We have moved on and learned from all that." They are implying that if they were alive then and not today they would not condone or participate. But they probably would. It is very likely that they would for those Christians in the past who opposed slavery for example were very few in number. The chance that you would live in 1300 and not want to see heretics burned to death and witches murdered would be so statistically small that it is virtually certain you would be as bad as the Church that destroyed them. The chance that you would want them murdered by the Church is statistically huge. It is arrogant to say you would not kill or enable the killing if you were alive then. You cannot know that and you are using the deaths of those people as an excuse to boast that you would have nothing to do with it. If you say your religion knows better now, you cannot say it did in 1300. If you were in the religion and leave then you would be as bad as the rest. Indeed you are in your heart for you should not be in a religion that has done such great evil even if it has changed. The evil proves that the religion is not immune to doing it - you are encouraging a religion and serving it when it has no intrinsic power to avoid evil to a reasonable degree at least. What if there is something subtle in the religious doctrines or some supernatural force supporting the religion that leads you to execute evil when the time is right? What if this kind of evil is intrinsic to the religion?

Liberal Christians claim that the Bible shows how God gave revelation progressively, he helped the true and good religion evolve. This is the excuse then for the violence commanded by God in the Old Testament. But the history of the religion looks like there was no divine guidance at all and any improvement came through trial and error. The talk about progressive revelation can be used by any religion even a religion based on deliberate hoaxes. To say that God let us murder and maim for he didn't think we were ready to be told that it is wrong is disgusting.

The Christian view that slavery is bad but we were too stubborn to give it up so God had to tolerate it and wean us away from it progressively is an excuse for tolerating the intolerable. They want us to believe that God accommodated his revelation to us by at first saying nothing against slavery and when we were ready he got us to abolish it and see it for the evil it truly is. That is just an excuse for saying that a collection of books purporting to give us instruction from God are from God despite the terrible moral teachings. With an excuse like that, you could write Mein Kampf volume 2 and fill it with nice thoughts and say that it and Mein Kampf are inspired by God.

Despite ordering that people be stoned to death, God "failed to provide his people with reasonable rules of evidence to judge criminal cases".

Christians often say that the killings of babies in the Bible were justified for they were going to grow up sinful anyway or perhaps killing them saved them from a life of sin so they had a chance to go to God by dying early. So much for being non-judgemental! It is the filthiest example of judgementalism imaginable. Many Christians admit that if they were miraculously sent back in time to kill the children they would.

The Catholic Church says that Jesus is the head of the Church and the catechism says Christ is the Bible and the Bible is Christ. But Jesus said in John 8 that it was okay to stone a woman to death for adultery as long as those who stoned her were sinless themselves. He gave out to the Jews for not killing men who cursed their parents. I would be concerned about a faith like that getting too much power. It did heinous things when it was able in the past. The pope saying capital punishment is a sin is lying. The Bible endorses it strongly in the name of God.

Leave those religions of the Bible - they have no moral authority to call you a member or require that you should be one. To honour them is to honour their holy books indirectly. And those books are evil rather than holy.

The Bible is full of violence, nonsense and hate. No wonder believers pick out the nice bits and pretend the evil commands are not there. If you really believe the Bible properly you will not treat it like that! There is something very vulgar and condemnatory about cherry-picking a book that is supposedly from God like that. It is like saying, "This book is my authority. It is more important and sacred than any other book. Yet I will pick and choose from it." It is accepting the Bible as inspired but with a "but". The Bible deserves no honour not even this begrudging hypocritical honour. You drop bad scriptures like they are burning coals put into your hands. You will if you have no leanings towards enabling violence or honouring it. The worse the book is the more disgusting is the homage you pay to it. As the hypocrite pays homage to virtue by pretending to be virtuous so do you pay homage to the violence. You serve lies and lies are the first step to creating a violent society.

If the revelations from God have both good and bad in them then what?

Is the good better than the bad?

Is the bad better than the good?

Are they equal? God only needs to use evil to do good with it because we made evil so he has to work in that backdrop. So in that sense he needs evil. If God uses evil for a good purpose then the horrible commands are good in some way we cannot comprehend. So they are equal. To praise the good is to praise the bad. That is the principle. You are in principle, though you think you are not, praising the bad commands when you praise the good.

Man reflects his own violence in the "revelations from above" and the religions he makes so do not enable him. Do not honour his religious creation for it is not really sacred - do not turn it into an image of God to be adored and served for talk about God is not necessarily about the real God if there is one - and man pretending to speak for God or imagining he does means man is manipulative and manipulation is a form of violence and enables further violence.

When a holy book commands murder or violence, and/or agrees with murder and violence in the past, it should be dismissed as unholy - no ifs or buts. It should be discarded immediately. There are certain evils you must not look for excuses or reasons for. And holy books that honour a God who commands violence are top of the list.

We must remember too that evil has to look good to succeed so don't chip in with, "But the Christian is such a nice person despite his belief in the Bible." Or, "The Bible contains so many beautiful teachings." Human nature is notorious for enabling evil with a smile. A truly decent person does not even contemplate honouring an evil book as the word of God. He throws it away. The good bits are a reason for rejecting it not accepting it. Something that advocates good and teaches good and then teaches its opposite is worse than something that means well but does little else but damage. Evil needs to be softened by having lots of good put into the mix. That way it does more harm than shamelessly blatant and undiluted evil.

Too often stories in the Bible are disproven or shown to teach evil lessons allegedly from God.

Then what the believers do is this.

They say the stories are figurative and were never intended to be taken as literally true.

That is just a way of pretending that the story is divinely inspired.

And surely God could make his point without all that figurative stuff?

And why does he not make the allegorical nature of the story clear? Most stories do not read as allegories.

The Bible is violent period. And if you stay in a religion invented by man and that has fake revelations from God that endorse violence you tarnish yourself. Enabling violence and being okay with nasty scriptures is the one thing needed before religious terrorism can appear and with or without terrorism appearing it is still a terrible terrible hideous thing to do. Nobody can blame God entirely even if God did give the violent commands - man had no right to mention the commands much less obey them!

Religiously motivated suicide bombers and terrorists who are virtually on a suicide mission think they will get fame and be remembered after their deaths. That motivates them for they use their death to send a message. They kill others to reinforce that message. It is no wonder they think that when you consider how famous Jesus is for terrorising the temple, Moses despite his mass murdering and of course Muhammad. The scriptures are memorials to monsters. The blame for this problem is clearly clergy/ministers and teachers of religion be they parents in the home or schoolteachers. And governments who fund such "education" are accountable.

The wars in the Bible and Koran were not all down to direct commands from God. God permitted say Saul and Muhammad to have their own opinion about when to wage war.

Even if you are responsible for your behaviour a bad influence like the Bible can be responsible too. The two are not mutually exclusive. It is better though to blame the religious belief system than the person if possible. The Bible instead of being carried in procession should be spat upon.

Good is not good when mixed with evil for that is what evil does. It likes to hide and sting unexpectedly. That is why the Bible should be called evil instead of pretending there is good in it. The good in the Bible is not the Bible's good. Nobody owns good. Nothing owns good.