

## RELIGIOUS BASED DISCRIMINATION AGAINST LGBT

<http://www.pinknews.co.uk/2015/07/23/this-bill-could-outlaw-anti-lgbt-discrimination-in-all-50-states/>

Religious based discrimination against LGBT people and those who sympathise with them is a huge problem. Christians can destroy the career say of a teacher who marries somebody of the same sex and they destroy it claiming they are exercising their right to disapprove of same sex relationships. They want special rights and special protection for their religious beliefs and there is no concern if the teacher's non-religious belief is that same sex marriage is a fundamental human right. One belief has to be treated like dirt while the other is treated like gold.

Do we really want a country where those who say LGBT people should have equal rights to straight people get the same hearing as those who would deny them those rights on religious grounds? What about women needing their rights to run for political office, to have access to abortion, birth control and divorce?

Many argue that though religious beliefs should get no special protection, it is unfair to deny them a fair hearing in the public and governmental sphere. They say it is unfair to ignore or reject one belief in favour of a rival belief. If they are right then it is clear that beliefs opposing homosexuality are going to cause bother for those who labour for LGBT rights. A debate can delay justice and anything that makes a debate too long or too complicated is a worry. Debate is hard enough without the babel of religious voices. Suppose people are trying to decide if LGBT people should have more rights. They will examine what harm homophobia does. They will ask if gay sex is in any way necessarily harmful? They will ask if the problems that sometimes come with straight sex occur in gay sex too and consider the significance of this. What about diseases? What about mental health? When you are asking these questions you do not want to hear, "Okay for me the main thing is that God said it is seriously wrong in my holy book the Koran." Listening to that means you have to listen to those who object because the Prophet Joseph Smith said something or the Pope or the Venusians or whatever. There are as many different scriptures, sects, theologies and faiths out there as there are people. Those people are are starting with doctrine not with trying to see how LGBT people live and what they need.

We must remember that if a religion opposes some freedoms for women or LGBT people, that it may debate without even mentioning religious doctrine. It may look at it in an earthy way. Nobody says that their views are to be excluded from debate then. Just because a religion is saying it does not mean it is speaking doctrinally. You need to hear their arguments even if they are rubbish for it helps you serve the truth better. Truth is not about what is true only but about rejecting what is nonsense. You need to hear nonsense in order to help the truth be seen.

The state does not have the time to listen to all the different religions and different factions within each religion so all must try and discuss the matter on humanitarian grounds and forget about religious doctrine.

The problem with religion is that it considers its beliefs because they are religious and spiritual to matter more than any secular or non-religious beliefs. For the believer, the God belief will always trump belief in evolution or vaccination. The believer tolerates non-religious belief and has no deep respect for it. So if the believer does not mention God or faith in his arguments they still proceed from faith. It is hard and often impossible to know if a religion is really speaking as a religion or speaking to man on the human level. It is hard to be confident that the religion is not speaking from faith.

Not all beliefs are worth listening to. Some are more worthy of attention than others. This implies that if you think a religion is speaking from faith despite appearances then its arguments in the public sphere should be listened to but not given the same weight as rational and sensible and humanitarian arguments.

Ultimately the only way to unite humanity more so that discussion can flow faster and better and lucidly is for people to stop supporting religion. If people discarded their supernatural and magical beliefs there would be no problem. They would agree with each other better. Human rights would be recognised faster and more securely and their protection would be assured.

The state must not encourage religious faith. It should be afforded tolerance but not endorsement or devotion.

Secular beliefs are the only true protectors of human rights.

To a man who defended Catholicism despite being gay on Pink News - he said that gay and educated Catholics are happy to stay in the Church and support it and that those who tell them to leave are bitter

Would you please learn what Catholicism is about before you promote it and defend it?

If there are really sincere and educated Catholics out there, they are not highly or properly educated in religious matters. There is no excuse for the evidence that Catholicism and other religions are man-made is easily enough got online. It is you who is the bitter one for Truth above simply meant that if a religion does not suit you or teaches grave errors or seriously rejects you then walk. In fairness to Catholicism, it says it is a sin to stay in the Church if it makes grave errors for God wants all people to be in the religion - whatever it is - that protects and is the pillar of the truth.

And Christianity is just a man-made religion. A yes to Jesus is a yes to indirect and implicit homophobia. Jesus even if he did stop the stoning of an adulteress to death did not apologise for or repudiate the stoning of anyone prior to that. In fact he said the Law of Moses was written by God meaning the cruel command to stone adulterous people and practicing homosexuals came from the God (see Leviticus 20:13 where God is quoted as saying that if a man lies with a man they are to be stoned to death. God says it is an abomination to have gay sex - abomination means morally and extremely detestable) he put forward as a sign of perfection to be emulated and worshipped. He supposedly claimed to be that God! No Christian has the right to say Christ did not engage in such killings when he was on earth for nobody knows anything about the most of his life. As a good Jew who supported the law it is possible that he did participate.

It is an insult to the people murdered as a result of the Leviticus law to say, "We don't do that now so it is okay".

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!

Catholic teaching is that God revealed everything we need to know and that the Catholic Church alone protects that revelation fully and properly for the infallible Jesus guides and permeates the teaching of the Church. Thus any change of doctrine such as to embrace homosexuality would be to deny this. Even more so if the Church abandons its doctrine that sex outside marriage or that same sex marriage is impossible in the eyes of God. The doctrinal ban on gay sex and sex outside marriage is very basic to Catholicism. The Church teaches gradualism - that any respect shown say to a gay person is intended to bring them to full acceptance of Catholic doctrine one step at a time. Kindness to gays is a strategy for destroying the "sin" of homosexuality. The gay person who is in the Church and who practices homosexuality, is in fact helping the Church to do its work. It is passive support if you are not in the Church and if you never bother challenging its teaching. Membership even if lapsed counts as active support whether you like to admit it or not. You have to decide if you wish to be a cafeteria Catholic and thereby enable and be complicit in hypocrisy or if you wish to be a proper Catholic and enable the Church to do what it does, including the discouraging of gay love. Most people would say that to enable hypocrisy and to make it attractive is worse than to enable Catholicism even if they feel Catholicism when practiced consistently and with full and proper obedience to the Church is dangerous. Hypocrisy is the ultimate cancer in society.

Nothing is as irritating as the gay person who supports and enables the Church.

