

CATHOLIC LIBERALS

Liberal religionists are saccharine and not as nice as they pretend.

The reason why many today feel that the idea of objective morality, the notion that love and justice are obligatory, is wrong is because they think these things are too vague and hard to get right. You have objective greyness not objective morality. The Bible according to some is contradictory and vague on morality. If so it cannot ground objective morality. To say it does and that you do that with it is to lie. Liberals stand for and encourage the notion of a vague morality. That is hideous if they are wrong or not accurate enough. The damage would be beyond belief.

Let us consider Catholic liberals.

If Catholicism or any religion is a man made religion then it will have errors. In that case a progressive Catholic (or whatever) does not exist. What you have is a person using the label who is trying to mend the errors while pretending the religion is definitely from God.

They don't take the Church seriously when it says it cannot change. The assertion by the Church that it protects the doctrines taught by Christ and the apostles and cannot change them is a doctrine. The liberal rejects the basic Catholic doctrine that Jesus left the Church under his protection so that we would know what was his doctrine and what was not.

To apologise for hurting somebody does not mean you admit you did wrong.

Liberals reject that as if doctrine is bad but they make it a doctrine that it is wrong!

Liberals pick and choose what they want to believe out of their scriptures and they still say they are the Word of God. Why don't they edit them and issue a shortened version without the errors? If the miraculous bits are lies then why keep them in?

Liberals form their religious opinions without even looking at the case for Church doctrines. They would at least need to have academic qualifications that are relevant or experience. But they plod on without them. They must be infallible just like that! They don't even need to research!

They want to turn the Church into a society based on mere opinions. Nobody can take it seriously. If you have the right to say you are Catholic while believing unCatholic things then why stop there? Why not argue that you can set up a Catholic parish without the authorisation of the Church? If the Church authority is misguided on doctrine then how can it be trustworthy in anything else? Indeed setting up an authorised parish would show far more trust in the Church than rejecting its doctrines would.

They are not afraid to say they want gay marriage and women priests in the Church when they could say that the doctrine of Jesus dying for sinners and rising again for them so wonderful. This is about social and political agenda not religion.

They preach that we must not offend Muslims or Jews etc. But they are not afraid to offend Catholics by saying the Church should change and allow gay marriage etc.

They deny people the right to join a religion because it will not change with the times. A religion that changes to suit the fashions does not suit any reasonable person. It is one thing to treat man's word as God's word but it is far crazier to do this when man's word is always changing. That is shameless idolatry.

Suppose religious faith is good. The religious person who wants to replace it with opinions is then taking away something good from the believer.

The fundamentalist can go to a huge effort to give his fundamentalist system some coherence and credibility. The liberal does not worry too much about the coherence and the credibility of his own version of faith. The liberal is far more dangerous than the fundamentalist. Better to be a rabid fundamentalist who cares about truth and honesty and who will change his mind if the evidence is good enough than to be a wishy washy liberal who cares about none of these things. The liberal is more dangerous in the sense of being more irrational than the fundamentalist. The liberal does not care if he gives people encouragement in bad thinking habits that can lead to great error and damage.

The fundamentalist who thinks he knows his belief is true is far more rational than the liberal who thinks his opinion is

knowledge. There is hope for people who try to be rational but none for those who are fans of liberal shit. They only make chaos.

The Catholic liberal regards his own opinions as sacred but may bitterly oppose and be intolerant of what he terms the Vatican line - what he perceives as the opinions of the Church. But this is inconsistent. Despite himself he is saying, "My opinions are sacred and so are the Vatican's worst opinions."

It is the height of arrogance to act as if your opinions are sacred - opinions by their nature can never be sacred. They invite others to consider them but not take them seriously unless there is solid evidence that they are right. When you are calling something your opinion you are telling others to correct it if it is wrong. A sacred opinion is a dogma. The liberals have their sacred opinions and they hypocritically abominate dogma. They are just fundamentalists who happen to be better charmers than the rabid angry and fearful fundamentalists.

It's a short step from, "My religious opinions are sacred and I follow them even if they cause misery to others" to "The Bible's opinions are sacred so I have the right to murder gay people for God said we must stone them to death." Both liberals and fundamentalists think their opinions are sacred even if they lead to suffering for themselves or those who they influence.

Liberals may say its intolerant and arrogant of the pope to say he knows God exists. Or that he knows gay marriage is wrong. Or that he knows contraception does more harm than good. They say he does not know these things. But just because they don't know them does not mean he doesn't know them. What gives them the right to tell another person what that person knows and does not know? They boast what great fans of respect and tolerance and freedom they are!

Battered Partners need to be told that the abusive partner will do it again "because that is who he is". You can't say that if you believe in love the sinner and hate the sin. Both liberals and fundamentalists claim to hate sin. The only difference is that the liberal tends to hate sins that are clearly anti-social such as violence and rape. The fundamentalist will hate far more things than that. Even a person entertaining doubts about his faith will be seen as doing something hateful. A person staying away from Church services will also be seen as doing something despicable. The liberal will tend to argue that attending Church is not a big deal.

Moderate and liberal religion likes to pretend to believe that you can love the sinner and hate the sin. The members however complain that if their beliefs are criticised they are being offended. They take it personally when their beliefs are criticised. Yet they expect the sinner to be happy that other people hate his sins! If criticising the beliefs is criticising the believer, then how can we love the sinner and hate the sin?

Self-deception in religion is very common and very powerful. We deceive ourselves only so that we can deceive others. Our love is set up to border on a transformation into rabid hate. If the most rigid and inflexible fundamentalist is engaging in self-deception - that self-deception will be uncontrollable. Because it is irrational, he might easily become a self-deceiving liberal. For example, he may end up arguing that gay marriage must be taught by the Bible for it says God is love. Both liberals and fundamentalists are using the human power to lie to oneself to create their religious systems. You need to lie to yourself to be a fundamentalist so a liberal lying to herself or himself is a fundamentalist too of a different kind.

Some say we must not criticise religion because doing so leads to arguments and hatred and rage. That is admitting that religion is really passive-aggressive when it is peaceful. The nastiness of religion will erupt when the trigger button is pressed.

Liberals and atheists tend to agree that we must always work for the greatest happiness or well-being of the greatest number of people. We might disagree on how to put this into practice, but we share the principle. This is a thoroughly religion free ethic. Thus religion is necessarily fundamentalist for it disagrees that it is non-religious in itself. It may put a religious spin on it but that is actually changing the principle.

Moderate Christianity makes very big claims but provides weak evidence in support of them. It tries to manipulate people's emotions so that the people will imagine they believe the doctrines are true when they merely feel that they are true. Fundamentalists do exactly the same thing. It is the reason we call them fundamentalist. Moderate Christians are only nominally moderate. They are really hypocrites.

Moderate Christianity is detested by those whom it calls Fundamentalist Christians. Moderate Christianity is really fundamentalist when it acts as if it has the right to exist and cause offence like that. It really should go the whole way and get itself declared extremist. Moderate Christianity is really something unnecessary and an extra excuse to cause disagreements and rancour as if we don't have enough. Secularists are hated by Fundamentalists but as Secularists have the default position they have a right to exist and to teach.

True secularism is the only thing that can never be fundamentalist. Thus anything that varies from it is fundamentalism - no matter how liberal or reasonable it pretends to be.

If there are Christian theologians who honestly look at rational arguments against the faith (I said if - this is hypothetical) it is sometimes said that they are not dogmatic, not proud and not arrogant and not know-alls who misguidedly think they know it all. But the same cannot be said of priests and laity who are not theologians. They do not have the same knowledge and yet they insist on obedience to a revealed faith and are proud of it. They are definitely fundamentalists.

Liberal theologians such as Hans Kung used arguments similar to the fundamental Christians to defend belief in the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Read his *On Being a Christian*. The liberal is always fundamentalist in some way.

"Liberal" Christians - or is it Liberal "Christians"? - pick and choose out of the Bible what they want to believe which is usually the nice and saccharine stuff. Why should anybody pick what they pick? What not take the nastier bits as inspirational? Most people believe the world is red in tooth and claw and you have to be ruthless to survive. They would be happy to be edified by the Bible tales of this blood-drinking God who commands murder and genocide. The liberals have no right to criticise those who do that. They indirectly give them permission and encouragement to do so though they would prefer to forget that. They cannot say that Christian terrorists for example are not representative of the Christian religion. The Bible advocates religious violence so they are representative.

Fundamentalists don't have impressive evidence for their cocksure creed being true. Liberals have even less and so are really no better. Their system makes no sense because they end up making very big claims on slender or no evidence. For example, they might say that the virgin birth is just a metaphor for Jesus having been sent by God as the supreme teacher. But because they don't take too much of the Bible that seriously they end up with the same attitude as the fundamentalists which is that reason and science must be sacrificed in the interest of faith. Liberals are just fundamentalists with more popular and fashionable beliefs than the conservatives or fundamentalists. The liberal is worse than the fundamentalist if the liberal turns his speculation into doctrine. The liberal only guesses that the virgin birth is a metaphor. The fundamentalist then is entitled to guess that Jesus is okay with him slaying heretics.

God is an extraordinary claim. The evidence is poor. You need tremendous evidence to justify such a huge claim. Religion gives useless evidence. By implication then the God concept goes hand in hand with fundamentalism.

Moderate religion may teach that Hell is possible and that miracles happen - these are very serious claims and they are not followed up with much proof or evidence.

Moderate religion has little or no concern for evidence for the faith it propounds. It tends to care about the good results of believing in God and ignore evidence for or against his existence. Anything that has no concern for evidence is fundamentalist. Also, fundamentalists are fundamentalist because they care only for the good results - as they see good.

Moderate religion keeps up a structure that clouds and prevents people being the secularists they should be and keeps them badly informed about what secularism really is.

Loyalty to the state which looks after you is what matters. Not religion. If you are from France and you go to Abu Dhabi you are looked after there by another law. Liberal religion undermines this merely by existing. No religion serves the state by teaching its laws and giving it wholehearted support.

Some liberals think that the Catholic Church in the past allowed a broad range of beliefs and opinions as long as some basics were upheld. The Catholic liberals complain that the Catholic Church today goes too far in restricting what priests and bishops and theologians can say. The Catholic answer to that is that the Church used its infallibility to arrive at the truth and settle the debates.

The liberals themselves put limits on what doctrines can be denied, doubted or opposed. Thus they uphold the authority of the Church. They just want the authority to allow more deviation but they do not want rid of the authority.

A lot of liberals in Catholicism lie about Vatican 2 having opened the door to liberalism. They engage in distortion about the reason for freedom of thought as exercised in the Church in the past. What happened was that the Church let debates take place and then it settled the debate by giving an infallible answer. The debates were not happening because the Church accepted freedom of thought but because it needed the debates to see what freedom of thought should be restricted.

Moderates and liberals are creating an addiction to religion or a need that can lead to fundamentalism. Indeed believers will tend to be suspicious of any threats to their belief so the seed of fundamentalism is sown in them.

Liberal religion lies. True Christianity has to be described as moderate. Liberal Christians are lying about the true nature of their religion. They are getting people hooked on it. When people discover the lies they may become the extremists Jesus meant them to be. Whoever promotes a fundamentalist religion, even if they are liberals, is dangerous.

Moderate religion looks for plenty of followers and tries to reach out to many people to make believers of them. It provides them with little or no evidence. In other words, it is manipulating people to be careless. Faith without evidence is not faith but feeling. To equate feeling something is true with believing it is fundamentalism. Its unreasoning.

No religion that conditions children in religious doctrine can be described as moderate. It is still advocating a method of getting devotion that is dangerous. It is only luck that ensures a child is conditioned in so-called moderate religion - the same tactic is used to make a child a devotee of the kind of religion that believes in destroying other nations and so on.

It is totally false to think that a fundamentalist is one thing and a liberal is another. A liberal is fundamentalist about some things. A fundamentalist will be liberal about some things. The fundamentalist for example who beats his daughters believes that he should have the freedom to do so – that's very strongly liberal. The person who wants more sexual freedom in society is less liberal. Sexual freedom could and should be conducted harmlessly but you can't say the same of beating people up. And especially when it's a brawny brutish father beating up his fragile daughters.

Many Catholics say that because we have free will we have the power to reject God and to fix ourselves in that rejection. If that happens we will go to Hell for all eternity. This is fundamentalism despite being spouted by liberals because psychologists believe that no decision can be that complete and final. The doctrine opposes their doctrine. It opposes the very possibility that one can finally and permanently turn away from the all-attractive God.

The notion of liberals that people only reject a caricature of God is patronising. It is mad to think that the Muslim interpretation of God and the Christian one are equally good and inspiring. The liberals are hypocrites if they say there are no caricatures of God! So what makes them think that their view is not a caricature? They pick and choose what they want to believe so how do they know? They won't be guided by evidence but by desire so they cannot know!

The liberals who make all understandings of the divine equally true and valid really mean that nobody really rejects God so everybody is really good but just mistaken or misled. So what is the point of religion then? Why bother promoting Jesus in Church and not some other God such as Henry James Prince or Ramakrishna?

It must be assumed that as most people would want the right to be able to make informed decisions that all would want it. People would agree with, "Its better to know the truth and have to painfully deal with it than to be deluded and happy." Liberals undermine all that. They spread confusion.

The liberals give the fundamentalists an effective example of lying for religion and over it. They cannot complain about fundamentalist dishonesty.

Belief in Christianity appears innocuous simply because even many Catholic priests and nuns do not have a degree of conviction that leads them to be consistent Catholics. If they are good people, it is therefore in spite of their faith and not because of it. But they are not good in their own inner intent so degeneration is always around the corner! The faith contaminates whatever good they do. It is just like how if you set up a charity that fed the poor and killed their oppressors the evil would contaminate the good you do. Evil that is mixed with good is more contaminating than outright evil. If you do good and take a stand against truth you are really trying to leave behind a harmful legacy of error. The good you do does not make that right.

Evil is part of human nature and always looks for an outlet. The saint and the murderer are both evil only the first by chance prefers hidden evil while the murderer prefers to do something. As to the fact of them being evil, there is no difference. The saint may be happy to see "bad" people suffer and be thanking God for it. Christians are too eager to say, "It is God's loving will" when terrible things happen to people. That is not natural.

Good people in a harmful or evil religious system are giving it respectability. Thus they are indirectly or implicitly very bad. We must not let their charm sway us to favour their faith or regard it as acceptable.

You hear of gay Catholics who despite Church disapproval and condemnations of homosexuality still claim to be Catholics and say they will not walk away. This is really saying that the faith is so justifiable and credible that it would be a mistake to walk away. That is really giving the Catholic Church credibility in its condemnations of homosexuality and one is still trying to be an advertisement for the Church. It looks like the person is too weak to be a proper Catholic but is trying to be and believes he should be.

The pope is the figurehead of those who would ruin many human rights such as reproductive rights. Some Catholics call

themselves liberal and contradict the pope. Liberals just want the pope to be nicer to some people such as the divorced but what use is that when the core system of Catholicism is a human invention and a toxic one? Liberals are only enabling the poison.

Instead of supporting their religion, liberals want to destroy it and set up a counterfeit of it. Their dishonesty only drives more members of a religion to take a strong stand in its favour against the liberals.

Liberals have their values. The values include equality and the dignity of the person and concern for those who are suffering or poor. Liberals sometimes seem to say that they only have faith in these principles. Others say there is no need for faith for it is plainly obvious that they are true. Then why are they clouding those core values with silly rituals and doctrines and Church structures? Why are they clouding them particularly with honouring evil saints such as Moses and Dominic and vile violence laden revelations such as those in the Bible? There is actually not a lot about love in the Bible God's doctrine but there are plenty of threats and violence.

The weeping and grinding of teeth in Hell that Jesus talks about is said to be the damned regretting not the sin but how much they suffer for it. They do not hate the sin as such. You might wonder if the liberal "Christians" who say hating sin is about compassion for the sinner for sin hurts the sinner are in fact preparing people for a hotspot in Hell! Both the liberals and the damned just care about side effects of sin not sin!

If Catholicism is a man made religion then it will have errors. In that case a progressive Catholic does not exist. What you have is a person using the label who is trying to mend the errors while pretending the religion is definitely from God. What kind of respect for equality and dignity is that?

Liberal Christianity is just a heap of man-made religions. Each group has its own views. It is a form of fundamentalist and idolatry to be part of a religion like that. Idolatry is a form of fundamentalism and fundamentalism is a form of idolatry. Catholicism is different from any other religion - it claims that the Church is somehow the saviour - it is Jesus. It is the mystical body of Christ and thus he uses it to discipline and feed and correct believers and pass on his teaching. If this claim is not true, then Catholic liberalism wants the Church to be worse than the other religions out there!