Patrick H Gormley

When religion "disowns" its terrorist members who slaughter in its name

The "Don't condemn religion for it is not all bad" religious brigade are not taking evil seriously when it is done as a religious act by a religious person. It is odd that they want to argue that it is individuals not a religion that is doing it. Why won't they say that if an individual do it an individual can do it as a religious person? Why won't they say that if the individual can be bad then a religion that is a collection of individuals can be bad too?

Many look at the terrible things religious people do and decide that some of it is not about religion for the people do not say they do it for God or faith. But were they asked? Would they say? They would fear that if they kill in the name of God that others will think God is telling them to kill them. If a religion is not able to stop or influence violent people to drop the arms, if it is not effective at making peace by stopping war in the first place, the members should not be in it. The religion is to blame so the members not saying their violence is faith based means nothing. A violent religionist does not have to admit it if he is violent for God - he is better off not admitting it for he might get support he would not get if people were put off by religious violence.

If a faith is a collection of individuals rather than a Church, the faith is still to blame for the crimes of the individuals in the name of faith. It tells them to be individuals so it is still responsible for what they get up to in the dark side of religion.

Even if you believe in free will, there is no doubt that in some aspects we are programmed by our environment. The alcoholic is programmed to crave alcohol. Some experts believe that free will is incomplete - it is a combination of freedom and programming.

Whatever you think, if you do bad you can be sure that programming and conditioning have played their part in it too. That bit is not all your fault. If we are programmed at all in any way, religion being a major part of your environment has somehow programmed the evil person to be evil.

Religion says it has to be lived 24/7. When the person seems to be doing secular things, the religion is still there behind it. There is no room for saying that the bad a person does has nothing to do with their religion for they are not acting as religious people but just as people. They could be showing how their religion has no power to help them become truly better people.

Why does the religion seek some credit when the individual does good? If it does that it must take the blame if the individual is bad. Its refusal to shows that it indeed is far from angelic.

If it is the individual to blame, then is the religion causing harmful individualism? It could be.

Some religions teach a spiritual connection between people that means the religion has to take the blame along with the individual. Catholicism is not the same as any other religion. It claims to be the body of Christ and to be infallible. Thus it is more to blame for the evil in its members than any other religion would be.

Most people will not be violent. Religions that claim to be able to supernaturally heal evil produce a number of evil people. In the light that most will be civil anyway, it follows that it is doing nothing to help. It only looks as if it might be helping. But a might could mean anything.

Religion confidently saying, "That nut is a lone wolf" or "That has nothing do with us. It's the guy's individual choice" is insulting and irresponsible and ignorant. It is not something you just say. You have to back it up with evidence. The evidence will be hard to get for you cannot know that much about anybody's else's life or development. But in principle it should be there before you speak. To blame the individual not the religion, fully or partly, is just victimising the bad person in order to keep the religion looking sweet.

Religion makes its terrorists sense they are supported. The smug shout, "Religious terrorism? - not in my name!"

In the book Christianity is Not Great, we read that humankind "has the wherewithal to be cruel and unkind without God. My point is that God gives him permission." Christianity is "a belief system that allows for that behaviour. It's no argument to suggest that evil will exist anyway, therefore we should let an existing justification for it continue." As long as religion or faith "produces any evil, it is suspect". "If it is true that we are in the presence of some system, some force, that rises above the squalor of human existence, it should consistently be far and above anything that man can offer". "They may not get

their own hands dirty, but they accept doctrines that protect those who do harm in the name of God. They give tacit approval to outdated ideas like physically beating children to keep them safe from hell." If you are a religious terrorist, you will deal out horror and destruction in the name of your faith. The reason you do this is because you feel sufficiently supported by the religion. For example, it may not cast you out or it may not seem to take your evil that seriously. You feel its condemnations of your actions are hollow and hypocritical. If the religion does not advocate violence and its scriptures do, you will feel it should approve of you. And you are right that it should not judge you. It shares in the blame.

No terrorist in the name of religion, acts in its name unless he feels others in the religion at least secretly approve of what he has done. It is superficial to blame the man not the religion. Blame both.

Terrorists in religion will see and be inspired by people who believe in the religion on the basis of biased and cherry-picked evidence or none at all. IF YOUR RELIGION DOES NOT CARE ABOUT EVIDENCE, IF THE RELIGIONISTS AROUND YOU DO NOT CARE ABOUT EVIDENCE, IF YOUR RELIGION DOES NOT CARE ENOUGH ABOUT EVIDENCE THEN THERE IS NO BASIS FOR TELLING TERRORISTS THAT THEIR VIOLENT INTERPRETATION OF A VIOLENT HOLY BOOK MAY BE WRONG OR IS WRONG. AND IF A VIOLENT INTERPRETATION IS EVEN SLIGHTLY POSSIBLE THE RELIGION IS STILL TO BLAME FOR RELIGION HAS TO ACCEPT THAT PERSONAL INTERPRETATION HAS A ROLE TO PLAY AMONG THE MEMBERS. The religion is the problem more than the terrorist.

Many religions oppose relativism and are actually relativist themselves. The dogma of relativism that nobody has the right to judge what another culture thinks is right or wrong encourages and invigorates the terrorist.

Those who claim to think that religion is good often narrow down what is meant by religion in order to make it look good. They might narrow it down to a prayer system or a community. This denies that religion has an impact and a relationship with politics. A religion is more than just praying and as for its being a community is not a community but a faith community. The defenders of religion have to trim away anything that could make the religion look bad. That is pure prejudice and shows a lack of concern for the damage religion does. The religious extremist will read that as a yes to religious terrorism.

The proof that a faith can produce evil people is when it does. It does not help to say, "X is following his own interpretation of Islam/Christianity. It is a good religion. It is X who is the problem." But X could feel that his religion is so good that it is worth killing for. It is the presence of good people in the religion that makes him reason that way. Nobody wants complete mayhem. They do evil to get good out of it. Islamists think that by destroying bad Muslims and other religions that they will create a Muslim paradise on earth.

If a religion or holy book has teachings that can be interpreted as permitting or advocating violence, the religion is responsible for the actions of terrorists. And since religion does not care much for evidence and truth, it follows that the terrorist interpretation is just as valid as anybody else's. The religion gives him no tools to rethink his position. It is to blame for the fact that there are no tools.

The Christians must not say, "Okay he is an individual. His terrorist actions in our name are not a reflection on us." If he could be acting as an individual that does not mean that he is. The Christians are being rude and dismissive unless they have evidence that the person is acting as an individual.

A religion is trying to cover up that religion is dangerous when it tries to make out that its terrorist members are acting as religious individuals and not in its name. Nobody is that individual - the terrorist is formed by a lot of influences many of which are religious. Even when a prophet or pope commands evil, religion makes out it is the individual's problem. Nobody really acts completely as an individual no matter what they do. You feel that enough people might approve or should approve of your evil deeds. It is that that gets you across the line.

If a particular religion produces crazier terrorists or more than average than any other religion, the blame is to be laid at the foot of the religion even it is not obvious what exactly is causing the problem. There are people in other religions but in similar economic and social conditions who are not as bad.

A terrorist may say that his faith motivated him to kill. The wider religion and its enablers might say this is not true. It is not helpful to call X a liar. If he says his faith motivates him then you have to take his word for it. If you say he is a liar, you risk misdiagnosing the problem and so the problem will go on and on without proper treatment.

Many religious terrorists say they do it at least partly for the faith. That is as good as saying their faith makes them as nasty as what they are. We must take their word for it.

Many religious terrorists do not say it but they act as if they are fighting for the religion. Actions speak too. Think of the

IRA.

People with a little faith have been known to do terrible things in its name. If faith is the problem then the more the religion praises faith the more it is to blame. There is incredible power in a religion that brings one to a little faith when that one has enough to become a religious terrorist.

When terrorists act in the name of say Christianity or Islam and you have hardly any psychopath acting in the name of secularism or Quakerism that is proof that there is something not right with the Christian and Islamic faith. If it is true that Christian faith made the Christian terrorist so vicious then his bad deeds do reflect on the Christian religion. To blame him as an individual shows more concern for protecting religion than people. There is more to people than religion. To blame him only is being unfair to him and sending out the message that it is okay to hurt people for faith.