

## WHY CHRISTIAN PAEDOPHILES LOVE THE BIBLE

Idaho in one decade (2000 to 2010) had over 4,000 children who were married and often by force. It is known that the youngest was about 13. It shows you do not need Islam in a nation for that to happen. Christianity at times leads to child marriages too. It was Christians who refused to vote for a ban on such fake marriages, on such child abuse. How could such a thing happen? What kind of religion does that?

Jesus said that a good tree is only shown in its real nature when the fruit appears. He should know for he was the one who wanted divorce banned to female children who were wed at 11 or 12. More about that later.

Yahoo Answers makes Bible believers show their true colours. They defend the paedophilia approved in the Bible which saw girls too young for sex being married off to men just because they won't admit that the Bible far from being the word of a good God is obscene and whoever makes a child read it uncensored should be hauled up before the courts. The excuse was that those girls were not considered underage in those days! What would they say to a paedophile who said he was not doing wrong by going after 12 year old girls because they are not really underage and that the law is stating a fiction by saying that they are?

One reason marriage is condoned so young is that people didn't live long but that is only an excuse. A wife-girl dying in childbirth at 12 or 13 for her body is not ready proves that. You marry when ready and that is that even if you only have a year left. Another reason is that if sex happens before marriage, marriage must be provided to avoid scandal so the low age is a reward for having sex with a 11 year old.

<http://answers.yahoo.com/question/index?qid=20100801084655AA846sc>

The Christian religion provides the perfect cover for perverts who prey on children. It does this through its doctrine and history shows evidence of abnormally high level of sex abuse of minors.

Many minors and children are abused sexually by close relatives. Church teaching on incest has little credibility for the infallible Council of Trent decreed, "If any one shall say, that those degrees only of consanguinity and affinity, which are set down in Leviticus, can hinder matrimony from being contracted, and dissolve it when contracted; and that the Church cannot dispense in some of those degrees, or ordain that others may hinder and dissolve it; let him be anathema." The Church thought it had the power to allow incestuous marriage between cousins. It is obvious that if cousin marriage is wrong then a dispensation cannot make it right. The Church is deliberately endorsing incest - it allows what it treats as forbidden.

The Bible which is supposedly God's truth says not a single word against the abuse of a female child in a sexual context. People who have sex with animals are condemned but they are surely less common than those who try to have sex with children of 5 or 6. The silence is telling. If the child is married to the abuser then their rape is condoned. Divorce was allowed too so the man could have sex with a female child and dump her and get a divorce and get another child. This is tacit approval of child sex abuse.

The Bible provides more direct justification too.

It follows then that any Church that claims to follow the teaching of the Bible as the word of God is teaching that paedophilia is acceptable - whether it realises it or not. The Bible itself commands child-abuse for it says that anybody who does not know that their sins murdered Jesus who had to atone for them by his death and rise so that we could rise too will be damned forever in the agony of Hell. These are awful things to tell a child. It is the kind of stuff that would make some children kill when they grow up on the basis that they have committed murder anyway and when it is committed once it is easier to do it again. The Bible even accuses them of a sin traced back to Adam. It tells them that a being some old men says exists has to be put before themselves and their parents and all love must be given to him and a depraved old book commanding murder and hatred and hypocrisy in the name of love must be accepted as the word of God.

There is no end to the evil that the Church pumps into children. The Bible is a palliative for the conscience of the paedophile. The priest claims to be giving you the most important thing there is, faith in God and in his true Church. But the priest takes no responsibility for what harm this does. He will not compensate you for that. If giving him money is not letting him steal off you then nothing is stealing when he dares to ask for such a serious commitment to his Church. That is the kind of respect they have for you! Tell them where to stick their apologies.

The Bible which the Church says is the word of God and infallible states that Christians are not to go to pagan judges with their disputes (1 Corinthians 6:1-11). The Bible did not say untrustworthy pagan judges but just pagan judges meaning that God has decided that only Christians should put Christians on trial. They would certainly have to be more than Christians but also very upright people according to the Bible standard which is pitifully poor I might add. If you can't take somebody to court when it is just pagans running the court how can you go to a court run by Christians whose piety and holiness is dubious? The Bible Jesus says of such Christians that they are neither hot nor cold and he will spew them out of his mouth. So they are despised as much as pagans in the Bible and by the Bible God. There are few Christians about and the most devout of them are often hypocrites. The Christians were told to stay away from pagan judges in Corinth which didn't have any Christian judges out of the closet. Christians were few and far between then. So the message is clear: though you need judges to have a decent society better to have no judges than pagan ones and better to have no justice than faulty justice or justice that is not justice as Christianity sees it. This shows extreme antagonism towards pagans. It shows that the vast majority of court cases today are sinful by Bible standards. It commands then that justice be controlled by the Church. If the Catholic Church had been holding the courts there would have been no mercy for clerically abused children and no consideration for them at all. The true Catholic cannot regard the finding guilty of paedophile priests to be morally valid. To them it can have no legal force. The paedophile then will feel persecuted and will feel that he is the wronged one!

Deuteronomy 19:15 has God forbidding any attention to be paid to any accusation that is made by only one witness (see also Deuteronomy 17:6; 19:15; Numbers 35:30). Deuteronomy is forbidding attention to be paid to most children who report molestation for in the vast majority of cases it is just the child's word against the abuser. And Jesus gave witness to the correctness of the rule centuries later (John 8:17). Jesus said that the law declared that what two men testify to is true. The same commandment was approved in 1 Timothy 5:19 and 2 Corinthians 13:1 by Paul the apostle. So Christians must not say that the commandment was done away by Jesus for it was validated in New Testament times.

The Bible can only make Christian paedophiles feel outraged and persecuted when they are sent down. It is no wonder there is little convincing remorse among religious child sex offenders but they cannot admit that their faith and holy book and therefore God are their inspiration in the ways of evil. The Bible has been responsible for the abetting of child-abuse and covering up that the Jehovah's Witnesses have recently being exposed for (which they admit was done because of the Bible teachings just mentioned). It certainly tells those who cover up that they were doing right. Maybe the covering up done by the cult and other cults like Roman Catholicism was done to hide the fact that Christianity and the Bible produce and/or encourage paedophiles.

Lot's virgin daughters who he raped when drunk had to be underage and yet 2 Peter says Lot was a righteous man. Even if he didn't know any better, Lot could not be held up as an example. Clearly Peter was condoning what Lot did. He was envying him. This was supposedly Peter the apostle the first pope and who was authorised by Jesus to speak for him. The New Testament sanctions child abuse as much as the Old Testament does. And this was in a culture which accepted such abuse. Even in pagan nations, men slept with little boys and raped them with public approval.

If a girl was found to be a non-virgin on the wedding night her husband was to have her stoned to death. Yet rape of a virgin, meaning a girl who could have been a child, got a superficial token punishment. Read Deuteronomy 22:20-29. This is as good as a clear endorsement of rape of a female child.

The Church likes to keep the fact that the Torah, the Law that God dictated to the evil Moses, did nothing about the Hebrew tradition of marriages being arranged between men and girls who were just children hidden under the mitre. The Law railed against adultery and fornication and homosexuality but its God turned a blind eye to this perversion. He did not even have the decency to lay down a minimum age. It made it clear that these marriages, usually the first marriage a man would contract, were lawful and not to be sullied with adultery. It even let men take more child-brides later. There is absolutely no reason why God couldn't have insisted on the age of the brides being increased. To say he couldn't is as absurd as saying that we should reduce our age of consent to twelve because many children are having sex these days. Evangelicals stand up for God no matter what he does so if they want to then they should have the laws of the land made to please rebellious selfish people. They should reward insubordinancy thus.

Jewish girls were married as soon as they reached puberty or started to menstruate (page 13, 30, Son of Joseph). They were betrothed which was a kind of marriage that took place shortly before full marriage, at about 12 years of age (page 35, Putting Away Childish Things, Uta Ranke-Heinmann, HarperSanFrancisco, 1992). There was no concern for the girl being mature enough or ready for marriage. Girls of that age would have been more innocent and inexperienced and easily taken advantage of than girls today. We are talking about a serious abuse of young girls here. They were used by men and by religion. Rape is not too strong a word to describe what was done to them on the wedding night. The marriage was their lot whether they wanted it or not. The psychological pressure must have been intense. The man who rapes by pressuring a woman is as much a rapist as one who holds the woman down. In fact he is more hateful.

And the New Testament comes out and sanctions this behaviour when it says that God gave Mary a pregnancy before the wedding. It was bad enough after the wedding but before it meaning she was a younger mother than usual.

Matthew and Luke say Mary was pregnant without sexual intercourse. We do not know what is meant by conceived by the Holy Spirit. It could be a euphemism for Mary getting "miraculously" pregnant during sexual molestation by Joseph or somebody else. The text never excludes the possibility of sperm. Given that Augustine said we should read the Bible in a non-magical way then Joseph must have been Jesus' father.

The New Testament gives divine approval for the abuse of children. It is bad enough to have sex with a child but to make one pregnant is a hundredfold worse. But Christians are strangely appalled at the idea that Mary might have had sex or come close to it and conceived that way and delighted at the idea that she conceived without sex or a man well below what anybody in their right mind would consider a decent age. So illicit sex is worse than an illicit pregnancy! This is another manifestation of the majority Christian belief that pain is good and pleasure is bad.

Luke says that when the angel told Mary she would have a baby she was shocked and wondered how she could have a baby when she did not know man? The angel did not actually tell her she would have a baby without a man only that she would have one. She talks as if she had not reached puberty yet and this entity was talking to her about babies. No wonder she was bewildered! Even she knew she was too young to get pregnant - and that was by the standards of that time!

Whoever says that the girls were not underage in those days so that their getting married at 12 or at the start of puberty is not a problem is one sick individual. First of all, the point is that they were emotionally and mentally and physically unprepared for sex. Second, they had no sex education. Third, they are implying that the only thing wrong with abusing children is that the law says they are underage and the fact that they are not ready doesn't matter! This is silly for the law is only about regulation. The law saying something doesn't automatically make it right.

Jesus was asked if any man could divorce his wife. Jesus said no and if he did he was making her commit adultery. He was recognising the validity of the underage marriages based on abuse and degradation of the female. He was approving of paedophilia. He was even forcing them to stay married - such was the strength of his pro-paedophilia stance. He said whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery. Those divorced women were married as children and thus were not married at all. They did not even consent to the marriage for the man took the marriage vow not the girl.

In Matthew 5:17-19, Jesus sanctioned the Jewish law and condemned any attempt to water down any of its commandments. This proves he agreed with the paedophilia it blessed.

Is it not child abuse to tell a child that Jesus came to save us from everlasting punishing and that they are guilty of Adam's sin and their sins are the reason why Jesus had to be crucified? It is so we conclude that child abuse is built into the Christian system. The system implies that paedophilia is permissible.

The doctrine of Jesus Christ that if your brother hurts you seventy times a day you must forgive him seventy times makes paedophiles feel victimised by those who detest them. It makes them feel that if the victim is damaged, it is because the victim failed to forgive as Jesus asked. The claim that Jesus has the miraculous power to turn a sinner into a holy person rapidly if that person only co-operates and asks for the grace urges them to blame the victim. The lack of compassion in the clergy and religious for the victims of paedophile clergy and religion can be explained by those doctrines. Doctrines such as that if you don't forgive, you are punishing yourself for what somebody else did to you don't help.

Paedophiles often feel a hatred and disgust for themselves after they commit vile acts. Sadly, Christian teaching about this forgiving God helps them deal with that self-hate. They use religion to relieve it. Thus the self-hate won't last long enough to deter them from future acts of abuse. Priests claim they can forgive the sin of paedophilia so these priests were virtually encouraging their colleagues to engage in it by trivialising it with cheap forgiveness and relieving feelings of shame and guilt. The paedophile priest should feel supported by going to confession.

Children have a tendency to believe in fairies and witches and Santa Claus and God and Jesus and tooth fairies and other supernatural beings. Religion seeks to keep a part of you childish, the part of you that reaches out to believe in God. Paedophiles are stuck at a childish stage which causes their disorder. Religion is helping to develop their disorder by promoting supernaturalism in children and urging them to childishly hold on to it.

It is common in the United States for normal people who report an experience where they were raped by aliens or sexually abused. Some Christians think demons sexually molested them. There have to be children who taken with Santa Claus were sure he came down the chimney and subjected them to vile sexual abuse. Any form of paranormal or supernatural belief can make people suffer that illusion. But to them it is as devastating and tormenting as the real thing. Religion opens the door to such illusion and belittles the suffering in doing so. It is best for there to be no traditions about aliens or ghosts or Jesuses or Santas than for one child to suffer as a result. A child sees dreams and reality as much the same so parents need to take responsibility for what they are telling their children. The scars that will be incurred will be permanent.

The Church teaches that children are to be given confession and communion around the age of seven or eight for then they

have the use of reason and can reject God by mortal sin or sin that takes you to Hell forever should you die. Strange that children can make the ultra-mammoth decision, the most serious decision of all namely where to spend eternity, and cannot marry or consent to sex. It is no wonder with absurd and vicious doctrines like this that paedophile priests do not think they took advantage of the children they had sex with.

The history of the Church shows that clerical child abusers showed no real tendency to try and get treatment for their paedophilia. Many paedophiles seek such treatment. The question is why the priestly ones don't even when they can. They have to be forced by their bishops to get help. And the help is really about making it look like they tried to change than about really trying to cease being a danger to children. It is about pulling the wool over the eyes of the flock. It has been observed by Laszlo Bito Phd that the priests guilty of the abuse have not showing any signs of intense remorse or guilt. They do not take every avenue they can to control their urges. The repentance they offer is light and pathetic. It insults the victims. Its more superficial than anything else.

The Church likes its scripture Acts 23:5. There the high priest has Paul the apostle struck and Paul retorts that he is a hypocrite for violating the law in doing that. He calls him a whitewashed wall. He then apologises citing as divine law the rule that you shall not speak evil of an authority. Texts like that only facilitate cover-ups in the Catholic priesthood.

## **Conclusion**

The Christian and Bible religion endangers children and helps paedophiles justify themselves.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS CATHOLICS ARE ASKING, Tony Coffey, Harvest House Publishers, Oregon ,2006

Breaking the Silence, One Garda's Quest to Find the Truth, Martin Ridge, Gill & Macmillan, Dublin, 2008 order from Gill & Macmillan, Hume Avenue, Park West, Dublin 12

PAPAL SIN, STRUCTURES OF DECEIT, Garry Wills, Darton Longman and Todd, London, 2000

Putting Away Childish Things, Uta Ranke-Heinmann, HarperSanFrancisco, 1992

THE POWER AND THE GLORY, Inside the Dark Heart of John Paul II's Vatican, David Yallop, Constable, London, 2000

The Womb and the Tomb, Hugh Montifiore, Fount – HarperCollins, London, 1992

Sex, Priests and Secret Codes, Thomas P Doyle, A W R Sipe and Patrick J Wall, Volt Press, Los Angeles, California, 2006

Son of Joseph, The Parentage of Jesus, Geoffrey Parrinder, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1992

God Is Not Great, The Case Against Religion, Christopher Hitchens, Atlantic Books, London, 2007