

## REAL POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

As political correctness is about equality and destroying discrimination it is often called cultural marxism. It doesn't always follow Marxist doctrine as in how it tends to promote same sex marriage which would have been heresy in the eyes of the Marxists of former days.

Another important thing about political correctness is how it tends to make society change its thinking without it realising it has changed. But in fairness this has always happened. If you are upset now how it is on trend to let women abort babies the day before they are due to be born remember that society has always warped its people. It was in the name of equality that heretics were murdered in droves by the Catholic Church in centuries past for their heresy made them unequal to the Catholics and thus entitled to no rights.

Political correctness is designed to eliminate every trace of unjust discrimination and to avoid giving offence. An area in which it has most influence is working towards the rights of women, gays and different races. In this, it sets itself in opposition to biblical Christianity so political correctness that prohibits criticism of Christianity is a laughing stock. But even then political correctness is a secular thing. It is as secular as Humanism in its own way because it treats every viewpoint as valid and denies that any belief system should be treated as uniquely true. The difference is that Humanists consider Atheism to be true and religion to be mere speculation and wishful thinking. Political correctness actually undermines religion and its power and we have to be grateful to it for that. Its ethos is to put people first which is a totally secular attitude.

Forms and schools of Christianity and Judaism and Islam that are true to their "revealed" doctrines are fascist. Even those that are not true to those dark teachings are dangerous for liberal Christianity can lose its appeal and lead to fundamentalism and so Christianity, for instance, across the board has to be exposed and those who have good will in it will abandon it. The liberals are saying that their cult is the true faith which means they are encouraging fundamentalism because integrity to the faith requires fundamentalism.

Fundamentalism promises certainties not pious hopes like liberalism – the trouble is that these certainties are fraudulent. It is nasty and that means that going to Church is very enjoyable for there is plenty of pulpit pounding and hatred vented and it appeals to the regrettable universal human desire to shock and make others lives a misery. The numbers of converts to fundamentalism do not mean it is getting stronger. It all depends on what most of the converts are after and many do fall away too – at least in their secret thinking. Anyone who attacks women or gays or any other group just because a book like the Bible is negative towards them should not legally get away with it. Nobody has the right to put dogma before persons. To accuse someone of evil on the basis of a book is no different from making it up out of thin air. The definition of libel needs to be broadened.

The Bible condemns cowards. There are no such things as cowards but only people who put their strength into fighting for the wrong cause. For example, the man who will not fight for his children's safety is fighting to be hurt by the consent of others and his children.

The Bible condemns homosexuals and St Paul even said that homosexuality was punishment for sin. The fact is that if two adults consent and are careful not to do harm it is nobody else's business what they do. It's none of God's either. The Bible says it is God's business and if it is God's business when he is not even on this world as one of us anymore and cannot be hurt then it is everybody else's too for we are still here. To oppose homosexuals then in this light is as bad as racism and must not be tolerated even if it means fining priests and clergy for condemning homosexuality.

The Church would respond that my liberalism like all liberals is not so open-minded after all and seeks to stop free speech and have a monopoly in politics. But is it open-minded to let those who condemn others for what is harmless do so? Liberalism is based on giving as much freedom as we dare not to let people do precisely as they please. And we do listen to the Church which is why we oppose its position. Obviously, the Christian cannot say anything else about us but that we are narrow-minded. They can hardly say they are narrow-minded which further illustrates how religion seeks to cause trouble and destroy many of the rights of liberals.

The Bible condemns anybody who believes in it and then either becomes uncertain or believes something different. If you were on your deathbed and you couldn't do or say anything at all for yourself would you be doing wrong if you became a sceptic like Pyrrho and doubted everything and questioned if the bed you lay on was real and not an illusion? No way. The Bible is an evil vicious persecuting book. To forbid persecution with the attitudes it and the Church has would just be inconsistency and hypocrisy especially when you are a dying sceptic.

The view that people have are right to think what they like is correct. But it is conditional. They have only this right if they do their best to be right and use their knowledge to benefit themselves and others. We must not forget that we do evil thinking it is right therefore it is important to try and be as consistent and logical as possible so that the disorder of evil will afflict us less for bad stupid thinking programs the mind to fall prey to more evil. Political correctness that has little concern for truth is silly. If the politically correct despise truth then how come they are so sure that it is right to be politically correct as they see it? But there are some circumstances in which it doesn't matter what you believe like when you are on your deathbed.

The Bible says that we have brought suffering on ourselves by abusing free will. Adam and Eve brought chaos into God's creation by doing wrong for wrong is chaos. They brought evil in. When I sin, I become as bad as they. When I sin, I assent to the power that is behind all evil and become as spiteful as Adam and Eve which means I will universal suffering and evil. What a guilt load!

If God exists then sin is worse than we think and if God is good then it is infinitely bad for he would do infinite good for us. You need strong evidence before you can accuse anybody so God represents the view that it is okay to nail people on flimsy evidence for the evidence for him is unsatisfactory.

The Bible blames us for sins. We have no need to believe that people are the cause of the evil that they do and that it is not something inside them making them do it. The purpose of the rewards and punishment of the law of the land is not to reward you for being good or evil but for doing good and doing evil. Nobody knows if you are sane or not. Nobody knows if the good you do is done with a good heart. The law of the land will send you to jail if you commit murder even if you meant well in which case you only thought you were doing right. We say we prefer to reward than to punish. But what looks like a good deed can be done with a bad motive. It is easy to do that. It is very very much harder to do evil deeds such as murder and have a good but perhaps misguided motive for it. So we logically should prefer to punish than to reward! People believe in free will because they want to believe in rewards and punishing but this is a mistake. It is better to see a bad person as sick rather than as somebody who is wilfully evil when we can and we always can. Always! It is less harsh and that is why belief in free will always leads to some level of hate and discrimination. God and free will go hand in hand so belief in God is bad news. The law of the land does not need free will and so should ban the concept. The doctrine of free will is incitement to hatred and a libel against humanity and an act of revenge because the doctrine is not needed.

The Bible should be banned for banning parts of it only gives curiosity regarding the censored bits and banning will not stop Christians claiming it is the word of God in its entirety. It is only nonsense changing its language to non-exclusive language for the original is still sexist and claims divine sanction for it and they are still saying it is inspired though they have altered the translation.

If there is a God then there is some purpose for evil that justifies him allowing it to happen. This makes any evil we do less evil for God wants it to happen to some degree whereas if there were no God it would be worse to do it. But the evidence for people is better than the evidence for God and we should not be even partly condoning evil that being the case.

Marriage is degrading to both husband and wife for it implies that they must give themselves to each other in the eyes of the law to have the right to love each other to the full and have children. It is none of the law's business. This is clearly implied by the fact that even in countries that are liberal with divorce the Churches still encourage marriage and forbids sex outside it when with the huge marriage split rate it hardly matters if they wed or not. Plus the Churches do weddings for people who have got Church annulments though the state does not recognise the marriages. By tolerating this, the state is admitting that marriage is none of its business.

If a woman has lots of nice brothers who would do anything for her then she has the right to have a baby without having the father involved in the upbringing of the child for the brothers will help her. Marriage implies that what she is doing is inferior to what a man and woman having children in marriage. It implies that she is in some way evil or sinful. It is clear that despite the link between marriage and love, marriage puts rules before circumstances and therefore before people. It's vile. And especially when marriage contains no vow to look after the children that may result from the union. It is entirely about the right of the husband and wife to have sex together! Sex must be more important to regulate than family! Marriage vows are valid if the husband and wife intend to have children but put them up for adoption!

It's impossible to see how you can love your neighbour as yourself if you get married for the husband or wife comes first. The law of love would imply that you marry late in life just to have babies for marriage is a necessary evil.

The Church hates no-fault divorce. But it is better for a husband and wife to part just because they prefer to be apart than to do it because they hate each other.

When you have a bad feeling about somebody say a suspicion you will often say you cannot put your finger on it but there is something about them. When they do something bad you say then that your hunch was right. That is a boast. You are

saying you knew what they were really like. But you did not. You just had a bad feeling about them and you cannot boast about being right for you were just lucky.

The Bible condemns imperfection. Jesus said in the very middle of the Sermon on the Mount that we must be perfect as God is perfect. You have the right to be imperfect for perfection is unattainable and is going to be no help even if it is. Nobody likes perfect people so you just do your best and accept your failures.

The Bible God gives the Golden Rule that says treat others as you like to be treated. This rule is nonsense. Work out how others want to be treated for everybody is so different and treat them that way. The Law which Jesus said was the embodiment of the golden rule is full of objections to harmless “quirks” like homosexuality and transvestitism so Jesus wanted to use the Golden Rule to dictate to people what they should think and feel and that everybody should be the same.

Religion likes to spread the myth that the reason things are so terrible in the modern world and not getting any better is because of the huge fall off in religious membership and Church attendance. This is nonsense for in the vast majority of Churches there is nothing but boring pious platitudes for sermons and outrageous hypocrisy among the clergy and apathy among most of the people. The Churches used to be filled by fear. Do they think they can make a better world by taking us back to that? To suggest that declining Church membership and attendance are to blame for the chaos in society is very bigoted for it is accusing those who sincerely think they are right of being godless whereas a really good God would accept the good will of the misled or misinformed.

After the holocaust of September 11th, 2001, the pope said that religion can never be a justification for bloodshed. His Bible which he says is the word of God says that God commanded many wars. This God who the pope claims to represent on earth even commanded strikes against sections of Israel not because they were going to attack his people but simply because they had lost their faith. The dishonesty of the pope is awful. The pope considers religion to be a good enough reason to prevent Third World women having access to contraception though birth will bring them great suffering and perhaps even kill them which makes his grand words insincere. Though men can trick the people to thinking a war that is not just is just we have more hope of doing something about it by education and by the fact that we can talk to all involved. But if a God who permits evil and suffering for an alleged good purpose commands a war that seems unjust the situation is hopeless. God has his own reasons and doesn't give them but still commands obedience even as he commanded Abraham to sacrifice his son Isaac to him (Genesis 22). Therefore anybody who believes in God and takes him seriously is bringing the world closer to danger. To oppose a prophet who thinks God is commanding war and bloodshed would be hypocritical for God could do that and there is no unmistakable verse of scripture that forbids bloodshed in the name of God. The fact that Islam and Christianity both have to admit that their holy books could be interpreted in such a way – consider the wide variation in interpretation in Christianity alone as a warning - as to sanction violence is reason enough to oppose them because they would have to say that anybody who wants to force their religion on others and persecute critics has a right to their opinion.

The Church says the Bible is the word of God even though it commands murder and bloodshed. What right then would the Church have to say that a man who seems to be a prophet and who commands similar bloodshed today is bad and should be silenced? Win that right by leaving the Church behind. Those who say that we don't need those laws anymore are lying for even if that were true modern society needs harsh rule at least where God is concerned more than any other society ever did for it is more materialist and selfish and there must be primitive tribes or whatever that could be doing with following the cruel laws for their situation would be the same as the situation of Israel when God decreed the cruel laws to it.

Expressions like, “Oh my God!” or “Thank God”, are unremittingly sexist. God is a male appellation. The opposite of God is Goddess. It reinforces the sense that what is female is inferior to what is male for male is divine and male language is divinised by God. Language is very important and can be very harmful for it conditions our thinking in ways we can never apprehend. The Bible may say that God does female things but this is only metaphor just like when it says that God hides us under his wings. Never does the Bible picture God as a real mother. Going to Church is a sexist enterprise. If God rewards and answers sexist prayer then God is sanctioning sexism. When Christians praise God for granting their requests they show themselves to be no better. To attack religious language and rouse the politically correct against it would be a marvellous way of harming the faith and we Humanists hope it will happen and be a success!

If people want to practice religion it should be done discreetly despite the words of Jesus, “Whoever is ashamed of me I will be ashamed of him” and “Don't put your lamp under a bushel”. Catholic spires should not be graced by the cross for that symbol insults Muslims who believe Jesus was not nailed to the cross and Jews who abominate crucifixion and Protestants who believe the second commandment forbids such graven images. Why be “in your face”? Religion finds this very frightening for secularists including the political correctness ones are not afraid to be “in your face” but that is necessary. Somebody has to be and it cannot be the religions for they all disagree and have their own conflicting agendas. But secularists look at all issues without religious or spiritual prejudice.

The Church says that God is goodness itself which automatically infers that atheists and agnostics are doing harm for they

don't believe in him. We will not allow ourselves to be smeared like that. The more you love God the more you insult us. Your prayers for our enlightenment offend us for it implies if we do not convert then we are resisting the light God gives us because we are so evil. Anybody that attracts people to faith by claiming miracles have happened is opposing our rights and our right to a sound reputation.

People are ashamed to be seen as healers and miracle workers for they know that these claims imply that they are special people and are superior and more valuable than others. So what they do is indulge in some mischievous misuse of language and claim that some force working through them does these things and not them and that the force is not making them better than anybody else. This is nonsense. If some force supplies healing energy and you use that energy you are a healer just as much as the other force is. A doctor may get his medicines from a drug company but that does not mean that the drug company and not him is what is helping people. The healers and miracle workers would be far better and admit the truth about what they do. Their attempt to steal the label of humility makes them worse not better, sneakier and not more decent – chances are that when they are like that they are exploiting statistics and faking and exaggerating their powers too! There has to be something special about a person before they will be chosen as they put it. For God to choose somebody at random would be as bizarre as him doing miracles at random which would be beneath his dignity. We conclude that anybody who claims to be a miracle worker of any kind, healer, psychic or saint, that person is claiming to be a superior human being and is wholly opposed to our notions of equality. Such claims have to be forbidden. The devout Catholic will prefer Padre Pio or Jesus Christ to some ordinary person. If there is a choice between Pio/Jesus or an ordinary person being phased out of existence they will choose Pio/Jesus. To choose a person just because they have preternatural powers is purest unjust discrimination.

Political correctness says that we should not say there are disabled people but people who are disabled. In this they are right. The expression people with disability makes you see people as people who have a problem. The other expression calling them disabled people implies that the people are a problem. It is referring to them in terms of their disability. Many say, "We condemn with horror the biblical claim that we are sinners. We may be people who sin but not sinners." When we separate people from sin we might as well go another step and deny sin altogether for the treatment due to these people will be the same whether we identify them with their sin or not.

You have people who discriminate against women and you have people who discriminate against people for the sake of God. The former are called sexists. As for the godists they are regarded as socially acceptable and that is hypocrisy. The sexist is better than the godist for the godist has no regard for human nature and has regard just for God.

Relativism is the view that you have a right to your moral opinion and that nobody should tell you your morality is immoral or wrong. It rejects the idea that anything is absolutely wrong. But it contradicts this by saying its always wrong to say relativism is wrong!

Relativism is itself intolerance. It condemns the view that morality is objective and real. It is not a proper response to the problem of tolerance. The pope speaks of the dictatorship of relativism which regards the person who rejects relativism as intolerant and evil.

The modern adage, "You have a right to your opinion/belief" is used by those who think they should think or believe whatever they WANT rather than think or believe whatever seems TRUE. Its a revolting misuse based on the wish to become immune to rational argument or persuasion. The only reason you have a right to your belief or opinion is that you use belief and opinion to find the truth or to improve your knowledge and accuracy. To say you have the right to believe or think what you want is ridiculous. It is not about what you want and you have no right to deceive people that it is. Grow up!

The person who tries to believe what he wants without regard to what is true is being intolerant of the fact that belief is based on evidence. He is not being fair or honest in this. He is not being supportive or tolerant towards those who want to base belief on good reasons. He will fear and tend to be bigoted towards those who endanger the facade he has created.

People say they have a right to their beliefs and opinions. That is actually a half truth. The correct thing is to say you have a right to your beliefs and opinions as long as you see them as helps on the journey to truth. If you say you have a right to your beliefs and opinions without any concern for truth then you are not being fair. Fairness is based on what is true. The person who sees the truth and calls it a lie is being unfair.

Those who tell you when you state a fact that it is your opinion are being judgemental and intolerant of you. It is not up to them to accuse you of stating an opinion when you are stating a fact. They are undermining your knowledge by saying it is an opinion rather than knowledge.