

## AGGRESSIVE EVANGELISTIC LOVE

Most religions encourage you to share your faith and show how it makes you happy. Not many like people preaching to them even benignly. Nobody likes an aggressive preacher either.

People who preach by example not word are still preaching.

All agree that in cases of necessity, we should deploy aggressive love. That is to say, if the house is on fire and the inhabitant won't budge then slap him until he does. Christianity has a firebrand Jesus in the gospels who practiced aggressive love on the grounds that Hell was an ever-present danger. That contrasts totally with the behaviour of the Church. The candy-coated love of modern Christianity is nauseating in its hypocrisy.

Christians cannot say that being too pushy in religion is going to make people hostile to religion. If the problem is that the presenters of the religion are too pushy, then the problem is not that the gospel is unattractive or useless. If it is effectual and life-changing God will surely show the antagonised that they have no right to oppose his truth just because they are annoyed by the messenger. After all, it is supposed to be God that opens peoples hearts and minds to the truth. He only uses the messengers as an opportunity so it makes no difference then if the messengers are nice or nasty.

People say that if you really believe in the power of the Holy Spirit to melt black hearts and fill them with love and peace and grace you will not feel the need to proselytise or badger people to listen to your gospel. This reasoning is incorrect. If the spirit is that powerful then he can overcome the bad or at least unpleasant impression of the faith given by the messenger. Christianity claims to believe that God needs us to share the gospel and doing that gives him the chance to find new disciples through our faltering efforts.

Jesus' parable of the lost sheep in danger of suffering everlasting torment implies that the clergy must be aggressive in pursuing the lost. It implies that some awful fate such as everlasting hell is going to happen to the lost sheep if it is not found and helped. The clergy must be eager to silence anybody who contradicts or diminishes the nastiness of their message.

All totalitarianism and unjust intolerance stems from bias and lack of concern for honest appraisals of evidence.

Christianity makes no effort to give people decent evidence that its huge claims are true! What proof do they have that we are potentially and sometimes actually bad enough to die cursing God and curse him forever and keep up the resistance to his love?

The main Christian duty is to warn people about eternal damnation and to invite and inspire them to save themselves from this fate. Thus your godless enemy needs help far more than your saintly father who needs you to be his carer. Thus you should spend more time looking out for your enemies than your friends. Jesus indeed said outright that if you help those who love you you have your reward and this is unimpressive in God's eyes. He said in the Sermon on the Mount that you cannot expect praise for loving those who love you.

God told Ezekiel that if a man sins and you don't tell him to stop and God punishes him then you will (not might) be held accountable by God for saying nothing. The man knows it's a sin. You can't sin unless you know it is a sin. Modern thinking would say that if a man chooses to sin and knows what he is doing that is his problem. The Bible disagrees. God uses moral blackmail to punish those who want to mind their own business! How kind!

Truly good people believe good uplifting doctrines. The doctrine of Hell, eternal suffering for those who die in unrepentant sin, is not about deterring people from sin but only from impenitence on their deathbeds. It is a purely vindictive and uncaring doctrine.

Should we say that Catholics are like schizophrenics and able to lovingly believe and promote such an evil doctrine? The person who is evil because they have known nothing else cannot be as bad as the person who is a mixture of evil and good. We are repulsed by the kindly old man who turns out to be a child molester precisely because he is so nice. Evil done by a "good" person is worse and more repulsive than evil done by somebody that has never done a good thing in their life.

Should we say we oppose religion because its a system and not the same thing as opposing the people that comprise it? Is it a case of hating the religion but loving the members? A man believes he has the right to kill us. We will be afraid of him when confronted by him when we are all alone down an alleyway. Nobody would believe us if we said we were not afraid of him but of his belief. In fact, if we really meant it we would belong in a mental institution. If religion truly loves the atheist, it will encourage him to oppose it.

Any Christian who does not proselytise cannot be taken seriously as a religious believer.