

**RELIGION IS OFTEN INDIRECTLY POLITICAL**

*Religion is often indirectly political.*

Religion that is directly political will also be indirectly political. Religion that is is not directly political will be indirectly political.

You never know if a faith is good or bad/dangerous until you see how its members use the vote. People who claim to profess love and kindness and helping the poor would still vote in a vile person as the president of their country. It is as if they show their real colours at the ballot box and people like to back up evil people in the hope that they will do the evil for them. They want to feel good and smug while happy that the evil president they brought in hurts others.

In a free country a person who enters or stays in a religion that has violent scriptures and tends to produce too many religious terrorists cannot ask for the same rights as a person who keeps out of organisations that have any respect for violence. It is not fair to ask people to believe that you are totally anti-violence. You would not be in a bad religion or potentially bad one unless you are in some way pro-violence.

Decency, not to mention Christianity, says you must not look for praise for any good you do but as far as possible try to keep it secret. If individuals should not then neither should the religion as a whole for it is a collection of individuals. Thus the religion has no right to use the good deeds and sufferings of its martyrs or anyone to get praise even in the sense, "They are not all bad." That is abusing the good done to get social leverage, and consequently political leverage, and to silence those who say that there is enough problematic with religion to justify dismantling it.

*Double standard*

Religion cannot exist unless some people, usually men, are regarded as authorised by some kind of God to speak and decree for him. To blame politics for bad things and for violence and exempt religion is unfair for both involve respect and a framework of authority. Politics is about human authority too. Why would you condemn politicians and exempt religion? That is refusing to admit that religious leaders and thus religion can be dangerous just because they are religious. It is not fair to pick on politicians and leave religionists out.

A malignant and scheming political entity and a malignant and scheming religious one have one big difference. One does not necessary have to feel inspired by a supernatural force that knows better than man and the other does. No matter how much harm politics does, there is more potential harm with a religion doing similar evil. And there is no way to reason with a person who feels God is calling him to kill for some mysterious purpose. There is nothing you can do to prove the person wrong.

Is religion a form of politics? What has it got in common with politics?

#Religion like politics likes to have its charmers who lie and distort and still manage to get prestige and the vote of confidence from the general public.

#Religion like politics uses rationalisation and propoganda to get its own way. An example of religion's hypocrisy follows and its a good example for the political world engages in similar duplicity.

When a film or cartoon insults Muhammad, the prophet of Islam, there will certainly be trouble and violence from vengeful Muslims. The Church has condemned such films and cartoons. Of course the antics of the Muslims is not condemned at all. If you wait for the Church to say that the cartoon and films did not force Muslims to resort to violent protests you will wait forever. The hypocrisy is horrendous and is really just making the killing and rioting and violence implemented by the Muslims look more respectable than what it is. Such hypocrisy desensitises Christians to carrying out religious based violence.

Religion is about what may not be real. The state is about what is real. Therefore only religionists who will not colour their work with religious prejudices and unfounded suppositions should be eligible for political office. For example, you cannot appoint a dictator who is determined to enforce Catholic teaching on contraception. Ideally, religionists who are under suspicion of bringing superstition to their political careers should sign a statement that they will not do so and be fired or corrected should they contravene the agreement.

Christianity is very powerful as a political force. The hypocrisy of the members who do not take it seriously but who give it money and who support it publicly is its political impetus. Though its meant to be a religion, it is more politics than religion. A Catholic is made by a sprinkle of water. That is the religious equivalent of nationality. Eg if you are born in Italy you are Italian. Human personhood begins some time after conception so if your Italian parents were in Spain when the foetus became you then you are Spanish. Nationality like water baptism is just a label based on political divides. The Christian leaders engage in the same lies and manipulations as politicians do. The leaders treat other religions like other political parties. The supporter of same sex marriage or LGBT Rights is only betraying his or her cause by being listed as say a Catholic.

Politics treats nature as if it is running by itself without an input by God. For example, no political party agrees with putting gay people to death to please God. It acts as if God's wishes do not matter. It will not care to check if God wants that or not. And politics can spark off hatred and war and bitter dissension. It is doing that despite not being answerable to religion. It is dangerous despite the fact that it only considers non-supernatural things. Imagine how much worse it will be if that changes...

It is thought that just because say a Catholic believes in nonsense that does not mean he or she should be deprived of the civil right to join the government. The reasoning is that the Catholic politicians could still do an outstanding job. Now it is not that they could that matters but what they will do. The evidence must supply the answer. Do most do a good job despite believing nonsense? A case by case examination would be necessary for many who believe in nonsense get worse and soon become unemployable. It is necessary also because religion IS politics!

### *Public and Private and Religious Morality*

The law is about public not private morality though through the mistakes and lies of powerful people it may intrude into the private sphere. For example, the law will not let you have sex in the street but its okay if you do it in private. An example of interference by the law is when consenting adults in the past were declared criminals for having gay sex in private. Anyway the law and morality are related. Religion gets its power by depending on morality in principle. In practice, it depends on its own version of morality - with some bizarre taboos. Most people gravitate towards a religion that they think is respectful towards and helpful towards public morality. The price they pay is to ignore the lies and hypocrisy. The state pays a similar price. It only endorses religion for it thinks it upholds public order and saves the state money. This is an odd assumption considering how anti-Catholic terrorists appear among the Protestants and anti-Protestant terrorists among the Catholics. The state has been fond of faiths that bluntly endorsed violence as opposed to enabling and facilitating the violent. Consider the power the Free Presbyterian Church had in Northern Ireland.

### *Does fear of God cause tyrant politics to save people by killing them?*

There are stories that godless tyrants raged in anger against God before they died. But what if they felt they were better off killing people than letting them live under such a God? It does not matter if a tyrant is forced to permit evil and suffering or wills them positively. The tyrant is still a tyrant. So it is with God.

### *RELIGION'S RELATIONSHIP TO POLITICAL VIOLENCE*

If religion were really thought to have supernatural rites and properties that made a good person a better person and put the God who overthrows injustice behind the person and which could reform bad people, politics and politicians would not be so keen to elevate it and even marry it to their policies and culture. And the way religion expects this political honour shows it has no interest in being a force for real good.

In at least 70% of terrorism, the common denominator is Islam. That cannot be ignored. In the past, most terrorism was Christian. It will not do to blame man not religion. To say that it is man not religion is to say that religion is somehow superior to man and we must never let ourselves see if it is its fault. That religion demands such special and unfair and silly deference shows it is intrinsically manipulative. Those who say that religion is good and always good are ignoring the fact that a religion can be socio-political as well as religious. It can have "holy" politics. Nobody says that politics is good and that it is the people who implement politics who are the problem. To say that would be an excuse for supporting evil politicians on the basis that their evil is not reflective of "true" politics. While not all religions believe in governing a country, they do expect the state to take its values from them. For example, Catholicism makes no apology for trying to influence the nation to outlaw abortion even at a very early stage of pregnancy. That is an example of how the Church urges the state to make its own decisions about law but to do so in a way that reflects the values of the Church. It is similar to how a school might decide to teach religion to children. It makes its own choice but it has no choice when it comes to adhering to the Church's regard for religious education.

The politician lets the people down and says he is sorry and makes mistakes and does wrong like anybody else does. He uses the fact that we all have faults to get away with what he has done. It often works! Religion has more "sins" than are

necessary which helps it work for the members feel guilty and end up being taken for fools by people like the politician who may be feigning repentance!

Islam was heavily influenced by Christianity's violent politics, scriptures and doctrines so Christianity is as much to blame.

Religion has to go for it is more about politics than it wants you to think and the beast it rides is politics. Fighting one legal battle after another with religion is too difficult and dangerous so it is better to strike at the sources: faith and lazy parenting.