

Religion is Rudeness

Religious belief should be kept in the private sphere. People should not publicly speak of God or their religious faith. Freedom of speech is a must. We make the request not like we make a law but like we request people to keep opinions to themselves.

People must distinguish between religious beliefs and non-religious beliefs. The belief that an unborn baby of 30 weeks is a human being and must not be put to death is not necessarily a religious one. The belief that a newly fertilised egg is a human being with equal rights to grown men and woman is certainly a supernatural or religious one. It can only be defended on religious grounds. We all have disagreements with one another. We must not take our beliefs so seriously that we cannot live as beings of the world. For example, a person who believes that eating pigs is sinful and starts a political campaign to stop people eating pigs is behaving as a religious person not as a person of the world. The person of the world will keep his beliefs out of the public sphere.

Christianity is one faith that gives an example of religiosity to the world. It is a bad example for it encourages bad religions like Islam to grow and thrive. Religion might lead to good religion but can just as easily lead to bad.

Religious belief is bad enough but religious dogmatism is evil. Dogmatism says that such and such a doctrine is the truth, its not a belief, its the truth. It naturally implies that contrary opinions must be silenced just as a child who wants to believe that Australia doesn't exist during school must be silenced. It leads to fanaticism. If religion was really as sure of itself as it pretends it would not have had Catholic at the throat of Protestant and Christian at the throat of Muslim over religious differences. You know weakness of your position when you feel you have to liquidate anybody who contradicts it.

The Book of Atheist Spirituality claims that it is not religious faith that leads to religious terrorism but bigotry and hatred (page 76). This is stupid for religion advocates hatred in the guise of loving the sinner and hating the sin and demands that God be valued above all things. The Bible commands much violence and killing and says God required it to. Faith does lead to religious terrorism.

Religion is rude and expressions like, "Oh my God!" and "Please God" need to be dropped from public discourse and relegated to where expressions like, "Fuck off!" and "cunt" are. Unbelievers should demand that people don't speak of God in public. Many believers get through the day without thinking of God or mentioning him and so it is inexcusable.

CHILD INITIATION IS RUDE

Whether it works or not, the reason a religion claims a baby or child as a member is so that the child may be conditioned to believe and serve the religion. This is unfair for children are so easily conditioned. It is part of their condition! People don't take religion seriously these days and indeed many clergy don't. But that doesn't justify the child being enrolled in the religion. For all the child knows, he or she could be enrolled in the Nazis. You may say a child can be a member of a particular race and so he or she can be a member of a particular religion. But the two are not the same. You can be a member of any race without being a member of any society. You can have a white recluse or a black or whatever one. But you can't become a religionist without joining some society. You can't exist or be human without being of some race. But you can exist and be human without being a member of any religion or group.

Religion is divisive. It puts up barriers. No decent parent would want to make their child a part of all that.

Roman Catholicism claims that a baby that isn't baptised doesn't have God indwelling it. Doctrines like that are the stuff of discrimination and arrogance, from which racism is made. A racist is only a racist because he or she wants to be and to copy others who are racist or who pretend to be for their own ends. People adopt dangerous and irrational positions for all kinds of irrational reasons. It is simply wrong to tolerate religions that imply there is a difference between a baptised and unbaptised baby and things like astrology or fortunetelling which condemn people and warn against them on the basis of what is seen in a horoscope or tea cup.

People often say they believe in God and encourage the belief in their children because life would be harder to endure without faith. That flatly contradicts God in the Bible. God says we are to love him totally but not to love ourselves or our neighbour totally. We are to love God totally and love our neighbour as ourselves - that is less than God. To love God for comfort is to love comfort not God. If we love God, we will love him for himself even it kills us. If he cannot give us any benefit for this love we must still do it.

No religion has the right to insult babies. Religion should be formulated within human needs and not be about rules in Bibles or from popes or God.

THE RUDENESS OF RELIGIOUS "MORALITY"

Religious morality has rules about sex. Sex is only allowed in marriage. They condemn promiscuity. But if a woman was living in a dangerous area where any man she marries is soon assassinated she could end up with a different husband every year. Her being with all these men is approved as long as she marries them. Religion also has no problem with a virgin marrying a man who claims to be a reformed profligate who had been with hundreds of sexual partners. A woman who sleeps with a man like that may as well have been having sex with hundreds of people herself! To sleep with any person is in the disease sense to sleep with everybody else that person has slept with. Marriage is about religious control not concern about the person. Religion does not object to marrying HIV negative women to HIV positive men. It is not the harm promiscuity does that religion objects to at all. It lies and pretends it does to manipulate people into getting married before having sex.

Religion says you must abhor the sin and wish it didn't exist but love the sinner. But sin is not something a sinner just does. It is something that the sinner does that shows what KIND of person he or she is. Therefore to hate the sin is to hate the sinner. Religion is a dose of simpering whitewash and lies. Praying for sinners is a polite way of confessing hatred for sinners. A faith that isn't sincere about that kind of thing and then says that sinners who die divorced from God should go to Hell to suffer forever is vile. Religion makes extra rules - rules we wouldn't have otherwise and to defy them is sin so religion increases hate and hypocrisy. For example, its a sin to go into a Catholic chapel and not genuflect before the wafer god in the tabernacle. If you were a Protestant or a non-believer you wouldn't have this rule. That would make you a better person. The God of religion cannot hate sins and love sinners either so to worship him at all is malign.

You are to love your rapist or the person who beat you up or the person who murdered your parents as yourself. Nobody cares if the effort to love them and especially that much is actually worse than you hating them. Many Christians would admit they just give up for the stress of hating a person and being made to feel bad about it and the stress of trying to forgive and the stress of trying to love them as oneself is worse than the stress of merely hating. And forgiveness can be reversed so they have to try and renew it every day and sometimes every minute of every day. The self-righteous forgiving people boast about the freedom they have when they forgive.

To like is to value. You do not value money if you feel disdain for it or if you feel nothing for it. You do not value person A who you dislike as much as person B who you like. The Church says that you love your neighbour even if you feel intense dislike for them by doing good for them despite your feelings. They separate love from feelings. This is nonsensical. It is refusing to admit that intense feelings of dislike are hate, failure to love. The Church tells the lies in order to persuade people to hate each other as they proclaim themselves to be loving. The Church wants people to become fake and deceitful in the name of God. Nobody would bother with Christianity if it taught that we must like our neighbour as ourselves for that is a very demanding ethic. It sets people up for failure and is too harsh. It is so soul destroying that it will only wreck human relationships and asphyxiate people with guilt. The Church is thinking purely of itself and not the harm that a strict morality that nobody can live out and which will remove all pleasure from life can do.

Many believe that to say you may help others and that is love even if you can't feel any love for them is to contradict the command of Christ that we must treat others as we like to be treated and we like people to express the fact that they like us by doing things for us. That being liked is more important than anything they do.

Jesus and the Church commanded love of neighbour as oneself. To them you are a bad person if you don't keep it. It would be bad and vicious and hypocritical enough if it were simply advice but to make a command of it and an obligation is to double the badness.

The Church will say, "If you feel a great dislike for somebody do you expect us to command you to ignore them when they need help?" No but we ask them not to pretend that this is love. If everybody disliked you and endured you to do good deeds for you it would destroy you. You need to be liked and you see and feel that loving is a kind of liking. You can't enjoy or feel good if people who hate you give you a gift unless you think their feelings have changed. Their bad feelings towards you can be a source of fear for you. You know they can erupt under pressure and harm you.

The religionists can't prove that you choose to suffer forever in Hell if you die separate from God. They have no right to make such a serious charge against us without proof.

Do we choose eternal Hell at death? Why should death make such a choice irreversible? Yet the believers have the audacity to blame the sinner not God. God clearly does have something to do with this. They are bound to see that and yet they go and praise their God! And God has made the influences that led a person to make the choice so God must take some responsibility for putting a person in Hell. Religion says it is your choice if you go to Hell. That seems to take the sting out

of the doctrine a bit until you remember that they are not thinking of a murderer who gives himself up and goes to jail willingly. They are thinking of a person who does not want the punishment but who is forced to endure it as punishment for their sin. So the murderer who is caught and goes to jail is more like what they have in mind when they say you choose Hell. Why don't they let a person who believes that adulterers and homosexuals when they have sex make a final irreversible decision and go to Hell and that if they repent they are only faking go ahead and believe that? It is actually less vicious to say that a person chooses Hell in life than to say that they choose it by dying in sin for that is really saying that they go to Hell because they died not because they chose Hell.

Those who believe in Hell believe that all people could go there if they so wished which would mean we have wasted all that God has done for us. Hell proves that when believers try to justify God allowing evil, they do not really believe in those reasons at all. They don't for example believe that God makes diseases so that we might learn from those who suffer from them and learn from our suffering. That is inexcusable. They sacrifice the need to explain possible reasons why God may allow evil and suffering to happen for the sake of believing in Hell. That is turning their back on compassion in favour of a vindictive doctrine taught by Jesus Christ, namely that there is a place of eternal torment where people suffer the extreme agony that results from losing the God they need for he is all good and all desirable.

Religion pretends that a ball of cells in the womb is as much a human being with rights as a grown man or woman. That automatically makes you want to kill pharmacists who stock abortion pills. It makes you feel you should. Consistent non-hypocritical believers that abortion is wrong at any stage would go and kill.

Religion teaches that there is a being who sees what is best in the long run the long run being millions of years. That being can make laws for us on that basis. If he asks us to die on a cross like he did Jesus we should obey. Belief in a moral God goes hand in hand with autocracy. Religion is autocratic and dangerous. A liberal autocrat is still an autocrat so be wary of liberal religion. It might not be as strict as fundamentalist religion but it still believes that rules supposedly revealed by God come before anything else - the basic stance of fundamentalism.

It is mainly the fear of suffering and death that the clergy draw on to get members into their religions or to keep existing members active. Without those fears there would be no religion. Those who play on such fears are the lowest of the low despite their standing in society and the good works they do. And the more they are paid and the more prestige they get the worse they are!

THE RUDENESS OF BIBLES

The Christians have a book called the Bible which is supposed to be the word of God, in other words, it was authored by God through men. It consists of the Old and New Testaments. True Christians teach that the Bible is infallible for God can't make mistakes.

If you are allowed to doubt and question and have faith only when it suits you there would be no need for Churches and Bibles - indeed it would be wrong to support them for they cause hurt and division - eg Roman Catholicism not allowing Protestants to receive communion. The Church and the Bible claim that the person who doubts or picks and chooses what he or she likes out of them and discards the rest is sinning and is calling God a liar. The fact that the person might not be doing that but merely thinking that the teachings the Church and the Bible says are God's might not be God's at all is dishonestly ignored. The person who faced with the prospect of doubting God's revelations and calling God a liar could simply change the reason for doubting. He could doubt that the messages are really God's. Then he has a free rein to doubt! Hinduism and Buddhism have no problem with doubt. It is only bigoted arrogant faiths such as Christianity and Islam and Judaism and Mormonism that do.

They are forced to admit that the Bible contains parts which are unclear. There are far more interpretations of the Bible among Christians than there are religious sects. This is because of the lack of clarity. The Christians have books in defence of the Christian lie that there is no error in the Bible but say some passages are obscure. One of them is *When Critics Ask*, (Norman Geisler and Thomas Howe, Victor Books, Illinois, 1992) which admits that there are unclear parts in the Bible (page 18, 40). Yet these books try to make out that there are no errors in the Bible. The authors only admit the obscurity for they are forced to and will look stupid or deceitful if they don't admit it. But lack of clarity proves that the Bible makes errors for lack of clarity is an error. It is just as serious as a contradiction. A contradiction says one thing and says the other as well. So it tells you nothing. So does lack of clarity. Christians have been told this for centuries and they refuse to hear. Also, if the Bible contradicts itself about say when Jesus did something it proves that it is accusing God of making a mistake. It is doing that just as much if there is a lack of clarity. Lack of clarity contradicts the Bible claim that God does not make mistakes or that God is almighty and all-knowing. Contradiction in the Bible does that too. Lack of clarity proves the Bible is not the word of God. The Bible is supposed of speak of three, Father and Son and Holy Spirit and yet it says there is only one God. That is hardly clarity and is a possible contradiction. The Christians speculate it means there is one it as regards God and three whos or three persons in one God which may make no sense for they admit that they don't understand this.

It says a lot about Christians when they don't see the Bible saying that God commanded the Jews to stone adulterous people to death as in capital punishment, commanding Jesus to accept crucifixion and a degrading death, saying people deserve to suffer for all eternity in Hell and the Bible declaration that doubting God's word is the ultimate sin as errors. That is heartless. No truly good person pretends that these are not errors and that the Bible saying Abraham did such and such and then saying the opposite would be an error!

The Bible advocates racism by having God say that Israel and the Hebrew race were above all races.

The Bible says that God hates people who sin. In Deuteronomy 28:63 we read, "And as the Lord rejoiced over you to do you good and to multiply you, so the Lord will rejoice to bring ruin upon you and destroy you". "An Ammonite or a Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to their tenth generation their descendants shall not enter into the assembly of the Lord forever" (Deuteronomy 23:3). There is no way the Christians can pretend, "The Bible just says God's hates sinners when it means he hates their sin - that was the way things were spoken and written in the Hebrew tongue." But even if they had a point it could still mean he hates sinners not just sins. But there is no way their excuse can work for the verses quoted. They leave you in no doubt that God hates sinners.

Jesus Christ said that if your eye leads you to sin - in relation to looking at a woman with lust or sexual desire - you must gouge it out for it is better to go into the Kingdom of Heaven with one eye than to be condemned to punishment with two. He meant you must do whatever it takes to avoid sin. Theologians say the gouging was just poetic and not literal for Jesus didn't make his randy apostles gouge out their eyes. But he certainly thought that it was better to go insane and gouge than to be sane and look at the woman and sin. The Christian religion says that sin is the cause of all evil so its the biggest evil of all. Non-religious people and most of the religions in the world deny this. It is more human to be repulsed at human suffering more than human sin.

Jesus said you can't judge anybody or condemn their sin if you have sin yourself and must take care of your own sin before you highlight anybody else's. So if the local gossip interferes when you argue with your wife you can't tell her it is none of her business. Society can't function with the nonsense that Jesus Christ spouted.

The Bible strongly and violently opposes the worship as God of what is not God. For example, it forbids the adoration of idols. Nobody is crazy enough to worship images - it is either thought that the god is inside the image living or that the image has been transubstantiated into the god or that the image is just something you use to represent the god so that you can bow before it and so on and this obeisance goes to the being represented by the image. But it follows that if your religion that teaches you a particular kind of God is wrong you are worshiping a man-made creation when you worship that God. If man invented God you are honouring an idol. With all the lying religions going about it is better not to take their Gods too seriously! The risk of idolatry is too great and would advise you to stay clear of these religions.

THE RUDENESS OF PRAYER

God being all good and all wise will not answer prayers that just request things from him without much concern for doing his will. This implies that if we want a bicycle, we should only want us because we feel it will help us serve God better. That takes the shine off religion! For a Catholic to pray that he or she will find a suitable marriage partner necessarily implies that you want a partner who will not use contraception.

Prayer is asking a supernatural power to do magic and do a miracle even if nobody notices the miracle. But belief in miracles is dangerous and incoherent and though it has been refuted conclusively centuries ago, Churchmen still persist in lying that miracles happen and that Jesus rose from the dead after three days and so on.

Prayer is based on an arrogant pipe-dream about God treating you as special and leaving the torments of life for others to endure.

Human persons assume there is a God just because they were lucky enough to have a fairly good and human life. This is arrogance in the extreme for it ignores the fact that there is more suffering and degradation and evil in the world than life and goodness when you take into account the endless evils that happen to animals. It is the, "I am relatively okay in life and that shows me there is a loving God and I take comfort from that and I refuse to see that the suffering of animals and other people proves me wrong." There is callousness in such an attitude. It is the same as, "my lover is kind to me and therefore he is a brilliant person who deserves the best out of life even though he is slaughtering babies every day of the week." It is really trying to get enjoyment while ignoring and refusing to emphasise properly with the suffering of other people and animals. It is admitting that if you suffered enough or saw enough evil it would prove to you that there is no God. But just because you are fine there is a God. That is really looking upon yourself as the most important thing in the universe. It is putting your own comfort first. Believers say that God allows suffering because of free will despite babies and animals suffering though they don't, according to the religions, have free will so they callously ignore this to believe in God. If evil

doesn't disprove God then it follows that if I were the only grown-up in the universe and there were billions of babies suffering beyond belief all around me I may and perhaps should believe. If God exists and is good I am bad if I don't believe. The God belief is pure vile hypocrisy.

To pray, "God bless you", or, "May God grant you healing", is really to mean, "God make that person take a terrible sickness and scream in agony for the next thirty years if that is your plan". Prayer and fanaticism are the same in principle. Prayer expresses the principle that religious doctrine and the God idea matter more than people. Christians are asked to approve of the killing and butchering that will take place when Jesus Christ returns to earth to vanquish all his enemies.

Jesus Christ said that even if you do all that God asks of you, you must still refuse praise and say you are a useless servant. This is false humility a deadly form of pride or it is a total absence of self-esteem. He didn't like pride so it was the latter he was advocating. Christian prayer is praying that God will make you more pleasing to himself by becoming as depressed as possible and being a doormat. Christianity says you can pray for anything as long as its not something that God has forbidden. Prayer needs to conform to the rule, "God your will be done." If it doesn't, its really an attempt at black magick. In other words, you should only want the bicycle you are praying for to please God and nobody else. All Christian prayer is horrid. It is an assault on your human dignity.

If God sends frost and people die on the roads as a result of driving in it can you pray that he will take the frost away? The frost is an act of God. Asking implies you don't trust him very well and saying you don't approve of him sending the frost.

The Book of Atheist Spirituality, Andre Comte-Sponville, Bantam Press, Transworld Publishers, London, 2008