

The Christian Religion is Treason

Religion has made God the king of the universe and as king allegiance to him comes before allegiance to the state. Jesus said that we must love God with all our being and our neighbour as ourselves meaning we must love God totally. We love him totally and not just more than ourselves. God alone really matters. He said that the command to love neighbour was only the second greatest commandment so it was not as important as the one to love God alone. Jesus according to the gospel of John produced wine for a drunk wedding party though he thought it was unloving to do that. Making people drunk is a sin. But the gospel says he did it to glorify God meaning that he did right for it hurt people but pleased God and demonstrated who comes first. So if God comes before people then he comes before the state and its laws.

Religion is opposed to the secular law. Religion is treason. Religion says that the basis of morality is the absolute value of God not man so the fusion of Church and state with the Church taking the lead is a must for religion. Religious morality then is not based on reason. Accordingly, religion simply cannot expect many people to agree with its rules so the only alternative is to force them to believe and use propaganda. If morality is just in our heads and nothing more like subjectivists and relativists tell us then a morality that advocates pluralism and liberty of speech and belief is a contradiction. So if you want morality and the control it gives, you have to persecute those who contradict you and destroy them.

The Church however says we must obey the law of the land. The only restriction put on that obedience is that if the law makes immoral laws (and it is God - ie them! -they say decides that!) we must not obey them. For example, if the law forbids going to Mass, the Church will disobey. Thus the Church does not obey the law of the land because it is the law but only as long as it fits and expresses the law of God. It is God's law that is really being obeyed not the land's. People imagine the Catholics are law-abiding citizens but that is only because the overlaps between divine and civil law give that impression. The outward appearance hides the treason.

We want people to reason this way, "The makers of the law are appointed in the name of the people to frame laws. We might not agree with those laws but we must obey them." Obedience to the civil law is far more important than obedience to God or social mores.

Many believers say that if you don't believe in God, you have no reason for saying that an immoral action is really immoral. You need a God to exercise moral authority. That implies morality must be forced on us under threat of punishment ie by civil and criminal law and divine law. But goodness is its own authority for even God cannot have the right to order us to say torture babies to death for fun. To say any different is to implicitly insult all the tortured babies. A God religion that is not punitive is a contradiction of itself. Religion then must either overthrow the state or take it over.

The law of the land is handicapped by an inability to punish every breach of the law. For example, maybe the evidence of guilt is inconclusive. Perhaps the jail is too full so the burglar has to be sentenced to community service or let off the hook. Religion sometimes consoles itself with the thought that God will punish where the law cannot! That implies that if there is no law at all it doesn't matter!

Religion says if there is no God or if you don't believe, then you cannot seriously think there is a moral law. Civil and criminal law derives from the moral law in a general way so religion is saying you can't take the law of the land seriously if there is no God or if you do not believe. The civil law is useless if there is no such thing as right or wrong. The law cannot be taken seriously unless it is dedicated to God and derived from his laws.

There is dishonesty in that argument. If you need God to believe in morality, it does not make sense to say that you need God before you can believe in the law of the land. Nobody can say they agree with all the law says. Nobody asks you to agree with the law of the land but to obey it.

The law of the land is more important than morality in the sense that you can get away with breaking moral rules pretty well. But violate the law of the land and it will probably come back to haunt you. You will probably pay the price. And it is more important than the moral law in the sense that it emphasises its own laws and promulgates them. Even if you don't know that stealing is immoral, you will know its illegal.

Christianity persecutes the law of the land. Not only does it follow the Bible in making the Lord's Law more important but it commands that the law of the land be broken when there is a conflict between it and God's law.

The Gospel of Matthew implies that it was illegal for Jesus to rise from the dead when the Roman soldiers were posted to stop anybody thinking that Jesus rose from the dead. But still Jesus rose thus it was an act of religious anarchy. Angels

helped Peter to escape from prison according to the Book of Acts when the legal situation was that he would have to go on trial before King Herod and stay in jail. So he broke the law about attending for hearings and staying in jail. The prophet Daniel was commended by God for breaking the law in Babylon. He was commanded to eat what the Law of Moses declared to be unclean food and he disobeyed and got into serious trouble. So we see it is considered better to break the law even when it asks for only minor offences against God. To persecute the law of the land is the same as persecuting the people who are represented by the law. To authorise persecution of the law of the land is to agree with people being persecuted. It follows that if the Church has the right to break the law the Church also has the right to control the law of the land because it is better to control a legal system than to undermine it and condone treason and break it.

The law of the land does not justify its decrees and its punishing of those who break them with the attitude: "The laws are right because we say so." There has to be evidence supporting its laws and which shows it is best to have them for the common good. If you reject the we say so reason for following the law, you reject the law even if you still keep it for then it is only something to be kept to avoid punishment and not because it is a law that is right. The religionist who believes that God is to be loved alone and others for his sake (which is not loving them at all) cannot agree with this reason for it is too humanitarian and earthly. The result is that faith is hostile to the law. Thus, it makes no sense for a theist who believes in total love for God to accept or advocate the separation of Church and state. The religionist has to fuse the Church and state and persecute all dissenters and religions that do not agree with his. The religionist has to punish people not for hurting others but for hurting God. For example, if somebody is murdered the criminal is not punished for taking a life but for taking a life from God. It is how God feels about it that matters not the murder. And so belief in this God demands that the state be the slave of religion.

The relationship between law and morality is this. There is private morality and public. The state is to preserve public order and do things like protect property and serious physical harm from being done to innocent persons. But this philosophy is often not practiced properly. For example, stealing a bottle of beer is illegal and adultery is not though it does more harm than nicking the beer. The law could decree that adultery is to be punished when the cheated partner decides it should be. That way the children are protected as well as possible from the exposure of a parent. And the children of thieves are not worried about are they? In fact the distinction between law and morality is just hogwash. It cannot be made to any sensible person's satisfaction the way things are. Humanists and others who admit that some actions are neither right or wrong however can. The law must believe there is such a thing as a real fair and objective morality before it can have any authority itself. It must be able to prove that morality. Just assuming that the most happiness of the most people is the right way to go is not good enough. We know that the basis of belief in right and wrong is the dignity of the human person that transcends religion and even happiness and the law has to be built on that basis.

Religion opposes this basis and therefore the whole law. To attack the basis is to attack the accessories and implications. This is true even if religion claims it does not. As long as you believe in God you have to attack the absolute value of the person. Then it is God who is the absolute value. He has the right to kill. You have to agree with killing anybody God tells you to kill. The Bible God attacks the basis by liberally advocating capital punishment.

When the Church treats the law of the land the way it does, it is not saying that no law has authority but that God's law is the law that counts and is superior to the law of the state. When there is a conflict, the law of the state has to lose out. So the Church has no regard for the law of the land in itself. It is only valuable in so far as it agrees with God. So the Church must persecute to get absolute power over the state so that the divine and human law can become one and both complement each other perfectly.

It can be validly argued that if a law is unjust it should be broken for the hell of it and to force the state to drop it or to draw attention to it in order to get it phased out. The laws prohibiting homosexuality would never have been eliminated had they not first been broken. Thus religion has to scheme to take over the state to get its barmy morals practiced with the support of the law. When religion conflicts with too many laws of the state it follows that religion destroys the credibility of the state and it is illegal to do that. It is treason.

The precedent for Christian lawbreaking madness comes from the book of Acts in which we read that the apostles were commanded by the authority of the law not to preach Jesus and they disobeyed and were punished.

Jesus himself broke the law by claiming to be the Messiah. He deliberately pulled a miscarriage of justice on himself according to the gospels. When he, the Son of God, had the right to break the law by walking into a murderous miscarriage of justice which was a serious collusion in the crime of breaking the law it follows that Christians can kill or do whatever they think God wants them to do regardless of the law and the harm done.

When God comes before the state it follows that religion based on kings and queens of heaven or whatever and treason are one and the same. When God alone is to be loved and everything is to be done for him alone the Christian does not give any allegiance to a president or country at all but only to God. Anybody who falls short of it is not a Christian. The Christians may give allegiance to God through the president and the government but they are only obeyed in so far as God

wants them to be. The president and the government should not be deceived then into feeling honoured at Christian obedience. They are only treated as vehicles through which God operates and their right to be respected and obeyed for themselves is rejected. The result is what looks like law-abiding ways is not that at all. For religion to put the pipedream of God above the state which is a real thing is extreme inexcusable treason.

Christendom holds that God comes first. Not surprisingly, the Christian Religion says we should disobey the state when it commands what is contrary to the will of God. For example, if parliament asks the Church to accept homosexuals for discrimination is incitement to hatred (a perfectly reasonable request) the Church has to go to jail rather than obey for all authority comes from God and God is the real king.

The Catholic hostility to abortion and birth-control means that the Catholic will in some countries break the law by refusing to listen to the state when it commands that these things be practiced to keep the population down. Religion insists on a right to break the law if necessary in such cases which means that any new religion with bizarre rules should do the same though they think they have a monopoly on rights. It opens the way to anarchy and chaos.

It is not possible for different religions to run the country. They disagree on doctrine and morals and legal principles. The only solution is for one religion to take over the running of the state and persecute any others. It is no answer to say that this anarchy and chaos never take place often so religion has the right to oppose the law and break it when it is unlikely for such terrible results to happen. But the credibility of the law is still ruined. You can't take the law seriously when you wouldn't if there were enough religions destroying it for if any chaos at all to any degree is to be tolerated then there is nowhere to draw the line. The answer is tantamount to saying that you may steal one sweet a day but not twenty sweets a day.

Religion is treason. It blesses the treasonous heart.