

LIBERAL RELIGIONISTS PAVE WAY FOR FUNDAMENTALISTS

CRITICISMS

LIBERALS CLAIM TO BE OPEN-MINDED AND TOLERANT BUT THEY DISMISS A STRICT FAITHFUL RELIGION AS MAN-MADE

THEIR SOLUTION TO MAN-MADE RELIGION IS TO FORM ONE THEMSELVES THAT DOES NOT PRETEND TO CARE MUCH ABOUT WHAT A GOD IS CLAIMED TO HAVE SAID - EVEN IF HE SAID IT!

THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO POLITICS - PARTICULARLY THE LEFT - IS DISTURBING AND INAPPROPRIATE

THEIR GOD IS THEMSELVES AND THAT PROVES JUST AS TOXIC AS HAVING A GOD LIKE THAT OF JESUS

THEY ARE REALLY ABOUT CULTURE

THEY ARE PRONE TO SCHISM AS IN CAMPS WITHOUT FORMING NEW RELIGIONS AND PRONE TO FORMING NEW SECTS

ANY GOOD THEY DO DOES NOT SEEM TO LAST AS PEOPLE LOSE INTEREST IN RELIGION THAT ACTS AND LOOKS TOO HUMAN

DO THEY EVEN CARE?

Liberal religionists are not the nice people they seem to be. They are chronological snobs. They think that because we know better than people thousands of years ago that we can be sceptical of some of their scriptures tales and even doubt the morals and doctrines of an ancient religion. Liberals all think they have the right to interpret ancient religions and scriptures through modern eyes! That is dishonest and insulting. And the idea "we have moved on from the superstitions and errors of the past" is nonsense. Yesterday's errors always come back tomorrow in a new outfit.

We regard religions that say God want you to kill or do other kinds of harm to others as evil. We call such religions extremist. We think of religions that don't advocate such activities as moderate or liberal. But even moderate or liberal religion is evil. There are several reasons for saying this.

#The liberal cares more about feeling happy through being spiritual (whatever that means) than about sin or anything else and has a God who is soft on sin too. That could be dangerous.

#The liberal likes to blame man for many of the rules in religion that purportedly came from God - but if religion is that man-made how can the liberal expect it to be peaceful? Man is not all good and his religions will not be all good either. The liberal enables lies and hypocrisy.

#If you are a hypocrite then get labelled a liberal and nobody will notice and they will support you. Some religious terrorists may be hypocrites too.

#Terrorists and sectarians are recruited from religious liberal families too.

#Liberals still vote religious fundamentalists into power and enable their laws. Liberals enable the odd scenario in the USA where parents can neglect a sick child which dies and avoid prison as long as they say they tried to help the child with prayer. Not all those parents are mad fundamentalist fanatics - they are often seen as moderate but for their attitude that calling the doctor is a sin. Liberals make these laws that give special treatment to these people.

#Liberals hate each other and some fundamentalists just as much as fundamentalists can hate each other.

#Liberal Christianity distributes the Bible despite its Jesus and its God endorsing violence in it. Despite its saying it does not believe it all, it is still honouring a violent book. The right approach is to throw away any book that advocates violence and that may influence people badly - no reluctance and no buts.

Liberal religions talk about peace is hypocrisy.

#The liberal admits that it is only his or her opinion that this part of the scripture is bad or wrong. That is not a strong protest against the errors and lies and evil laws of God in the Bible.

All liberals tend to keep their liberalism to themselves a lot. An Anglican bishop who thinks Jesus sinned will not crow about it. Thus they are not as unsupportive of fundamentalism as they boast.

#Liberals enable the plague of moral and religious relativism which is bad and sometimes worse than other forms of fundamentalism. The relativist just cares about having an opinion and does not care if it is fact or not.

#Liberal religion says we must be very libertarian because nothing is black and white and is extremely complicated. Liberal religion encourages religious devotion despite the fact that you worry that this devotion involves supporting something that is in some way harmful or untruthful. We can be sure that ISIS devotees rationalise the acts of violence they carry out by saying that it is okay to have reservations but to go ahead and act because it is complicated anyway. Conservative religion in fairness is fonder of "Okay you don't have all the answers but commit anyway" than liberalism.

#Liberal religion denies that any religion is either true or false - this enables fundamentalist religion.

#Liberal religion tends to lie that anything that does bad is not really acting as a religion. This in fact implies that all religions are infallible! Infallibility claims pave the fundamentalist's way.

#All religion is partly fundamentalist at least.

#All religion paves the way for worse fundamentalism.

#Christianity is intrinsically fundamentalist.

#The God concept is inseparable from fundamentalism. It is always fundamentalist to believe in God or to say he exists. If God exists he deserves to be put first. The only way we can be sure we are doing that is by doing good at great sacrifice and personal suffering for all eternity.

Liberal Christians are fundamentalists as much as conservative fundamentalists are. The only difference is in what they choose to be fundamentalist about. What is called moderate or liberal religion is fundamentalist in some matters. It is not the alternative to fundamentalism that it pretends to be.

Religion that is mere opinion but which makes demanding claims would be a form of bigotry. You cannot tell people to form the opinion that gay people can be killed. An opinion is something one should be free to agree with or disagree with. You cannot tell anybody to agree with your opinion. You cannot advocate serious damage in the service of an opinion.

Liberal religion is so full of uncertainty and singing from the same hymn sheet as society that it can only make people want to be fundamentalists.

Religious liberalism is not the great defender of truth and liberty and tolerance it pretends to be.

Karen Armstrong

Karen Armstrong is a religious cherry-picker who pretends all religions at core are good. Armstrong is trying to manipulate fundamentalists into toning it down but she is in fact a fundamentalist herself. She goes as far as to say Christianity and Islam etc are about seeking a sense of transcendence and of being strong enough to face evil and get through it and that is what they mean by God. When they talk about God they do not mean a being that exists or may not exist but are talking about their search. The Catholic Church under St Thomas influence did and probably largely still does understand God as a true or false issue. What business has she defining what religion is doing or telling it she knows what it teaches even when it disagrees with her? Then she sets about calling all who contradict her fundamentalists or fundamentalist sympathisers.

Moderates? Or hypocrites?

Liberal religionists tend to believe that there is no punishing God, but that God does not make a person pay for their sins. So God only wants do to nice things for you and charm you as if the people you leave bleeding through stepping on them don't matter. Many of the liberals believe that if you commit the sin of being a drug addict, God will not send you anything to harm you but will simply stand by and let you suffer the consequences of your actions. They deny that this is punishment. But their God is not a God of justice. Detering people from evil is fair but is not what justice is all about.

Justice is about treating a person according to whether they have done good or evil on purpose. Punishment ties in with the idea that you must reward a person according to their works. If they do bad you give them bad. To hurt them to deter them from crime or to reform them is not punishing them. A truly just God will have to punish because if he doesn't he is guilty of declaring that it really doesn't matter if you are a good person or a bad one.

Moderate religion is ridden with disagreement about doctrine and practice and about ethics. It is plainly man-made for that very reason. It is fundamentalist for any man-made faith to act as if it has authority from God.

Every liberal religion has its "lunatic fringe." It tolerates it. Thus it is responsible. Religion is not needed as a social structure. We can get community without religion and pray in the house. An unnecessary system with a lunatic fringe is to blame for that lunatic fringe despite the hypocrisy that may drive it to condemn it.

The argument that when a religion or members of a religion do evil that the religious faith must not necessarily be blamed is incorrect. The argument says that when a religion supports harmful acts and its members commit these acts that is a mistake to think that the religious beliefs are mainly or partly to blame for the actions. But much religion does command harm. It is fundamentalist dishonesty to deny that.

Moderate religion is really treating religion as man's word not God's so it is not about religion so much as exploitation. Even if we are conditioned by religion or brainwashed, we are still responsible for letting ourselves be exploited this way. We will know it deep down.

Moderate religion gives tacit approval for causing division. Instead of us all accepting one another as people the liberal has to separate from those who are made of sterner stuff and who insist the religion is to be followed and not watered down.

Moderate religion is based on irrational thinking and feelings just as much as religions that espouse terrorism are. Just because one religion does not teach that we must kill members of other faiths does not mean it is any better than one that does.

Moderate religion places obligations on its members even if it just to order them to go to Church at Christmas and Easter. Morality is full of problems. That is why it is essential that people be given the information they need to make their own moral choices be it some kind of utilitarianism or whatever.

Religion for the vast majority of followers is more about engaging in sacred rituals and being part of a religious community than about belief. Even if somebody reads their Bible and concludes that if we feel God is asking us to sacrifice our family and kill them we should do it they will not.

Most people who are members of religion tend to be uncomfortable or disapproving of those who are more religious than they are and/or members of other religions. They have suspicions about very religious people and people outside their religion. That shows how they feel about their own deep down. They do not really think it's a good thing.

Moderate religion gives us rules we don't really need. It results in believers thinking they should do silly things such as baptise their children or hang up holy pictures.

Even unbelievers and secularists may believe or want to believe strange things. Perhaps the secularist could insist on abortion on demand even up to birth. If rational people sometimes give in to the most dangerous and hideous ideas and promote them, how much more are we to fear irrational people who follow liberal or fundamentalist religion? For the secularist, knowing things the mundane and earthly way is what matters. Believers in God agree up to a point but say that you also need God to tell you things in your heart. That is dangerous for the information from "God" may be contradicted by information from "God" in the future and is making a God out of your imagination.

The liberal who says love your neighbour as yourself does not realise that he is being a fundamentalist. You can do a lot of good for your neighbour while loving yourself more than anybody. The liberal forgets how much of his morality is based on the idea: "God says it. He must be obeyed whatever we think about his commandments."

Liberals and fundamentalist Christians say that people need a right relationship with God otherwise their human relationships will be very faulty. They have a little ditto: "The love of God and your neighbour go together." This is fanaticism for it is calling atheists who have successful relationships liars.

Most psychologists will tell you that you must depend on yourself to be happy in life and not on God or other people. When you are outgoing is all your work in the sense that it is you who has to make others drawn to you. So liberals are fundamentalists for they seek to inflict faith in God on you and obscure your vision.

Liberals are often people who just water down and lie about their religion's dark side. They are really disobedient. They only seem to be helping but they are not. Disobedience to a religion is really saying, "The religion has such and such a standard but I will not obey." The disobedient person of faith is as much a supporter of an evil faith as the obedient.

The disobedient only look like rebels or people who won't face the truth. They cannot be taken seriously. They should find or form a system - even if it is religious - that suits themselves and in which they can be their true selves.

You are not a true believing member of a religion if you cherry-pick the teachings that are essential or follow from the essentials. A religion cannot function if it permits you to do that. Again cherry picking makes you look like a rebel and a hypocrite. People should actually be attracted to the teachings through the antics of the cherrypicker. The hypocrisy may provoke a desire in the witnesses of that hypocrisy to be sincere.

Religion as a community can only be as dysfunctional as society is. For example, a violent society produces violent religions. Religion is a great even then for it may argue that its evil has divine approval.

A default is the position that should be automatically taken by a person who hasn't decided what position to take. Moderate and liberal religion denies the default doctrine that atheism must be assumed to be true until shown otherwise. Thus it is fundamentalist in that sense - it is obscurantist and intolerant.

Is it wise to encourage belief in God when most believers adhere to dangerous religion based on God? Not if there is a strong chance that belief in God will lead them to facilitate such religion or join it. God is that by definition must be put before all things - that is behind moderate religion and extreme religion. They have that in common. Thus the belief is intrinsically extremist and its only luck that stops that extremism from breaking out all the time.

Prayer has to put God's will first in order to be acceptable to him. If it doesn't it is blasphemous. But we know that people matter not religion or God which means prayer, if it is morally acceptable, is only acceptable if it is human-centred.

Prayer is always a fundamentalist activity. The praying person is urged to see that prayer works which really means that the person is being asked to remember the times it seemed to work and to forget the times it didn't or to pretend that it. Prayer is training in fundamentalism. It is its bedrock.

A person cannot win with prayer. If it is devotion to God, it is fanaticism or putting faith before people. If it is not, it is an attempt to fool a God and to expect help from him when you don't respect him. Either is essential fanaticism.

Religious liberalism says it forbids fanaticism. Is that why it endorses prayer which is seen as based on a feel good kind of attitude. But its fanatical to try and expect people to please God with prayers that they only say to feel good. Its insulting a God who may punish so its fanatical. Its fanaticism to invite punishment.

Moderate religion has no right to criticise its members if they become a bit extreme or very extreme. It does the same thing itself so it is in no position to forbid or criticise. Thus it indirectly sanctions such crimes.

Finally

Liberal religion is dishonest, confused, stupid, over emotional and like a kingdom that is divided against itself, it will not stand. It is only an advertisement for orthodoxy or extremism. Members depart from religions that go liberal and end up swelling fundamentalist ranks. And it is extremist the way liberals lie about what the religion teaches to get it to fit some prevailing ethos such as Nazism or LGBT ideology or whatever.

If religion is not ethics then liberals are actually renouncing religion in the name of religion for making out that all that matters is love or something! It does not respect those who want more than just love but who want religion or who see religion and love as two sides of the coin.

Liberal religion rejects the infallibility of fundamentalism while acting like it itself is infallible. Anybody can read a bad scripture or doctrinal text with loads of lines that raise questions about its ethics and tell themselves it only says good things and that somehow the bad bits don't mean what they say. But even that person has to admit unless they are insane, "Nothing is perfect so I cannot be sure that my nice interpretations are really right. Maybe some of them are not what the author intended at all." But that is exactly what the liberal will not admit. They are self-appointed psychic oracles. The liberal has no moral right to criticise the infallibilism of her or his fundamentalist rivals. Indeed the liberal is only a different kind of fundamentalist.

