

Secularism and religious feasts and symbols

Secularism does not celebrate religious festivals

What about Christmas? It is about celebrating the birth of Jesus Christ who is God according to Christian dogma. Christmas really should be secularised and called Yuletide. Jews and Muslims should be offended by Christmas. The feast offends against their most sacred doctrine that God is one person and he has not become man as Jesus Christ. Christians may say they do not intend to offend. But they do. They believe that they must promote their faith even if it means other faiths disappearing forever. True Christians just don't care if they offend people or not.

Even if Christmas does not offend Muslims and non-Christians, the fact remains that the Christians have this attitude: "If it offends people we don't care!" The secular state can make some things illegal though they are not worth banning. Christianity will try to stop the law from banning it from insulting other religions in that way. It does not have the right attitude towards the law.

Christmas and Easter

Community centres and the public sector may send out cards saying Happy Christmas. This is harassing unbelievers and non-Christian religions. It assumes they must have a happy day for its Christmas day - in other words, its the feast day of the birth of Christ and should be enjoyed. It assumes that if Jews are offended to have it thrust in their face that Jesus was the Messiah then let them be offended. Even if Jews are not offended, that would make no difference. The Jews should be offended for Christmas sends out the message, "The Jews are wrong that Jesus is not the Messiah and we oppose their message and if they are offended then tough!" To affirm anything is to deny and oppose anything that contradicts it.

Christmas is Christianity imposing its feast on other religions. So if cards are going to be sent out by community centres and the public sector the cards must not mention Christmas or depict the nativity scene. If there is to be a celebration it must be kept neutral. Sometimes Easter gives rise to similar problems.

Religion claims to have a right to observe the Sabbath day. This is not a right but a legal privilege.

Christians may say that their Christian culture is important and that is why the thought that Christmas must be banned or emptied of Christ by the government authorities must not be even considered. But it is isn't that important to most so-called Christians who only care about the family and drink and party . Those who care about these things care about them not Christmas.

The state will not be going along with religious holidays and sabbaths. If you don't wish to work Sundays, that is your problem not the employers or the states.

Religious symbols and the state

There should be no monument or religious emblem allowed on public property. It should not be created or maintained with public money. Such property belongs to the people as people and not as religionists. Nobody is to be considered a religionist but a person before the law. Anything else means people can get special treatment based on what they profess to believe in terms of religion. It is not the state's job to regulate religion so the law should not pay any attention to religious labels.

Crosses on top of Churches and wayside shrines need to be removed. To suggest this results in Christians trying to get Jewish testimonies or Muslim testimonies to the effect that adherents of Judaism and Islam are not offended by Christian symbols. But they should be offended. The point is that the Christians don't care if other faiths find them offensive or not. Jews and Muslims will perceive that the Christians have that attitude and that will lead to the fuelling of inter-religious strife.

Religious images such as the ten commandments and crucifixes should not be displayed in public places and certainly not in public sector buildings such as Maternity Benefit offices or the health sector clinics etc. The Church says they should for they are only put up to support the spiritual and emotional wellbeing of Catholics and honour traditions of putting them up. The Church says that they are put up in this spirit and they are not put up to impose faith or the Church on people. But people can wear their own emblems if they need them that badly. And traditions have to change. The cross should offend the Jew and Muslim. If it doesn't, it is because they don't understand what their own position on the issue should be.

Whether offence is taken or not, it is intended to offend.

Christians have worn crucifixes over work uniforms. Then when required to remove them they refused and got their employer accused of discriminating against them. Such discrimination cases got laughed out of court primarily because wearing the crucifix is not an essential part of being a Christian.

Christians claim the right to wear crucifixes in public and have shrines along the road. Of course Christians could still be Christians if they could not do these things. So doing them is not a right but a privilege. The state has the right to ban them if they are intended to give offence. And they are. The Bible says the cross of Jesus is a sign that we are all sinners and cannot save ourselves and are unworthy of everlasting happiness and everlasting freedom from sin. These teachings are vile.

The Cross a symbol that accuses you of needing a saviour and of being a sinner. Its blasphemy to Muslims. It is an offensive symbol. It insults those of us who use psychology to fulfil ourselves.

Minarets are not essential to Islam. Switzerland banned them. So the Swiss are right. There can be no automatic right for Muslims to build them.

Let cribs and religious emblems be removed from all offices and buildings run by public sector or government employees.

Religious pictures have to be removed from public places. Pictures like that offend decency. It is only what promotes self-esteem that is decent. If teachers and those who work in the public sector wear crucifixes let them do so discreetly.