

WHY IT IS BAD TO BLAME MENTAL ILLNESS RATHER THAN RELIGIOUS TERRORISTS

Calling terrorists mad or bad or both?

If religion is good by definition and default then what do we say about religious terrorists? We can choose one or more of the following.

We can say that they are mad.

We can say they are fakes and hypocrites.

We can say they are malevolent.

We can say they suffer from a dangerous level of ignorance.

But when non-professionals call somebody mental that is itself bad. Consider the medical findings on violent people. "People with serious mental illnesses, like schizophrenia, do have a slightly higher risk of committing violence than members of the general population. Yet most violence is not attributable to mental illness" www.propublica.org. Religious violence is caused by religion not craziness. If faith-based terrorists were mad their leaders would have had no faith in them to carry out complicated and risky acts of terror. They are considered to be sane enough and responsible enough to attack and even suicide bomb!

It is somehow tarnishing all mentally ill people to say anybody bad is mad. A person who commits acts of terror is more likely to be seen as insane if they do it in the name of a religion. Religion statistically then causes the slander of the mentally ill to rise. It is obvious though that if you are going to be classed as insane faster if you have a religious influence over you that people suspect you are not right in the head in the first place for being religious. It would be worrying if people thought, "Religion and faith are so good that you have to be mental to harm in their name." That by default is saying atheists who harm nobody are bad and are sane if they start doing bad in the name of atheism and are criminals not potential patients.

People assuming all murderers are mad is just ridiculous. It is not very Christian either for the Bible is clear that Moses and St Paul were murderers but repented. An evil person could absolve themselves of responsibility if they think their killing proves they are mad!

When we are all fakes to some degree can we talk about them being fakes? Some fakes use the fear of God as a weapon of terror - others use suicide bombs.

Why do we say they are malevolent and their religion or faith is not when anybody can create a faith that is malevolent? Why do we say they are to be trusted as good when they create a good religion.

We cannot say they are ignorant for we need to talk to them first to see if they really are as dumb as we think.

Religion cannot be truly good when it leads to people judging what they are not equipped to judge in order to defend its reputation.

The evidence is what should decide if religion is good or bad or nothing special. Religious people mess around with words in order to define religion in a way that does not even care about the truth.

To define religion as inherently or only good means you refuse to admit that Catholic violence has anything, even a bit, to do with Catholicism. A religion is to blame if it communicates so badly that believers think they are supposed to murder Protestants. The whole religion is to blame for once you set up a religion you have to expect bad communication down the line. To say terrorists are never Catholics or Muslims is to admit you do not really care if they are.

If terrorism has no religion as many say then why stop there? Other things you could say are, "Lies have no religion." "Errors have no religion." "Violent scriptures and revelations from God have no religion." "Religious leaders who say they preach only the truth have no religion". It gets ridiculous. The liberals do not shy away from being so silly and religion is a disgrace because it stands for such silliness.

Community has something to do with the good or bad an individual does. No individual really is a complete individual in anything they do. God and the terrorist can count as community if God is real. If God is just in their head the community feelings and sense will still be there.

People can do insane things and not be crazy. If they are encouraged and supported by others they are sane if that encouragement or support is the reason they do what they do.

The terrorist feels supported by God in his terrorism. Feeling God supports you is not inherently the problem but it inherently CAN be the problem just like any support can. The others in the group or his environment who support him are not seen as the support: God is. God is working through them and when we say God does things for us we mean that he does it through others. They are not gods but as good as. They are effectively gods. A person in a terrorist group may be more inspired by support from neighbours for they are seen as more normal than those in the group.

Does the religious terrorist do it for he feels it is mainly about him and God? Does he feel God is his ally? Yes! Some individuals can do it for they feel that it is just them and God.

When people say they are optimistic for God is with them they are really saying that they mean how people will cooperate with God to help them. It is really man gets the compliment for nearly all the help we need in life comes from others. Practically speaking man is God. That is what is going on when nations declare war. Faith is the catalyst.

People who are doing grave evil feel supported by you when you know what they do and are nice to them. That is the reality nobody wants to confess. People don't need constant assurance that they are right. They need a friend or two to encourage them at least once and that equips them to feel others indirectly support them by seeming not to care. It is easier to do bad if everybody around you is just nice to you regardless. And don't forget you can feel God is just as kind!

Liberals as good as excuse terrorists by saying they have mental problems

Liberals tend to pick a religion such as Islam for politically correct protection while they abuse and enable the abuse directed say towards Christianity. They will single out religious terrorists or at least the Islamic brand of religious terrorist and bestow excuse upon excuse for them.

Many articles absolving Islamic terrorism are well written and their immaturity and liberal tripe can be well masked. Incredibly some say religious terrorists are without hope of a better life so they develop a mental problem that makes them eager to escape by becoming a soldier for God and thus virtually inviting a tragic death. So they think they must die as heroes and kill others in the process. Terrorists sometimes do have great opportunities and are well-educated. To say they need to be told to work hard and get a great future is just stupid for they do believe in working hard but it is the future they have the problem with. You don't need to be a terrorist to fear the future. The Islamic terrorist and Christian ones who think nobody goes to Hell see themselves as escaping this terrible world should they die.

The other pile of rubbish is in saying that the Islamist terrorists want to get beautiful peaceful Islam associated with their brand of violence. Some do but are they many? Probably not! And what if their mistake is in thinking Islam really is a religion of peace? And nobody dies in order to tarnish the religion they revere even if it is a distorted idea of that religion they have.

Muslims who send death threats and who support Islamic State feel that if people do not consider their evil behaviour Islamic then what they do does not really insult Islam and is not relevant to the integrity and glory of the religion. If they love the religion they will not see themselves as Muslim in doing what they do. The liberals have robbed them of a deterrent. If they did see their actions as reflecting on their faith and people they would not commit them. No they are conditioned by the liberals who tell them and the public that their evil deeds have nothing to do with Islam.

It is possible for a non-member of a religion to think it needs them to wage violence for it even if it is a non-violent religion. A religion is responsible for this if it has anything that can be construed as pro-violence or that makes light of violence.

All terrorists think that one day their terrorism can bring about peace on earth even in the long-term. It takes faith to think such a thing. It is faith that relates to religious faith though it is not religious in itself. Religion embraces that non-religious faith which is why it is still to blame if it becomes a toxic influence on terrorists. In addition, religious faith in God presupposes God can and will fix things and uses our evil in his incredible and lovely and wise plan. It reinforces the drive that can drive and does drive terrorism.

Terrorists know that if God wrote the Koran for her or him that if they mistakenly think they must heed and implement the

violent commands then that is understandable. Violent commands in a scripture thrive on how evil can be subtle and take a life of its own. The commands are always to blame even if there is a command abrogating them. They are still a bad influence.

A Christian or a Mormon condemning religiously inspired violence from Muslims is definitely Islamaphobia for the Bible commands much violence in the name of God against harmless people and it is a blight on Jesus that he regarded such a book as pivotal to his spirituality. The Book of Mormon has the holy spirit commanding Nephi to murder a man to get his brass plates.

Terrorists see themselves as fighting for Islam and expect the nations they attack to succumb to Islam. And it does not change the fact that to revere scriptures that have violent commands from God shows you are not as serious about peace as you say you are. And as for rational Islam the problem is how faith is taking the word of another as true so in that sense faith has nothing to do with reason. Liberals and politicians are worse than Islamic State for they are the reason we will never be able to get a grip on the problem with their politically correct delusions and lies.

Liberals are extremist themselves for they see the harm their nonsense does and they keep spouting it.

You have enough religion or want to have religion when you blow yourself up to kill people who don't belong to it or who are considered apostates or heretics. Not following the religious customs of your religious ideology is not proof that you are mad or something. It shows the power of the religion to harm. You as part of it and the power of its faith are how the religion is to blame and is now tainted.

Saying anything is an abuse of religion can be used in an ideological way and become a strategy for disrespecting and attacking religious freedom. You can say it is an abuse of Catholicism not to let priests break the seal of confession to stop murders. Or you can say it is an abuse of Catholicism to ban abortion. Or to ban atheists from becoming pope. Atheists would not want to but you never know. Stranger things have happened. It is thus in a faith's best interest to admit that it, at least in some unknown way, leads to hate and violence.

Do not use the existence of the mentally ill as an excuse for blaming mental illness not religion when religion does harm.