

## THEOTERRORISM - THE DISTINCTIVE TERRORISM THAT RELIGION INSTILLS AND LAUNCHES

Religion can be theoterrorism or enable it. It often is theoterrorism. Some forms such as Christianity or Islam definitely are! A terrorist organisation that is lazy with terrorism is still terrorist and most Christians and Muslims are lazy.

Religion sees itself as and functions as a nest in which the egg of community, the egg of politics, the egg of religious education, the egg of culture are to be found in. Thus as the eggs are always never fully good religion has no right to be taken for something that is totally about peace and love. It is quite true that as bad as religion is, it is bad because it is getting away with it for society and politicians do not show their disgust at many of the teachings but are sure to have a problem with teachings that challenge their selfish selves.

Just as society and politics would condone murders of the past so does religion. It is alarming that these three entities can celebrate death and murder and not even bat an eyelid. Take Ireland. There is no problem celebrating and applauding the example of those who drove the 1916 rising. At Easter Vigil, the Catholics praise a reading that says God killed the Egyptians. Calling that reading the word of God is praise. But they do more than that. They sing the praises. The story is that Moses leads Israel through a miraculous dry path through the sea. Instead of closing the sea behind them and keeping the soldiers out God lets Israel get over and the soldiers are half-way across when the water crashes in on them as a result of God empowering Moses to raise his hand and magically signal the water to drown them and then a psalm praising this miraculous mass murder is sung. That is retrospective religious genocide and retrospective sectarianism. Young men and women were compelled into the army by law or circumstance and who did not want to kill anybody were brutally drowned. To add insult to injury, Catholics then receive the body of Jesus who claimed to be this murdering God. Obviously they think they are too special to get such treatment from this God who is unworthy of worship. They don't care that he killed people as long as it is not them. It is a worry that believers in a really sweet God struggle to get and keep followers while a darker God attracts people better even if they pretend they do not notice or believe in a dark side. Catholics pretend except maybe at the Easter Vigil! Every religion's scriptures speak approvingly of murder when commanded by God or a god. If the members are nevertheless told to be good then they are doing it because they are told and that is a weak reason. Real goodness rejects authorities that ever condoned or commanded murder and does good not because you are told to but because it is good.

Society and politics have a bad side in reality and a potentially bad one as well. Nobody denies that. But religion is no better. It is so like them and so inspired by them and they refuse to challenge or be upset by religion condoning such evil as we have read about as long as it was done ages ago that it is clear that society, politics and religion are made from the same bad fabric. It is an insult to a God if there is one to call it divine.

Religion complains a lot about how everybody is always in danger and everybody gets a bad deal. That inspires those who wish to hurt others for their reason: "They have to suffer and die anyway so why should we not ensure it is for our benefit or that of our religion?" It is one reason among many why religion is so fond of attacking even some of its own never mind other religions. Even the thought, "Even if some are okay they are still at risk. We can hurt them for they are in danger anyway." It must be admitted that atheism too might hurt people using similar logic. But at least it shows religion cannot take the moral high ground.

Hate is natural. Hate serves a purpose in extreme circumstances when you need to eradicate an enemy to save yourself or your family. In combat, you are going to lash out instead of trying to mindfully do the "moral" thing. If you pause to care about moral you will be slaughtered. Those who say they hate nobody are either not aware that they do or they are lying. If you see hate as natural rather than as a moral outrage you will be willing to listen to the enemy better and you will be less willing to demonise the enemy. And many people feel they need to hate somebody in order to love their family and friends better. Many feel that hate and love need to go together in this way.

Despite the fact that Hitler preached an ideology that led to action, some say that religions and ideologies in themselves come from actions that have already happened and are not down to word. They would have you think that when Pope Innocent III wanted heretics killed people did it not because he told them to though he did but because they were already killing other heretics. But then why did they kill any heretics at all in the first place? Because their religion and their Bible and their political co-religionists and priests preached that the killings must be done. Word starts action off. Word and preaching direct action.

Neither religions nor ideologies proceed from word to action. Most often the words are chosen to justify decisions already taken, and to lead up to conclusions already reached. Theology is the process by which these ideas take root in the life of the world, so it is immensely powerful and important, but it cannot work in isolation.

Religion claims you must forgive and love the sinner but hate the sin.

It calls itself good because of that teaching. But it is aware that some people have to feel a murderous hatred for the evil person before they can start moving on. That takes the sheen off. That shows the hypocrisy.

It is odd that liberals hate being reminded that Islam is more supportive of violence than Christianity. Or that Jainism is less supportive of violence than Christianity. It is a fault if you mention that out of religious wars, Islam has waged the most. The fact remains that religion as in devotion to God tends to violence. Even if it leads only some members not all to violence it is still to blame. The not all bad excuse is just an excuse and an indignity heaped on the victims.

Religion encourages you to think that if you do certain things or believe certain things, God will keep you alive after death and reward you. If a person's strongest drive is to stay alive, then we see why believers in God have a disproportionately big number of violent criminals and religious people on the crazy train who are not deterred by the death penalty!

Religious terrorists are dismissed when they say they really believe the evil they do is God's will and part of his plan to bring about a greater good. Liberals ignore what they say and put it down to politics or the dysfunctional society they emerged from. This refuses to take account of the fact that Islam, plus the religion of the Old Testament God, and Catholicism for most of its history, had no demarcation between religion and politics. Today though Catholicism and the state are declared separate they are often not really as separate as they are said to be. Religious people engage in political lobbying. They want to force the will of their religion on you through political means. The liberals are assuming that religion is not about anything other than belief in belief - a psychological boost from faith. They treat religion as if it does not impact on the world and state things as fact. Each religion does make fact claims. Once something that could be a guess is dressed up as a fact anything could happen. The detachment from reality that is necessary for violence to be endorsed has started.

Anything that logically justifies trouble should be abandoned by the people no matter if it pretends it is pro-peace or not. You can't build peace on foundations of sand.

Christians and Muslims and conservative Jews have the strongest tendency to persecute people who disagree with them. These religions have commands from God in their scriptures that tell them to cause religious wars and destroy those God does not like. The Catholic Church has made many official statements calling for the killing and destruction of heretics just because of their beliefs.

Some say that it is not religion or faith that causes trouble in the world but people being sure they are right. But this is foolery because we all think we are right and do not hurt others over it. There is nothing wrong with thinking you are right. That is what opinion, which is the same thing as belief, and thinking and reasoning are all about. Religion says that once you think it is right you should never deliberately change your mind. If people thinking they are right causes wars then religion is the top offender!

The Church accepts weak faith just like Jesus did. Since God and his truth supersedes all things in importance it follows that to accept this faith is akin to believing a man should kill a heretic on flimsy evidence. If a fanatic kills for the faith, the Church certainly has no right to put all the blame on him. This is because the Church blesses fanaticism. It is crafty enough to make sure that it does not look very obvious.

There is no evidence that the New Testament abolished the legal laws of the Old Testament which commanded the brutal slaying of heretics and homosexuals and adulterers. Not a single civil law in Moses' regime was forbidden and Jesus himself praised the Jews for trying to keep these civil laws though Rome was ruling the land meaning that the excuse that the civil laws only apply in a theocracy does not hold any water holy or unholy. Jesus said that he did not come to do away with the Law and the Prophets but to see that they would be fulfilled better. The Laws of God in the Bible and the Koran don't make much sense. For example, putting criminals to death is commanded. This tells us that all Law comes from God and is to be obeyed whatever we feel about it meaning that the Law of the land should be theocratic for what we think is right and wrong is no good and we need God to tell us what's what.

Whatever disputes there might be about what should or shouldn't be done the dispute is not about values but how to apply the values. Thus, the Old Testament God approved of hatred and exercised it meaning there was no way he could do away with this approval for his approval made hatred a value. Not surprisingly, Jesus' authorised apostle Paul teaches a God of hate in Romans.

God says he is king and it is our duty to obey him and believe in him. You cannot obey a king you don't believe in. He says he must be obeyed because he says so and not because he is good. If he is to be obeyed because he is good then it follows you have the right to make sure he is good and judge him first but he says you don't have that right. He also says you should believe in his love in spite of all the evidence to the contrary. If you can judge God you don't need to believe in obeying him for good would be independent of him meaning he has to measure up to its standards like the rest of us. If you can't judge God you cannot question his ways or his motives and therefore you have no right to think anything other than what he orders you to think. The idea of duty implies that religion wants unbelievers to suffer for their unbelief. Duty means something you must suffer for if you don't carry it out.

All people have a right to their opinion but nobody gives them the right to express evil opinions eg that coloured people should be exterminated. Religion exaggerates the number of things that are evil opinions. For example it makes out that it is an evil opinion that Jesus is not or cannot be known to be the only way to God or that homosexuality is often morally good or at least neutral.

Correctly understood humanism holds that the person is the most valuable thing. It is nonsense to say a person should be happy if life is not more important than the quality of life. Religion cannot say that though it often sings the same tune as those who advocate this philosophy these days. God made death and commanded us to consent to the death that he has appointed for us and the Jewish, Christian and Islamic scriptures all command legalised murder. God undermines our respect for life and if that is right then why not kill heretics for him?

Islam and Christianity say that God comes first. If God comes first then the faith or religion must matter far more. If they matter then freedom of speech must be denied to heretics and other religions when a religion gets control of a state.

Many things are forced on us - school is for shoving facts down your neck - so it seems that religion can take over the state and force dissenters to listen to its gospel until they convert or die. Each religion has to work towards that which shows how divisive religion is.

Sins are mistakes. When you do wrong it is because you mistook it for good. It was the good in it you were after. Religion then must have the right to force us not to make those mistakes. Humanists do not believe in sins so we don't have to be like that. Also religion sees nearly everything we do as a sin in some sense therefore since we are so godless it follows that unless the Law stands by God to the fullest of its power it will not be a force for good because whatever the Law legalises is seen as moral and religion says that not to forbid something and decree a punishment for it is to encourage it. Religion and democracy cannot mix. Jesus said that nearly everybody was possessed by evil spirits so that infers that we should fear everybody else and like nobody and certainly not have any respect for democracy. Jesus said that if Satan casts out Satan from people then he cannot have a kingdom and spoke of Satan being the ruler of the world implying most people are at least partly possessed.

## RECOMMENDED READING

Cheung, C., and J.W. Yeung. 2011. Meta-analysis of relationships between religiosity and constructive and destructive behaviors among adolescents. *Children and Youth Services Review* 33(2): 376-85.

Colvin, C.R., and J. Block. 1994. Do positive illusions foster mental health? An examination of the Taylor and Brown formulation. *Psychological Bulletin* 116(1): 3-20.

Dawes, R.M. 1994. *House of Cards: Psychology and Psychotherapy Based on Myth*. New York: The Free Press.

Dawkins, R. 2006. *The God Delusion*. London: Bantam Press.

Dekker, J. 2009. World religion database. *The Charleston Advisor* 11(3).

De Waal, F. 2013. Morality without religion. *big think* (May 19). Online at <http://bigthink.com/videos/morality-without-religion>.

Dennett, D.C. 2006. *Breaking the Spell: Religion As a Natural Phenomenon*. New York: Penguin.

Desmond, S.A., J.T. Ulmer, and C.D. Bader. 2013. Religion, self control, and substance use. *Deviant Behavior* 34(5): 384-406.

Eisenberg, N., V. Castellani, L. Panerai, et al. 2011. Trajectories of religious coping from adolescence into early adulthood: Their form and relations to externalizing problems and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality* 79(4): 841-73.

Ellis, L. 1985. Religiosity and criminality: Evidence and explanations of complex relationships. *Sociological Perspectives* 28(4): 501-20.

Ellis, L., and J. Peterson. 1996. Crime and religion: An international comparison among thirteen industrial nations. *Personality and Individual Differences* 20(6): 761-68.

Created by free version of DocuFreezer

- Ans, R.J. 2007. Nazism, Christianity and political religion: A debate. *Journal of Contemporary History* 42(1): 5–7.
- Furrow, J.L., P.E. King, and K. White. 2004. Religion and positive youth development: Identity, meaning, and prosocial concerns. *Applied Developmental Science* 8(1): 17–26.
- Galen, L.W. 2012. Does religious belief promote prosociality? A critical examination. *Psychological Bulletin* 138: 876–906.
- Gilovich, T., and K. Savitsky. 1996. Like goes with like: The role of representativeness in erroneous and pseudoscientific beliefs. *Skeptical Inquirer* 20(2): 34–40.
- Good, M., and T. Willoughby. 2006. The role of spirituality versus religiosity in adolescent psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 35(1): 39–53.
- Harris, S. 2006. *Letter to a Christian Nation*. New York: Random House.
- Hirschi, T., and R. Stark. 1969. Hellfire and delinquency. *Social Problems* 17(2): 202–13.
- Henderson, R. 2013. Why there is no such thing as a good atheist (blog entry). *Huffington Post Religion Blog* (December 18). Online at [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/pastor-rick-henderson/why-there-is-no-such-thing-as-a-good-atheist\\_b\\_4442287.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/pastor-rick-henderson/why-there-is-no-such-thing-as-a-good-atheist_b_4442287.html).
- Kahneman, D. 2011. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Kendler, K.S., X. Liu, C.O. Gardner, et al. 2003. Dimensions of religiosity and their relationship to lifetime psychiatric and substance use disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry* 160(3): 496–503.
- Koenig, L.B., M. McGue, R.F. Krueger, et al. 2007. Religiosity, antisocial behavior, and altruism: Genetic and environmental mediation. *Journal of Personality* 75(2): 265–90.
- Kohlberg, L. 1981. *Essays on Moral Development, Vol. I: The Philosophy of Moral Development*. San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- Laird, R.D., L.D. Marks, and M.D. Marrero. 2011. Religiosity, self-control, and antisocial behavior: Religiosity as a promotive and protective factor. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 32(2): 78–85.
- Lilienfeld, S.O., R. Ammirati, and K. Landfield. 2009. Giving debiasing away: Can psychological research on correcting cognitive errors promote human welfare? *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 4(4): 390–98.
- Lilienfeld, S.O., R.D. Lutzman, K. Dutton, et al. 2014. Implications of psychopathic personality traits for everyday life: Results from a large community survey. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Lindner, D.O. 2005. Steven Weinberg on religion and science. The evolution controversy. Online at <http://law2.umkc.edu/faculty/projects/frtrial/conlaw/weinberg.html>.
- Lodi-Smith, J., and B.W. Roberts. 2007. Social investment and personality: A meta-analysis of the relationship of personality traits to investment in work, family, religion, and volunteerism. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 11(1): 68–86.
- McCullough, M.E., and B.L.B. Willoughby. 2009. Religion, self-regulation, and self-control: Associations, explanations, and implications. *Psychological Bulletin* 135(1): 69–93.
- Meehl, P.E. 1978. Theoretical risks and tabular asterisks: Sir Karl, Sir Ronald, and the slow progress of soft psychology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 46(4): 806–34.
- Milgram, S. 1963. Behavioral study of obedience. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 67(4): 371–78.
- Piantadosi, S., D.P. Byar, and S.B. Green. 1988. The ecological fallacy. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 127(5): 893–904.
- Prager, D. 2011. No God, no moral society: The case for the Torah, Part III. *JewishJournal.com* (February 2). Online at [http://www.jewishjournal.com/dennis\\_prager/article/no\\_god\\_no\\_moral\\_society\\_20110202](http://www.jewishjournal.com/dennis_prager/article/no_god_no_moral_society_20110202).
- . 2013. A response to Richard Dawkins. *National Review Online* (October 1). Online at <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/359999/response-richard-dawkins-dennis-prager>.
- Robinson, W.S. 1950. Ecological correlations and the behavior of individuals. *American Sociological Review* 15(3): 351–57.
- Sagan, C. 1995. *The Demon-Haunted World: Science As a Candle in the Dark*. New York: Random House.
- Salas-Wright, C.P., R. Olate, and M.G. Vaughn. 2013. The protective effects of religious coping and spirituality on delinquency: Results among high-risk and gang-involved Salvadoran youth. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 40(9): 988–1008.
- Schwartz, S. 1994. The fallacy of the ecological fallacy: The potential misuse of a concept and the consequences. *American Journal of Public Health* 84(5): 819–24.
- Shariff, A.F., and A. Norenzayan. 2007. God is watching you: Priming god concepts increases prosocial behavior in an anonymous economic game. *Psychological Science* 18(9): 803–809.
- Sheahan, L. 2007. The problem with God: Interview with Richard Dawkins. *Beliefnet*. Online at <http://www.beliefnet.com/News/Science-Religion/2005/11/The-Problem-With-God-Interview-With-Richard-Dawkins.aspx>.
- Sheiman, B. 2009. *An Atheist Defends Religion: Why Humanity Is Better Off with Religion Than Without It*. New York: Penguin.
- Stams, G.J., D. Brugman, M. Dekovic, et al. 2006. The moral judgment of juvenile delinquents: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 34: 692–708.
- Taylor, S.E., and J.D. Brown. 1988. Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin* 103(2): 193–210.
- Weingarten, E. 2011. Why we'd be miserable in a world without religion. *Slate Magazine* (November 8). Online at [http://www.slate.com/articles/news\\_and\\_politics/intelligence\\_squared/2011/11/the\\_nov\\_15\\_slate\\_intelligence\\_squared\\_u\\_s\\_debate\\_why\\_dinesh\\_d\\_souza\\_will\\_argue\\_against\\_the\\_motion\\_the\\_world\\_would\\_be\\_better\\_off\\_without\\_religion.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/intelligence_squared/2011/11/the_nov_15_slate_intelligence_squared_u_s_debate_why_dinesh_d_souza_will_argue_against_the_motion_the_world_would_be_better_off_without_religion.html).
- Wills, T.A., A.M. Yaeger, and J.M. Sandy. 2003. Buffering effect of religiosity for adolescent substance use. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 17(1): 24–31.

## THE WWW

[www.infidels.org/library/historical/joseph\\_mccabe/big\\_blue\\_books/book\\_10.html](http://www.infidels.org/library/historical/joseph_mccabe/big_blue_books/book_10.html)  
Fascist Romanism Defies Civilisation by Joseph McCabe

[www.hom.net/~angels/democracy.html](http://www.hom.net/~angels/democracy.html)  
Democracy is not a good form of Government by Citizens for the Ten Commandments

[www.mindspring.com/~bab5/BIB/lessons.htm](http://www.mindspring.com/~bab5/BIB/lessons.htm)  
Is Christianity a Cult?