

## MY POSTS AND COMMENTS WHICH SHOW HOW EVEN MODERN CHRISTIANITY CONDONES CHRISTIAN VIOLENCE AND EVIL

*Response to a newspaper article headed: Charity Commission Barring Extremist*

There is extremism in attitude and extremism in outlook. Christianity is extremist the latter way.

The Bible believer today does not stone homosexuals but he approves of the fact that it was done in the past at God's behest in the Bible. Jesus upheld Old Testament doctrine. He never apologised for the killings. If you praise violent scriptures as God's word, you take responsibility for the contents and the consequences. If somebody thinks the rules about stoning are in force today you need to take responsibility for that and the results. If you say a baby should be allowed to suffer by God and that God should not intervene you take responsibility in the sense that you are saying that if there is a God you would tell him not to intervene. You would do the same thing if you were God. You are willing to say that what absolutely should not happen should happen. You are willing to take the chance. What does it all say about you? Never mind God. This is about you.

*Regarding Chinese persecution of the Church 2014*

Atheist Sam Harris is right. Christianity when practiced without cherrypicking and watering down is deadly. Jesus clearly approved of taking the Old Testament as God's unerring word despite its commanding that certain sinners must be brutally murdered. Moderate Christianity paves the way for the real thing. Atheists like the Chinese seem to understand the religion better.

Jesus - "Do not think that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to fulfill. For assuredly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle will by no means pass from the law till all is fulfilled. Whoever therefore breaks one of the least of these commandments, and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does and teaches them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say to you, that unless your righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, you will by no means enter the kingdom of heaven." Matthew 5:17-20.

I pay no attention to Christian disputers for they lie like politicians. Their opinions do not change the fact that Christ was a man of his bigoted and fanatical times.

I don't want a religious war. But Christians may need to repudiate anything that casts them in a bad light even if that means becoming humanist.

*Against a Huffington Post article November 2013 that tried to make out religion isn't naturally harmful.*

A gay person said he was a good Catholic despite being an active gay for the Church allows debate and doesn't want people swallowing doctrines at face value.

Hypocrisy and ignorance galore in this article.

"When large religious institutions promote oppressive ideals, it is the fault of power-hungry, hateful individuals -- not the fundamentals that are most central to the religion."

Commonsense says that there are evil religions.

Who are you to decide what the fundamentals of each religion are? It is fundamental to Judaism that Moses be regarded as top prophet and inspired by God so you are calling him hateful and powerhungry when he claimed God endorsed genocide and murdering people by stoning them to death through him. Religion is based on the notion that we cannot see God's plan so he can command things that seem evil or stupid to us. This foundational doctrine is dangerous. But it does not mean that those who take it seriously should be judged as power-hungry and hateful by your intolerant self.

"If a major religious figure -- say, the Pope -- condemns contraception or gay marriage with a faith-based argument, if we turn around and assume that all Catholics believe the same, we are operating on harmful stereotypes."

But they are not Catholic believers if they deliberately reject the Pope's teachings. They are Catholic cherry-pickers. Real Catholic believers agree with the Pope for it is part of the Catholic faith that it is the truest form of Christianity and based on God's final revelation to humankind. If you trust the Church as the voice of Jesus Christ you believe what it says.

Simple!

And if your gay friend is telling the truth about the primacy of conscience in Catholicism then where do you draw the line? What if your conscience tells you to elect yourself Pope? The Catholic Church holds that primacy of conscience means primacy of the conscience that is obedient to Catholic authority. It is not an endorsement of dissent from the Church. There is an exception though. The Catholic Church claims to be based on faith not knowledge so if there are errors of doctrine in Church teaching, the Church says we must leave for it is a sin to belong to a religion that you know is only man-made or capable of error. If the Church is wrong about homosexuality, then it is not the one true faith. Simple.

<http://freethinker.co.uk/2016/06/29/jehovahs-witnesses-vandalise-ancient-mexican-heritage-site/>

"This is not the usual behaviour of JW's - although they believe that it is "false religion" and "idolatry", they usually respect the right of such ancient monuments to exist and don't take things into their own hands to destroy them."

The line is significant for it lets slip that the problem is not that the buildings were destroyed but because there should be a process set up so that people are not taking things into their own hands.

We have to remember that no religion, especially one which honours violent texts as the word of God, can be seen for what it is until it gets the opportunity. When a religion gets enough blind support it shows its true colours. Violent scriptures show that a religion is violent in its heart if not its actions and show the religion should be considered a trojan horse. An atheist will never say that a baby's death is a good thing and part of a plan while a believer will say it is bad one way but a good thing for it is part of God's plan for the greater good. Who is the better person?

And we must remember that Jehovah's Witnesses will hold that it is better to be a JW and please God and erroneously think that violent zeal is necessary than not to be a JW at all. In other words, it is better to be a misguided JW than a pagan or a Catholic.

<http://www.rappler.com/nation/142561-bishop-david-pacquiao-bible-death-penalty>

The bishop is a liar for saying Jesus saved a woman from execution to show the death penalty was wrong. Jesus did say it was okay to stone the woman if you were not a sinner like her. The idea that Jesus would have stoned her for he was sinless is ridiculous. Lone wolves were never allowed to stone.

<https://www.testreligion.com/stoningadulteress.html>

Everybody knows the Bible needs interpretation but cherry picking interpretations are not acceptable. If Pacquiao has thought about arguments that the Bible does or does not condone or even command murdering sinners by stoning then his interpretation is as good as the bishops. The bishop and the pope and the Church are responsible for his ideas in the sense that whoever promotes a book that gives mixed messages on violence is to blame for any violence that happens even if they do not sanction it.

Retribution is about what you deserve. People forget that if you punish just to deter then the punishment is intended to be unjust for you don't care about what the person deserves. Catholic liberal hypocrisy always backfires on itself. And I see that hypocrisy in this hypocritical Pope Francis who wants nobody sent to jail for life for murder.

The core of your post is that the New Testament does not have any specific teachings about capital punishment. That is a lie. It does. It says it is justified. And even if it did not mention it, it would expect us to turn to the Old Testament for light and continue with executions commanded in it. To argue that Jesus did not mean it when he said to the men to throw a stone at the woman if they had no sin is nonsense. It is clear he believed that she should be stoned but if the circumstances were right.

*A comment on pinknews said it is nobody's business who one loves so Peter Tatchell should not out gay bishops who ban gay sex but who engage in it themselves*

It is other people's business if representatives of a man who banned sex outside of marriage as a serious sin that deserves everlasting torment in Hell and who said that the Old Testament was God's unerring word though it commanded people to believe gay sex was a grave sin are themselves hypocrites engaging in gay sex. Out them I say. They are enablers of a religion that in its authentic teaching has the audacity to say that somebody can deserve to be punished and tormented forever.

*In relation to the murder of Lee Rigby -*

A religion is a system. The system should be distinguished from the people who claim to be in the system. Most members only imagine they are members or are too scared or unknowledgeable to obey their religion properly. That is why you see them making no effort to defend and promote the more sinister teachings of their religion such as stoning adulteresses to death. The system should still be condemned and seen as fundamentalist. If some of the people commit awful crimes in the name of their religion and because the system tells them they should do it, then they are not crazy people but obedient ones. They are living up to the system. The advice then "Crazy people do crazy things. So don't overreact" would be irrelevant. It is really just an excuse for refusing to admit that some religions endorse cruelty and fanaticism. That whitewashing only helps the fanatics. A religion is never to be judged by the goodness of its members. Human nature is very inconsistent and you see kindly gentle people in the worst doctrinal systems imaginable. To judge a religion by the goodness of the members puts pressure on critics to keep quiet. Freedom of speech must never be disrespected by such discouragement. Much fundamentalism is not obvious.

For example, it is fundamentalist for religion to claim to own marriage. It does not. Only the state bestows the rights that are associated with marriage.

*Response to Franklin Graham approving as a Christian of Putin's homophobic laws - 2014*

I recall how the New Testament teaches that the Jewish Law wherein God commanded that homosexuals be stoned to death is right. The New Testament is said to favour mercy over such "justice". But even if it does it still regards it as justice. Mercy is not a repudiation of the executions but only means the criminals are being forgiven. It is not true that the executions were based on Torah civil law - the Torah claims to be a religious law not civil law. So Christians cannot say, "It was only the law for the Jewish theocracy so it does not apply to us for we have no Jewish theocracy today." Graham is being consistent with the teaching of Christ which is why if we want to help gay rights the only proper way to do it is to condemn not just Christian bigotry but how it is inspired by a bigot called Jesus Christ. Condemning the bigots not the cause of the bigotry, namely Jesus and the Bible, is really a waste of time.

Cancer needs to be cut at the root.

*Speakers Code Leads to Secularist banned from speaking on Islam at Warwick University: <https://uk.news.yahoo.com/ex-muslim-human-rights-campaigner-165108807.html#oPLb17l>*

Speakers code, "Are not permitted to encourage, glorify or promote any acts of terrorism including individuals, groups or organisations that support such act".

What about the university allowing chaplains who tacitly endorse the evil Bible as infallible though it says God commanded terrorism - eg having gay people and blasphemers put to death by stoning? What about the worship of Jesus who admitted he had no problem with the Old Testament? To honour violent writings as God's word is the ultimate in honouring them.

Another quote, "Must seek to avoid insulting other faiths or groups, within a framework of positive debate and challenge." I find Bible teaching offensive and the Koran is offensive too.

*Gerry Reynolds Obituary 2015: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/obituaries/father-gerry-reynolds-priest-respected-by-both-sides-during-the-troubles-who-played-a-vital-role-in-a6762646.html>*

Catholicism does not regard itself as a religion that can be kept separate from other things that you do. It says religion is about influencing politics and that politics should be Catholic when implemented by Catholics. And the Church permits people to decide for themselves if a war is a real war or just. Catholicism as a religion has to take responsibility for the troubles. And the IRA if they read how Jesus himself backed the Old Testament as being really of divine authorship thus implying approval of God's warmongering and murderous commands in it could feel spiritual as they planted bombs. The Church has never apologised for that man of violence and never will. Reynolds did not repudiate Catholicism and thus was not a true peacemaker. True peacemaking is not cosmetic and the tension between communities is still there.

*Re Anglican Split with Episcopalian Church over Same Sex Marriage 2016 - argument that the Catholic Church had no holocaust*

True. But we must not forget that in Catholic doctrine, God formed a religion under Moses and the prophets that murdered gay people by stoning at divine command. This religion was fulfilled and added to and updated by Christ. The new Testament claims to be in continuity with the Old and denies that Christ formed a new religion but says he completed genuine Judaism. Many of the Jewish people did not accept the updates or Christ's right to administer them and so are considered breakaways. Catholicism claims to be the end result when Judaism was updated so whatever Judaism did bad is what the Church did bad. The Catholic Church then implicitly claims it had its own holocaust. A religion honouring evil brutal books as something to be read by all and taken by all as being God's revelation and God's writings through men needs to be firmly opposed. It is an outrage for violence should be abhorred outright. There are better books than the Bible out there!

*Re Archbishop of Singapore saying we must love gay people and hate their sin*

The prelate is taking the love the sinner and hate the sin line. But love the sinner and hate the sin is a euphemism for, "Hope something bad happens to that person if necessary to encourage him turn away from the sin for the sin is so hateful and awful." I just wanted to make that point as people might see what he is saying as kindly - it is not.

*Re Leaflet given out in Cambridgeshire called Homosexuality 2014*

The leaflet quotes the Catechism of the Catholic Church. The current pope will not revoke the Catechism's judgmentalism on homosexuality and because of his popularity he is far more dangerous than any leaflet. He is subtle poison and encouraging mentally ill people to think they have demons. As head of the Church, he is head of a hate organisation which has the nerve to try and make hate look good with its doctrine of love sinner and hate sin. The leaflet is a good example of that doctrine.

Any Anglican faction accepting gays is being cosmetic for it will still hail the homophobic Jesus as the perfect man. Jesus never apologised for the murder of gay men as endorsed by God in the Bible. Not only were they murdered under the laws of Leviticus, the laws of Moses, but they were tortured to death by stoning. Jesus even went as far as to say the Old Testament was all God's word and infallible. For him, whatever the Old Testament said, God said (see Mark 7:5-13). He claimed to love and know the God who wrote it. If he had been Moses he would have done the same thing.