

ALL RELIGIOUS CREEDS ARE VOID BUT SOME MORE THAN OTHERS!

Bahai'sm is an offshoot of Islam that seeks to unite all world religions. It was founded by manifestations of God notably Baha'u'llah. Baha'u'llah proved that he was not a manifestation when he insanely thought he could promote unity among the world religions by founding a new one that takes bits out of every religion and which turns Krishna, Jesus and Buddha into manifestations of God though they all contradicted one another. And its a strange way of uniting religion to make another religion! Christianity cannot water down its view that Jesus was the only manifestation of God and who proved it by coming back from the dead and yet this cult claims to be compatible with Christianity. If the other manifestations, Buddha, Krishna, Moses and Jesus were really from God and interested in uniting people, then why did they form different sects with each one contradicting the other?

Buddha the founder of Buddhism was a fanatic who advocated a difficult and boring life in order to make sure you are not reincarnated. He never stopped to consider that if there is no life after death this is a waste of time and one might as well live it up within reason. He accused all desire of being something that we must get rid of. But manipulated the right way, desire can make your life fun and more interesting.

The word Catholic means universal. It refers to the fact that the one true Church must invite all nations to become part of it. Christ implied the Church must be Catholic when he told it to make disciples of all nations. To be universal the Church must be primarily one in faith for what is divided by confusion and heresy can't be for everybody. The Church would need a clear and fixed message to be really universal. To be universal the Church has to have one government - that is to say, it has to be one Church. So to be Catholic, the Church has to be one, united. It has to be holy, that is dedicated to God and what God has revealed. It needs some kind of authority then to preserve this revelation intact. If the apostles received the completeness of God's word, and the Church says they did, then the Church has to be apostolic. So there are four marks of the one true Church as expressed in the Nicene Creed, "I believe in one, holy, Catholic and apostolic Church." This creed is a manifestation of the infallibility or protection against error that the Church supposedly enjoys.

The Roman Catholic Church claims to meet this one, holy, Catholic and apostolic model. This Church is not one for it is divided on matters of faith. It is really like a collection of faiths under the Roman Catholic umbrella.

The mark of oneness has more to do with unity in mind and heart than with organisational unity. Plus Protestants are thought to belong to the Catholic Church by virtue of their baptism. That's not unity. The unity of the Church is artificial so the Church is not Catholic. Plus there is the idea of automatic excommunication in which you commit a sin that secretly puts you out of the Church, such as, abortion, schism, heresy and apostasy and others. That means you will have many Catholics who are visibly Catholics but who are not Catholics at all. The Church also says that those who die in invincible ignorance desiring to be with God even if they are not Christians have become members of the Church. That denies the doctrine of the one visible Church. The true Church is not confined to the visible Church so the visible Church then is not necessarily the true Church. The Church is not one. It is missing the main mark.

The true Church should be united. It does not really matter if a false religion is divided. If you can have one con around why not another? Catholics ignore the fact that it is not the Church being one that is important but that it should be one. For example, the modern day Catholic Church claims to be the one true unerring faith but this isn't true for it has altered many doctrines. Traditionalist Catholics can tell you about many of these changes which is why they have declared the current Catholic system led by Rome to be the Vatican Two Conciliar Sect not the Catholic Church. The modern Catholic Church is not fully the Catholic faith so its oneness means nothing. A sect standing by the old doctrines would be the true Church and the Roman Catholic Church continuing.

The Protestant view that despite Christian's disagreements and divisions they are one spiritual family as long as they carry God's love in their hearts and that this family is the one true Church is more plausible than the Catholic view.

The Catholic Church isn't holy for its teaching is often ridiculous and dangerous and it has corrupted the legacy of Jesus and the apostles by adding doctrines they never knew to the faith so it is not apostolic. For example, Jesus told the Jews that they must not divorce. The Jews engaged in arranged marriages involving men and girls who were virtually children. Jesus' teaching accepts these forced unions with children. That shows that the Catholic Church is heretical to allow annulments when the bride is a child or forced.

The Catholic Church isn't Catholic for babies who won't be brought up as Catholics are not welcome for baptism and women can't become priests. Only the right Church would have the right to be called Catholic and the Roman Catholic

doctrine is full of lies and errors.

There has to be something unique about the term Catholic. If any sect at all even atheistic ones can call themselves Catholic, then there is nothing special about being a universal faith so it is not a mark of any kind at all. A religion that errs is excluding people who know it is wrong so it is not Catholic and it is not open to all people. Being universal or open to all is not as important as being right. The reasoning of Rome that as the Church is Catholic that is one of the signs that it is true makes no sense. It is really saying that whatever is true is Catholic and since the Church is Catholic the Church is true. That is incorrect logic.

Catholicism is just another man-made faith.

Hinduism is a tradition more than a religion. It allows you to be an Atheist as long as you follow the traditions. That is fine but all Hindus then should become Atheists and enjoy life without the burden of supernatural beliefs. The caste system of Hinduism is a great evil for it treats many people as dirt just because they were born into the "lowest" class. They are accused of having committed great sins in a past life thus deserving this treatment.

The word Islam means submission to God. The religion was founded by the Prophet Muhammad. He gave the world the Koran which was written down after his death. This book, though it claims to be the perfect word of God, gives no evidence of supernatural origin. It never predicts the future though such predictions are the only sure mark that a book is from God who alone knows the future. You could write a clearer and more uplifting book than the Koran in the name of God so it would be fairer for this new book to be taken for the real word of God.

The Koran is alleged to be a perfect work of written art. It's "divine" author Allah says that. But if you read it you see many mistakes, such as lack of clarity, and you will sometimes meet a piece of it in one place and a similar version of it in another - bad editing. It accuses Christians of making a Holy Trinity of God, Jesus and Mary which is false. The trinity is the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Mary wasn't even as important in the Church at that time as she is now. So its hard to make an excuse for this gross error.

Jehovah's Witnesses comprise an American Christian Fundamentalist sect that follows the New World Translation of the Bible. This Bible is a travesty of the standard text of the Bible and has been adulterated to back up the sect's peculiar beliefs. They deny that Jesus was God and reject his bodily resurrection. The cult has fallen prey to fanaticism in its absolute opposition to blood transfusion. The fact that this teaching does not murder as many today thanks to alternatives to blood transfusion makes no difference for they would still kill by their teaching if these alternatives were unavailable. And like all bad religion, the more converts it gets the more people suffer and die.

Mormonism is the religion founded by Joseph Smith Jun in 1830. He claimed that he translated a new scripture The Book of Mormon from golden plates that he dug up in a hill. Eleven witnesses had a vision of the plates. Their evidence was totally pointless because there is evidence in the book itself that it is not the word of God. For example, it makes prophecies and not one of them has been convincingly fulfilled. Those that did come true came true through luck. Yet Smith's translation of the Bible (Deuteronomy 18) declared that the highest standards while giving revelation from God will be followed by a true prophet. Basically, if a prophet gets all his predictions right but one he is still to be regarded as a fraud despite the miraculous knowledge of the future. This warns us against the idea of accepting miracles as signs from God though the false prophet Jesus (who claimed allegiance to Moses or to have sent him) claimed they were. Logically the same would apply to prophets who make some predictions that could be explained by chance when they are fulfilled. The Bible indicates that evil spirits can do seemingly holy miracles to deceive people but since only God knows the future then prophecy is the only way to be sure, it is the only miracle that proves God is speaking or has spoken.

Smith prophesied that a man called David Patten would accompany him on a mission in spring but Patten died before this happened. The Mormon answer that Patten would do the mission as a spirit being is just an obvious cop out. This prophecy can be read in the Mormon Scripture Doctrine and Covenants Section 114 which asks Patten to sell what he has and get ready so that he can go on the mission with twelve others. Another excuse is that the section contains not a prophecy but a command from God for David. Would God tell you to do something knowing you will die before you get the chance especially when he doesn't speak much? Excuses like this are unconvincing and when God speaks there can be no doubt that God knows the future. God says in the prophecy that it is wisdom for Patten to get ready for the mission. Why would God who rarely speaks waste time on Patten and what he was doing if he was going to take Patten from the world? Smith accepted the Bible statement that if a prophet predicts wrongly he is a fraud. Smith was a fake prophet.

Smith's new addition to the Bible The Book of Mormon is a fraud. The Bible commands that a prophet who is always right but who is wrong once or who teaches heresy is to be ignored. That is why if Smith was not a true prophet we cannot believe in the Book of Mormon.

Mormon 7:9 says that whoever believes the Bible will believe the Book of Mormon. But the Book of Mormon says the

Bible has been changed and corrupted and the Bible gives no reason to believe in the Book of Mormon! 2 Nephi 2:23 states that if Adam and Eve had not sinned they would have had no children and would not have known any joy for they knew no misery and being unable to do good for they did not know what sin was. This is utter rubbish. Sinlessness was no bar to making babies. Thought God was all-powerful? And you can have joy when you forget about misery and do good when you forget about sin so you can have joy without knowing what sin is.

Moroni 10:3-5 promises that those who sincerely pray about whether or not the Book of Mormon is true will find that it is true. Mormons interpret that to say that they will get a burning feeling that it is true from God which tells them that it is true. It mentions knowing and not feelings and the Book says that feelings can mislead so it means that the Book will be credible which is completely untrue. We know that when people stray from the truth that it is because they feel their heresy is true. The Book of Mormon is saying that there will be plenty of archaeological evidence for its claims. This is untrue. Archaeologists ignore the book completely. No wonder when the Book says America was full of cows, pigs and horses in the period it claims to record which we know isn't true. Today Mormons say that there were strange animals and God just used the name of the animal we know in the modern world that was most like them! Rubbish! Smith altered the Book after saying it was the word of God. For example, he forgot that King Benjamin was dead by the time we get to the book, the Book of Mosiah verse 21:28 in the Book of Mormon. He had to subsequently change this to King Mosiah. To this day, the Church has been interfering with the text.

Smith was copied by a man who was undoubtedly a fraud James Jesse Strang who produced far more convincing witnesses to his miraculous, yet undoubtedly non-existent, plates which warns us not to be quick to believe Smith.

Moses is the reputed author of the first five books of the Bible which comprise the Law which was allegedly instituted by God.

The Prophet Moses was an evil man who demanded in the name of God that adulterers and homosexuals be stoned to death. To say the Old Testament is the word of God is to side with God despite the murders he said he commanded through Moses. Though Moses demanded the highest standards in working out who was really a prophet of God: agreement with the word already given and predicting the future without error, he never left any fulfilled predictions behind that would prove that he could keep up to the standard. To reject Moses is to deny the divine origin of Judaism and the pretended fulfilment of Judaism, Christianity. It is to deny the divine sonship of Jesus Christ for Jesus said Moses really was a prophet of God and that Moses' writings were his credentials.

Judaism is the default faith. Christianity started among Jews who changed the Jewish religion. If they had no right to then we should become Jews. For this reason alone, the Christians must allow the Jews to commit the executions as God commanded. Having faith that Christianity is true is not a licence for refusing to play it safe.

A spiritualist is a believer in psychic abilities that allow gifted people to communicate and get messages from the departed. When it needs psychic powers to work, it is possible that the powers are inventing the entities which could be products from one's own subconscious mind. The powers could be divining facts about the dead while the medium thinks the revelations are coming from the dead who may really be non-existent. Spiritualism is black magic for it is a waste of time and the powers should be used on nurturing the only thing that matters, self-esteem.

Christians say that spiritualists are foolish for they open themselves up to powers they do not understand and which could be dangerous. Surely Christians are worse for they don't know if Jesus really was all-good and they try to open up to him. Maybe he is an evil spirit now. Maybe he has no power at all and evil spirits do meaning they are what Christians are opening up to. And the Christians expect us to open up more to Jesus than any spiritualist ever asked anybody to open up to the spirit world!

Though witchcraft today claims to be a benign nature religion the fact is that all magic is evil magic.

All magic is evil magic for it is trying to avoid what really matters. What matters most is not spells, believing in God, a man who rises from the dead, miracles but believing in your natural power to accept - maybe it will take a long time - that bad things can and do happen so that you will cope better.

Magic is trying to manipulate reality and other people and to circumvent or drop the law of cause and effect. If you cast a spell for money, you certainly think that if you use cause and effect alone it may or will not happen so you need to get an effect that has no cause into the mix.

Believers claim that love spells are wrong for they are too manipulative for they are trying to make another person love you. They say that instead you should do a spell to make yourself more lovable to another. But there is no difference in forcing a person to love you and in forcing them to see that you are lovable and therefore attract them. Nobody can love anybody unless they see them as attractive. If love spells are wrong, then who will want to do magic?

God says that we should not suffer a sorceress to live (Exodus 22:18). He could have demanded some other treatment for her but he demanded execution. God evidently believes that there is something in this magic – why else be so harsh against it - but we know better! The view that God opposed it for he wanted to keep his people free from pagan influence doesn't explain the harshness.

Magic workers do loads of protection and health spells and still get cancer and have accidents and die young so magic is wasting time.

The magical doctrine that we must work with nature not against it says, "Okay I want to believe in this nonsense and to do that I must avoid evidence or proof that it is rubbish and just see what seems to be evidence in its favour." That is why the magician never tells you to do spells instead of getting your cancer treated. Trying to avoid the law of cause and effect, the law of nature and then saying you embrace it makes no sense. Magic is too much about what you want to believe to be a commendable venture. It has got that in common with miracles and prayers.

The Protestants belong to Christian Churches that separated from Roman Catholicism at the time of the Reformation though their faith was certainly around long before then in the form of the Waldensians, Hussites and Wycliffites. They teach that the Bible alone is the word of God. They teach that salvation is not by faith and good works and sacraments like you have it in the Catholic Church but by grace (God's doing) alone. When you trust in God that he has washed away your sins in the blood of Christ that is a sign that grace has saved you. God then will inspire you and help you to do good works. This is a sign too that God has saved you and chosen you for salvation in Heaven. Many Protestants say that nothing, no sin or anything, can take your heavenly destiny away from you once you are saved. They teach that you are made righteous by faith in the sense that when you believe by the power of God your salvation is activated. Faith is not a good work that earns salvation. They teach salvation by faith alone without good works.

The Protestant God is obviously condoning the sins of believers. Jesus may pay but as far as we experience it, which is what counts, our sins are being condoned. The Catholic God does the same when you can go straight to Heaven after committing billions of venial sins if somebody has got indulgences for you to cancel the punishment due to them. A God that rewards sin is not a God but a hypocrite. The fruits of Christianity prove that Jesus was not the Son of God for he was the one that said the work of God always brings good fruit.

To teach that faith alone saves is to deny that human beings matter. It teaches that dogma matters more than people for you cannot be saved by saving a life but you can be saved by trusting in dogmas. It is a lie that it is not dogmas but God a person that is trusted for if there is no God then it follows that it is dogmas. We don't know for sure if there is a God and less sure if God really saves this way so it is dogma.

Paul wrote in his divinely inspired scripture that obeying the law of God cannot save or justify, put you right with God, because the law gives knowledge of what sin is (Romans 3:20). In other words, the law saves nobody for they cannot keep it. Then he writes that God has had to save us without the law by faith. He means faith alone for he already said why obedience to God can't save.

The Bible is a Protestant book. The Bible is an evil book for it is attractive to those who want to be saved but not from their sins. Protestantism is perfect for people like that with its doctrine that Jesus died on the cross so that you could sin with impunity.

