

### Chapter 1 : Against religion: The case for faith | The Christian Century

*Religious hatred is the term for hating a religion. Adding -ism onto a word does not turn it into a system of hatred (see multiple above answers). Racism is not the hatred of other races.*

Your religion teaches that if you do not accept Jesus Christ as your personal lord and savior you will burn for eternity in hell. No matter if you are a good person, or are equally devout in another faith. The religion you have as an adult is hugely dependent on the time and place of your birth. If God chose to have you born today to a poor family in India, your chances of converting to christianity to be saved are near zero. In essence, God chooses certain people to burn for eternity and they have no say in the matter. Religion is like football. Everyone wants to believe their home team is special, but the fact is they only think so because they were born there. I like to play the morality card, e. If the answer is religion, cue argument about people with different religions or no religion still being good people, thus morality does not come from religion. If they bring in heaven and hell, I counter by saying that if there is a god, I would hope that he would judge people on their actions i. Why would God condemn me to eternal torture just for not believing him in the face of a huge lack of evidence? Why did he create me with my questioning, rational mind if I was going to be punished for exercising it? Do you believe in Zeus? Do you believe in FSM? How about unicorns or fairies? How about Xorplax, a god I just made up? The best way to do this I have come across is the scientific method. I require evidence to substantiate claims, and a preponderance of evidence to substantiate extraordinary claims. Faith is a weakness. Faith is the excuse we give ourselves to believe something when there is no good reason to. Faith actively stands in the way of looking for evidence and seeking further knowledge. Instead of faith, let us use reasonable expectation based on observation, and use hope for the things we cannot control. All religious beliefs are so far objectively unjustifiable. If you can justify yours, please do so. Personal experience is fine for you, but know that if that is your only basis for belief, you have no footing on which to convince others your religion is valid; it is entirely possible you have misinterpreted your experience, or that your senses were unwittingly impaired at the time. These were found via Reddit. Please share your own here:

### Chapter 2 : Organized Religion Quotes (63 quotes)

*Criticism of religion is criticism of the ideas, but against traditional religion which he saw as superstition for teaching that gods interfered with the world.*

Some cultures are good and some bad. That being said, there are particular attributes that characterize false religions or become the norm during religious decline in a true faith such as Christianity. For example, "Every religious system in the world is centered upon a temple or a sacred place and has rites and ceremonies, has hierarchies and titles distinguishing men from one another, and has holy days and holy celebrations" quoted from a teaching I heard from Pastor Tommy Moya several weeks ago. The Old Testament prophets such as Isaiah, Micah and Amos decried religious ritual that was without true righteousness, humility and love for neighbor. The line of prophets arose starting in the 8th century B. For this, the prophets pronounced judgment upon the nation, and God dispersed the people and, on two occasions, let enemies destroy their temple. Many Pentecostal, charismatic and evangelical churches have these same issues. Not only that, but all leaders including me have to constantly grapple with some or all of the following issues internally to make sure we are never sucked into this false system. Get Spirit-filled content delivered right to your inbox! Click here to subscribe to our newsletter. The following are 10 of the characteristics of false religious systems as taught by Jesus in Matthew

There are onerous rules and regulations some call legalism Matt. In the contemporary church, there are numerous man-made traditions and requirements that never arose from the Word, which have become an unnecessary burden upon believers. For example, in many Pentecostal churches the emphasis is on outward holiness related to attire, makeup, the cutting of hair, jewelry and other regulations. I have spoken to numerous young people who stopped attending church because these regulations made them feel weird in front of their unchurched friends. Fundamentalists in the past forbade any form of entertainment, including watching movies, listening to the radio, watching television, etc. These are legalistic efforts to bring holiness that have resulted in numerous churches losing their next generation. The church leaders serve to receive prestige from men vv. God makes it clear in His word that some religious leaders love the praise of men more than the praise of God John

The judgment of God is against the leaders who are constantly posturing themselves within their denomination to attain the highest seats of authority and places of honor among men. Truly, some of the greatest people of God in the earth today are hidden from the public eye. The leaders crave titles and moving up the ranks of hierarchical religious systems vv. I have found that, the more a person speaks about their academic achievements and ecclesial titles, the more insecure they are as a person and about their ministry accomplishments. I say this as a person who has been consecrated both a bishop and apostle and who flows in circles with leaders who use these titles. Many of the greatest leaders in the church world do not insist upon people referring to them with a title. The leaders have an entitlement mentality vv. I believe in the biblical principle of serving the people of God as a prerequisite to being qualified to function in the same ministry as they do. That being said, there has also been abuse of this principle since many people desire to become leaders partially because it enables them to be waited upon. I believe younger ministers should serve older, more mature ministers out of honor and proper protocol, but at the same time older ministers should not demand it or become abusive if they do not receive it. We do not receive titles in the kingdom so we can be waited upon but so that we can have greater opportunity to serve in the church. The more mature a Christ follower is, the more they will celebrate service as the highest form of ministry and leadership. The leaders become a stumbling block to others seeking the kingdom vv. It has been evident the past 30 years in both the evangelical and Roman Catholic churches that leaders can become huge stumbling blocks instead of assets to the kingdom. Whether it is lavish lifestyles, sexual misconduct, abuse of power, or other forms of narcissism, many believers have been turned off from Christianity by those who are supposed to represent it. Truly those who handle the Word of God will receive the most scrutiny at the judgment seat of Christ James 3: The leaders value and love money and wealth more than anything else vv. The religious leaders Jesus denounced seemed to value gold more than the glory and honor of God. Leaders should never serve primarily for money but for the love of God and His people 1 Pet. The weightier matters of the Word are

neglected vv. Although I believe and practice the principles of tithing, fasting, church attendance and the like, they should never be an excuse for me to think I have fulfilled all of my Christian duties. Jesus says here that we ought to continue to tithe but also include in our lifestyle the practice of treating others with justice, mercy and faithfulness. For example, if we tithe but treat our spouse poorly, neglect the poor in our midst, or mistreat others, our tithe will not do us any good. Then we are just like the Pharisee Jesus describes in Luke. Ritual is valued more than inner transformation vv. The tendency for human beings is to fall into a routine and equate our routine with true worship. Whether it is the sacraments of denominational churches or the shouting, shaking and tongue talking of the Pentecostals, human nature has a tendency to fall into habit patterns of outward worship bereft of the life-changing dynamic of encountering the living God. We do not have to do away with these rituals, sacraments and traditions but should integrate them with true heartfelt worship and passion for our Lord. They honor the departed saints without living like them in the present vv. I have found that it is much easier to study about revival than to actually work hard for it. It is much easier to study church history than it is to make history. Every denomination and expression of the church has its Christian heroes of the past, but very few denominations, churches and adherents attempt to emulate the life, passion and sacrifice of the saints of old for example: Jesus wants us to honor the prophets of old by living like them, not merely by building and revering their tombs. They reject the prophets and wise men who confront their false systems vv. The Pharisees and Sadducees rejected Jesus John 7: It is not an accident that in Luke 3: Thus, God bypassed the litany of prominent political and religious leaders and their systems 3: When a leader is captivated by their religious system or dead institution they become blind to the pure Word of the Lord. God has to bypass them and speak prophetically through those outside the dead institution. Those who are humble and have ears to hear as Nicodemus in John 3 will recognize and receive the people God sends to them, irrespective of their institutional affiliation. Truly, God cannot be contained in a temple, an institution, a denomination or any one religious system. He is Lord of all and will seek after those who worship Him in spirit and in truth John 4: May God help us to avoid these 10 judgments! Visit him at [josephmattera](http://josephmattera.com).

### Chapter 3 : The God Argument: The Case against Religion and for Humanism by A.C. Grayling

*Quick Arguments Against Religion ALWAYS point people who use the "open mindedness" argument here to this video Mine goes like this (assuming I'm talking to a christian): Your religion teaches that if you do not accept Jesus Christ as your personal lord and savior you will burn for eternity in hell.*

Here are the rules; -Note the number of your argument. We will number arguments for easy reference -Put the name or title of your argument in bold eg the "pink unicorn argument" first and then explain it. If you want to argue, please quote the argument and then make a new thread. The atheist will proceed to argue there -No insults or vulgar words. Let us try to be civil in explaining our arguments. There is no solid or tangible evidence for God nor a logical argument for God. The existence of God is taken on faith and not by evidence. There is no theory of God -There is no conclusive logical argument for the existence of God. There are many definitions for the same God as there are many gods. This is problematic if one is to ascertain the characteristics of God to judge if God exists or not. An omnipotent God is self-refuting and contradictory. To have all abilities -However, some abilities are contradictory to each other. You can't be asleep and awake at the same time. God has the ability to live for ever. However, that means that he can not die and he doesn't have the ability to kill himself God has the ability to be everywhere. However, that means that he doesn't have the ability to leave a certain place or the ability to be absent. But if God exists, the believer gains everything goes to heaven and the unbeliever loses everything goes to hell. There is therefore everything to gain and nothing to lose by believing in God. It is purely a method of extorting the gullible thru fear. Like many other such arguments, it also fails to denote exactly which god it refers to. Taken to the extreme, following the wager would necessitate betting on the god with the worst hell, so it could be avoided. But religionists are in much danger as the atheists. Who knows, perhaps he actually prefers independent thinkers such as atheists, not cowardly subordinate followers. It would be quite possible for a true believer to discover on Judgment Day that the destination was not Heaven. Allah, in his infinitely mysterious ways, may have had other plans; and there would be no appeal or debate with an omnipotent being. Since the odds of the Islamic, Christian, Jewish or Hindu god co-existing as Almighty god are zero, the wager creates a false dilemma. The wager even goes against the doctrine that many religions have where gambling is sinful. This has been false for many who have trusted in their god for help or guidance, instead of seeking reality-based solutions. People have unnecessarily fought, killed and died for their belief in their god. Boko haram problem in our country is an example of dangers of religion. Far too many have died because they or their parents chose prayer instead of medicine e. Jehovah Witnesses will rather let their children die than allow blood transfusion. Swords, bullets, poison, and poisonous snakes have killed many who thought that they were protected by their god etc etc etc. Even without these more dramatic effects, believers often devote significant time, energy and money to worshipping their god. This could have been properly invested in worthwhile developmental pursuits both for the individual and for humanity as a whole. This probably explains why the least religious nations have been the most advanced nations on earth and vice versa. Nigeria, as deeply religious as we are is still one of the most corrupt nation on earth. Beliefs in a god and the often resultant ideas of divine punishment and reward too often make people more willing to accept inequalities in this life, without trying to make things better for themselves. Low-paid factory workers and slaves were taught that their rewards were in the afterlife, so they should be meek and obedient in this life to ensure their imaginary rewards. God-belief has real expenses that can be large or destructive both to the individual and to the world e. By accepting the wager, they have perhaps implicitly given up these important traits. It gives them feelings of structure and meaning in their lives, and makes them feel connected. It helps remove the fear of death and nonexistence that most of us experience after death, just exactly what we experience before our birth. Belief in a god also makes the world more black and white, less confusing, and easier to deal with. But, is this any actual proof for the existence of a god? Is comfort a good indicator of the truth of external reality? The universe does not owe us comfort and meaning; we create them ourselves through our various religions. The happiness of credulity is a cheap and dangerous quality. I think that addicts will do or think almost anything to continue getting their fix. Some

people eventually see that freedom from religious addiction is an intellectually and emotionally healthy change, although withdrawal can be painful. An omniscient God is self-refuting and contradictory. However, if God can't forget, he then doesn't know how to remember or recollect. The reasons for these amendments are to keep up with advances in technology, to keep up with advances in human knowledge and to close loopholes. Unfortunately, religions have holy books that have religious codes and are considered the laws of God. This is seen in religions like Christianity and Islam. This means that their holy books would have to be edited for modern times to be relevant. However, these religions claim that their holy books contain eternal truths. Christianity and that their holy book is complete Islam. This creates a problem because we know for a fact that truth is based on evidence and knowledge which both change as time and society progress. The problem is very simple; religious books like the Quran and Bible will continue to be outdated naturally, no matter how many times they are interpreted because laws by nature have to change with the advance of societies and technology or we will be looking at anarchy from loopholes. Why not focus on laws that work? Then he is not omnipotent. Is he able, but not willing? Then he is malevolent. Is he both able and willing? Then whence cometh evil? Is he neither able nor willing? Then why call him God? Religious theists can not answer this question adequately as it provides a great problem with the theory of a "good and just" God. There are four flawed religious answers to these questions 1 God gives man freewill. We shouldn't Judge God based on what man does with his freewill! Such a God knows everything- what will happen and when it will happen- predetermination! Why not Judge people individually rather than kill indiscriminately with floods and disasters? God couldn't find a better way of achieving the greater good than to let children drown in a tsunami - Greater good for who? The societies ravaged by earthquakes? Atheist debunking Christians on Hurricanes and God Re: Every religion currently being practiced on this planet, as well as every past religion which no longer has followers, has a definite, discernible origin in time and space. Even if the exact beginnings of a religion are murky, that religion still originated in a definite area and in a definite time period. However, I argue that any god or gods which existed and which desired to reveal themselves to humanity would not do this - they would not provide a revelation to only one culture, at one time, in one place. There are several good reasons to believe this, and if it holds, then any religion which did have only a single point of origin cannot possibly be true. The fact that all religions originated in one specific culture, at one specific time and place, points strongly to their being the product of that culture, time and place - and not the product of divine revelation. The Argument from Locality is a valid argument against religion for the following reasons: Any deity which desired to be believed in would reveal itself to everyone, not just to a specific person, culture, race or nation. There can be no doubt that any religion that had it right would be universal. Modern science has taught us that all humans are the same on fundamental genetic and cognitive levels and that race is a social construct as much as it is a biological one. In light of these facts, it is not rational to insist that a god - plainly not a creature of biology, with no special ties or allegiance to any subgroup of humanity - would select any single specific people or ethnicity to be its chosen. It can hardly be a coincidence that every religion which claims God has a chosen people was founded by those who claimed they were the chosen people. It therefore follows that any god which founded a religion would probably provide its initial revelation to multiple peoples - preferably scattered throughout time and space, to ensure as wide a distribution of followers as possible - or, failing that, the initial revelation would be given to one group of people with instructions to spread it to others. But there are other points, detailed below, which tell against the second possibility; and while the first possibility would be virtually indisputable evidence of divine origin, it is a possibility which no known religion, present or past, embodies. It would be extraordinary for people from across the globe and throughout history who had no contact with each other to independently invent the exact same religion, without a god giving them all the same information through revelation. But again, this situation describes no religion in existence today or ever. If there is a reward for believing, it is fundamentally unfair that some would receive more and more reliable evidence than others. An example may best elucidate this point. In Christianity, those who believe and worship God as he instructs are rewarded with a blissful eternity in Heaven. But not everyone has an equal chance to attain this reward. But modern skeptics do not have access to this evidence. This cannot be considered fair. Why should God pick a small number of people and overwhelm them with so much first-hand

evidence that their coming to the correct conclusion is virtually assured, while all the rest of us are forced to subsist on scraps of handed-down hearsay? Is salvation like winning the lottery - a matter of luck? How can God be a god of justice if he gives some people a much better chance than others?

### Chapter 4 : Arguments Against Religion – Agnostic/Atheist Reasoning for Disbelief

*Even in societies where freedom of religion is a constitutional right, adherents of religious minorities sometimes voice concerns about religious discrimination against them. Insofar as legal policies are concerned, cases that are perceived as religious discrimination might be the result of an interference of the religious sphere with other.*

Jan 11, issue The critique of religion is not limited to the thought of these three, but it is rather interesting that their wariness and mistrust of religion has been, if not altogether forgotten, almost totally absent from Christian consciousness in the decades following their demise. In order to give concreteness to the subject, I shall quote passages from the writings of all three. The Christian religion too, he writes, "stands under the judgment that religion is unbelief, and is not acquitted by any inward worthiness. Man tries to grasp at truth [by] himself. But in that case he does not do what he has to do when truth comes to him. He does not believe. If he did, he would listen; but in religion he talks. If he did, he would accept a gift; but in religion he takes something for himself. If he did, he would let God Himself intercede for God; but in religion he ventures to grasp at God. Paul Tillich, though he disagreed with Barth on many counts, was at least as sharp in his attack on religion as Barth. In a sermon titled "The Yoke of Religion," based on the statement of Jesus, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden. And so we see in all Christian churches the toiling and laboring of people who are called Christians, serious Christians, under innumerable laws which they cannot fulfill, from which they flee, to which they return, or which they replace by other laws. This is the yoke from which Jesus wants to liberate us. He is more than a priest or a prophet or a religious genius. These all subject us to religion. He frees us from religion. They make new religious laws; He overcomes the religious law. We call Jesus the Christ not because He brought a new religion, but because He is the end of religion, above religion and irreligion, above Christianity and non-Christianity. We spread his call because it is the call to every person in every period to receive the New Being, that hidden saving power in our existence, which takes from us labor and burden, and gives rest to our souls. It is true that Tillich elsewhere is able to use the term religion in a more neutral or sometimes even a positive way, namely, as descriptive of a human striving for meaning and deliverance, to which the revelation in Christ comes as response and resolution. The striving, the longing Sehnsucht for God is for Tillich, as for most of these thinkers, of the essence of human being. Too much religion is entirely too successful in finding, defining and circumscribing the Infinite and in using its convictions to denounce others. It substitutes for the essential otherness and mystery of the divine the doctrinal and moral certitudes that serve precisely the nefarious ends that the atheist Dawkins names. The great caution uttered in the fourth century of the common era by that North African spiritual genius Augustine of Hippo needs to be writ large over all such presumption: The polar opposite of this kind of religious certitude, for those theologians grouped around the misleading term neo-orthodoxy in the 20th century, is faith. Following an ancient exegetical device but giving it a new twist, Bonhoeffer contrasted the two biblical stories of Babel and Pentecost to concretize the difference between religion and faith. In that saga, human beings, terrified by the precariousness of their creaturehood well, human creaturehood is precarious, reach up after divine transcendence in a pathetic and futile effort to secure the future. Their absurd tower, the first as one may say of many such towers, is an attempt, as it were, to get hold of and control the Controller. What they get instead is a still greater consciousness of their finitude and vulnerability: By contrast, Bonhoeffer saw, Pentecost, the spiritual beginnings of the Christian movement described in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, does not depict human beings grasping after the Absolute but rather the divine Spirit descending to and transforming human beings from within, as Jeremiah insisted is the only authentic transformation. Babel, the religious quest, ends in even greater human alienation; Pentecost, the birth of faith, initiates reconciliation even among those who cannot fully understand one another. Why, we may ask, is it important for us today to revisit and reclaim this neo-orthodox critique of religion? We should do so in the first place because this is not just a 20th-century theological invention but a courageous attempt to recover a genuine and unavoidable biblical theme—a theme that transcends religious particularity and finds echoes in all profound experiences of the presence of the holy. Christians lost sight of this critique as soon as the Christian religion took upon

itself the role of religious establishment, and wherever that ambition enters a community of faith—any community of faith—it annuls or corrupts the very experience that gave birth to that community: A religion that wants to commend itself to everyone and to dominate to be Christendom cannot afford to be self-critical. It must be promotional, upbeat, positive! That message is surely unavoidable for all who take scripture seriously; yet Christendom was adept at repressing precisely that message. Such rationalization is, I suspect, characteristic of every religion that seeks to achieve imperial status. The critique of religion is genuine only when the community of faith knows that this critique applies first to itself—that it is part as the First Epistle of St. Peter puts it of "the judgment that begins with the household of faith. Insofar as religion is inherently a kind of grasping, as Barth insisted, it follows that the religious impulse will also engender an inherently competitive and conflictive spirit. A spiritual struggle that is motivated by the desire for finality, certitude and the possession of ultimate verity is not likely to manifest much openness to, or even interest in, other claims to truth. To the contrary, it will foster the type of exclusivity that guards its spiritual treasures zealously, having as it were wrested them from eternity. In every religion, there are vulnerable points—ideas, attitudes or emphases which, under certain historical conditions, are bound to become flash points of conflict. But surely there is no point more redolent of potential violence than this kind of spiritual certitude itself. In a global village where religious disputation no longer limits itself to quarrels within the various historic religions but spills over increasingly into the unprecedented meeting of world religions, every one of them made newly insecure by their felt awareness of one another and of rampant secularity, the greatest flash point of all is inseparable from the religious impulse as such. With its clamoring for ultimacy, its frenetic triumphalism, its incapacity for existential doubt and the entertainment of alternatives, such religion inevitably courts violent opposition. The newly minted atheism of today understands this and capitalizes on it. No one—and certainly not a bevy of smugly atheistic Oxford dons—is going to rid homo sapiens of the religious impulse. Probably faith—by which I mean awe and trust in the presence of the holy—will never be found in easy separation from religion—some religion; but the thoughtfully faithful will nevertheless be able to distinguish between what comes of faith and what comes of religion. And the greatest distinction of all in this contrast will always lie in the readiness of faith, unlike religion, to confess its radical incompleteness and insufficiency—indeed, its brokenness. How could it not do so? As the prophet Isaiah cries in the presence of the holy, "Woe is me! I am lost, for I am a man of unclean lips, and I live among a people of unclean lips" 6: In short, there is an intrinsic modesty in faith, and it has nothing to do with bourgeois politeness or political correctness. Authentic faith can never rest content with itself; it can never extinguish its own existential antithesis, doubt; and it can never assume that it has arrived at its destination—that now it "sees" face to face and not as through a glass darkly 1 Cor. I conclude with a quotation that ought to be heard alongside and in contrast to the quotation from Dawkins with which I began. Dawkins faulted religion precisely because it bolstered the tendency of its already humanly egocentric devotees to believe themselves unassailably right and true. The statement I wish to cite presents a very different image of the human being encountered by "the Eternal Thou" Martin Buber, for it seeks to depict not religion but faith. His name was Jacques Ellul, and this is how he described the posture of faith: Faith is a terribly caustic substance, a burning acid. It puts to the test every element of my life and society; it spares nothing. It leads me ineluctably to question my certitudes, all my moralities, beliefs and policies. It forbids me to attach ultimate significance to any expression of human activity. It detaches and delivers me from money and the family, from my job and my knowledge.

*Religion and its Defects* Organized religion is a facet of society that acts as a frame in the development of an individual, whether growing up with a religious fanatic family or in an atheists structured home the majority of the views expressed are views from one's own family, not his or her own understanding.

Reviewed May In the pantheon of anti-religious deities, Tamas Pataki is small fry. His contribution to the cause does, however, significantly augment the writings of the big four – Dawkins, Harris, Hitchens and Dennett. This is familiar territory: Dawkins has been roundly condemned for generalising about religion based on arguments to do with the loony fringe. It is remarkable, is it not, that these attributes – omnipotence, omniscience, and omnibenevolence – so necessary in the regulation of infantile narcissism and wellbeing, are precisely the key perfections attributed to God. It means that no other person can have dominion over the religious, so they need not fear retribution from others for their own repressed anger and envy. As part of the Elect, they share in the reflected glory of God and become, after all, omniscient and omnipotent. And of course, though they may not know very much, through their sacred text they can access ultimate and infallible knowledge. Keeping women in their place is a punishment and safeguard, a way of dealing with deep-seated frustration and anxiety about mother who is needed and desirable yet ultimately unattainable. Because they are laid down at such a formative stage, the underlying psychological configurations of religion are especially deeply embedded – a fact, says Pataki, which helps to explain the intensity with which the religious hold their views: For many of the religious, any perceived assault on their religion threatens exposure, and is received with fury. But it is not without its problems. The worst typifies the whole Chief among its difficulties is the one already noted, the tendency to tar all religion with the brush of the extreme varieties. He concedes that religion is larger than the beliefs and practices of the religious, but argues nonetheless that narcissistic concerns certainly are central in most religions, and the attempt to indirectly satisfy narcissistic wishes is a fundamental motive to religious confession. In short, the book is misnamed though the fault may rest as much with publishers as with the author. Religion for Pataki is narrowly restricted to its popular expressions: His argument from psychology, as noted above, works well on this level, but I would protest the attempt to excise any sophisticated realism or non-realism from the realm of the religious. Many contemporary thinkers have tried to dispense with the personal attributes of God altogether. Pataki seems to want his religion calcified. How dare we attempt to do what theologians have always tried to do: How silly of us to think of them as religious. Why single out religion? The idea that people should be killed for holding beliefs that are deemed errant and a threat to the faithful is, I believe, an entirely Judeo-Christian-Islamic conception. Absolute and inerrant authority, the demonising of the outsider, the demand for obedience, the illusion of having superior knowledge: Pataki has done us a service in *Against Religion* by helping us to understand fundamentalism in a new light.

### Chapter 6 : Religious discrimination - Wikipedia

*Hello there! this is a thread for all the best atheist arguments against religion/religious doctrines/God. This is a thread for listing/explaining arguments and not a thread for.*

Apr 17, Martin Cohen rated it did not like it What one star? Am I a true believer, and hence biased? After all, this is a book that comes surrounded by a cloud of self-congratulatory flim-flam. The God Argument, by A. Can different roads pass by exactly the same places? Perhaps a wiser thought and a better metaphor would have been: Every publisher must produce its own book explaining the same points about religion, but hope that each sells more than its predecessors. This book however is supposed to be different from the others - a philosophical examination of the arguments. Or perhaps the publisher came up with the name after Grayling submitted it. Although it is full of arguments in one sense: Which means that they are alright. Religion, as presented here, has negligible philosophical content. Rather it consists of hanging homosexuals; beheading or stoning to death adulterous women; subordinating women and children in Bible Belt America. The problem with this reasoning is that there could be another explanation for the bad things - like maybe inbred sexism, or aggressive pursuit of economic self interest. But that, I suppose is sociology. Here we only do logic. Mind you, some claims do look rather sociological, like: What would that be like? Ah, read Part the Second of the book. A list of people advancing science and education, hoping "to see the human liberated from religion and superstition" is offered, starting, of course, Dawkins and Dennett but not Peter Cave and ending with that great humanitarian, Christopher Hitchens. Parmenides, Plato, Confucius, ignorant folk like that, must yield way to those who have seen further. The task of communicating the new knowledge is however complicated by the fact that religion is like "jelly" - constantly shifting position, so that just as you land a good blow on it, it wobbles to another place. Take that, vile Church Times reviewer! Quite so, but what then is the relevance of logical arguments to dismantle the religious edifice? Perhaps that is why the book is rather less about the traditional philosophical arguments although they are rehearsed than it is about belief. Grayling does not believe in religion. Earthquakes cause a lot of suffering. That their gods or the world designed by their gods arbitrarily or otherwise destroyed and killed? No, in that case the agent behind such acts would be seen as evil. But he happily mocks Roman Catholics for hypocrisy in using contraception without feeling the need to acknowledge that many atheists turn up in Church for weddings or funerals. Logicians normally like paradoxes. Grayling discusses abortion at length but never deviates from his simplicities. But it seems he was not looking too hard.

### Chapter 7 : What's the word for being racist against a religion? | Yahoo Answers

*Religious Discrimination Religious discrimination involves treating a person (an applicant or employee) unfavorably because of his or her religious beliefs. The law protects not only people who belong to traditional, organized religions, such as Buddhism, Christianity, Hinduism, Islam, and Judaism, but also others who have sincerely held.*

Whereas religious civil liberties, such as the right to hold or not to hold a religious belief, are essential for Freedom of Religion in the United States secured by the First Amendment , religious discrimination occurs when someone is denied "the equal protection of the laws, equality of status under the law, equal treatment in the administration of justice, and equality of opportunity and access to employment, education, housing, public services and facilities, and public accommodation because of their exercise of their right to religious freedom". United States the U. In this specific case a law against bigamy was not considered to be discriminating against Mormons , who stopped practicing Polygamy in The right to organize publicly supported religious schools was only given to certain Christian denominations, thus tax money used to support a selected group of Christian denominations. The denominational schools could also refuse admission of a student or the hiring of a qualified teacher on purely religious grounds. Quebec has used two school systems, one Protestant and the other Roman Catholic, but it seems this system will be replaced with two secular school systems: Section 93 of the BNA Act offered constitutional protection for denominational schools as they existed in law at the time of Confederation. Like "Public schools", Catholic schools are fully funded from kindergarten to grade However, profound demographic changes of the past few decades have made the province of Ontario a multicultural, multi-racial, and multi-religious society. The thought that one religious group is privileged to have schools funded from the public purse is becoming unacceptable in a pluralistic, multicultural, secular society. Scientology in Germany Scientologists in Germany face specific political and economic restrictions. German federal and state interior ministers started a process aimed at banning Scientology in late , but abandoned the initiative a year later, finding insufficient legal grounds. Despite this, polls suggest that most Germans favor banning Scientology altogether. The Muslim minority alleges that Greece persistently and systematically discriminates against Muslims. Results indicate that religious minorities experience employment bias Moreover, religious minorities face greater constraints on occupational access in more prestigious jobs compared to less prestigious jobs. Occupational access and entry wage bias is highest for religious minority women. State department on Mexico note that "some local officials infringe on religious freedom, especially in the south". Sunni Muslims have also fallen victim to persecution from the majority Shia population of Iraq, which may have led to the ISIS invasion. Please improve it by verifying the claims made and adding inline citations. Statements consisting only of original research should be removed. May Learn how and when to remove this template message Historically, religious discrimination in Turkey has been a serious issue, with the Armenian , Greek , and Assyrian Genocides all occurring there. Discrimination has continued in the Syrian Civil War. In one instance, Turkey allowed members of Al Nusra , a radical Islamic terror group that controls land in Syria, to enter through their border, and then into the majority Armenian Christian town of Kessab , which is right on the Turkishâ€™Syrian border. They proceeded to take their captives to the Turkish city of Iskenderun. Religious discrimination in Pakistan Religious discrimination in Pakistan is a serious issue. Several incidents of discrimination have been recorded with some finding support by the state itself. In a case of constitutionally sanctioned religious discrimination, non-Muslims in Pakistan cannot become Prime Minister of President , even if they are Pakistani citizens.

### Chapter 8 : Pataki, Tamas - Against Religion

*If you see religious people use religion as their weapon of choice against atheism or deism etc and you see adoption of religion as being part of an individual's free choice then you might be more likely to want to attack the company that produces the weapon rather than limit the free choice of the individual.*

Despite believing in Gods, Lucretius, like Epicurus, felt that religion was born of fear and ignorance, and that understanding the natural world would free people of its shackles. Voltaire complained about Jews killed by other Jews for worshiping a golden calf and similar actions, he also condemned how Christians killed other Christians over religious differences and how Christians killed Native Americans for not being baptised. Voltaire claimed the real reason for these killings was that Christians wanted to plunder the wealth of those killed. Voltaire was also critical of Muslim intolerance. Hume claimed that natural explanations for the order in the universe were reasonable, see design argument. Their books and articles have spawned debate in multiple fields of inquiry and are heavily quoted in popular media online forums, YouTube, television and popular philosophy. In *The End of Faith*, philosopher Sam Harris focuses on violence among other toxic qualities of religion. In *Breaking the Spell*, philosopher Daniel Dennett focuses on the question of "why we believe strange things". In *The God Delusion*, biologist Richard Dawkins covers almost every facet of religion injecting both snarky irony and humor. In *God Is Not Great*, journalist and polemicist Christopher Hitchens focused on how religious forces attacks human dignity and the corruption of religious organizations. In the *Oxford Handbook of Atheism*, according to Thomas Zenc the four books were published during a time of intense debate on political, religious and sociological questions. The works share many common themes yet notably differ in scope, style and content. While according to Zenc the beginnings of a broader narrative New Atheism seems to have emerged it does not, stand up to the full definition of a movement. Religion and Definition of religion Today, religion is broadly conceived as an abstraction which entails beliefs, doctrines and sacred places—even though the ancient and medieval cultures that produced religious texts, like the Bible or the Quran, did not have such conceptions or ideas in their languages, cultures, or histories. Religion as a modern Western concept developed from the 17th century onwards. Criticism of religious concepts[ edit ] See also: However, we feel that religion even in moderation provides a foundation for fanatical groups to thrive" [20] Some criticisms of monotheistic religions have been: Religion is wrong as it is in conflict with science i. Genesis creation myth [21] Conflicting claims about the one true faith also see argument from inconsistent revelations. Development of religion Dennett and Harris have asserted that theist religions and their scriptures are not divinely inspired, but man made to fulfill social, biological and political needs. Narratives to provide comfort and meaning[ edit ] David Hume argued that religion developed as a source of comfort in the face of the adversity, not as an honest grappling with verifiable truth. Religion is therefore an unsophisticated form of reasoning. As such, they may have served several important functions in ancient societies. Examples include the views many religions traditionally had towards solar and lunar eclipses and the appearance of comets forms of astrology. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people. It is in the interest of the ruling classes to instill in the masses the religious conviction that their current suffering will lead to eventual happiness. In this perspective, Marx saw religion as escapism. Original sin, he argued, convinces people that the source of their misery lies in the inherent and unchangeable "sinfulness" of humanity rather than in the forms of social organization and institutions, which Marx argued can be changed through the application of collective social planning. They conclude that people with such disorders have had a monumental influence on civilization. Pickover found evidence suggesting that temporal lobe epilepsy may be linked to a variety of so-called spiritual or "other worldly" experiences, such as spiritual possession, originating from altered electrical activity in the brain. Science as a Candle in the Dark, presented his case for the miraculous sightings of religious figures and modern sightings of UFOs coming from the same mental disorder. Psilocybin from mushrooms affect regions of the brain including the serotonergic system, which generating a sense of strong religious meaning, unity and ecstasy. Certain physical rituals may generate similar feelings. Ridgway,

Philosopher Auguste Comte posited that many societal constructs pass through three stages and that religion corresponds to the two earlier, or more primitive stages by stating: The law is this: Exorcism and Faith healing

A detailed study in found instances of deaths of children due to religion-based medical neglect. Jerusalem syndrome Jerusalem has loaned its name to a unique psychological phenomenon where Jewish or Christian individuals who develop obsessive religious themed ideas or delusions sometimes believing themselves to be Jesus Christ or another prophet will feel compelled to travel to Jerusalem. Of these, were admitted to hospital. On average, such tourists have been seen annually, 40 of them requiring admission to hospital. About 2 million tourists visit Jerusalem each year. Kalian and Witztum note that as a proportion of the total numbers of tourists visiting the city, this is not significantly different from any other city. Honor killings and stoning Honor killings once well known in the Western are now extremely rare however they still occur in other parts of the world. An honor is when a person is killed by family for bringing dishonor or shame upon the family. As of September , stoning is a punishment that is included in the laws in some countries including Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Yemen, the United Arab Emirates, and some states in Nigeria [67] as punishment for zina al-mohsena "adultery of married persons". In , the Iranian judiciary officially placed a moratorium on stoning. Though no first tier religious texts prescribe the practice, some practitioners do believe there is religious support for it. While it is mostly found in Muslim countries it is also practiced by some Christian and Animist countries mostly in Africa. GFA is not widely practiced in some Muslim countries making it difficult to separate religion from culture. Some religious leaders promote it, some consider it irrelevant to religion, and others contribute to its elimination". The practice is illegal in all Western countries and it is also illegal to transport a girl to another country to carry out FGM. Multiple parents have been charged for committing this crime in the United Kingdom with those charged being exclusively from Muslim countries. As such, some have argued that failure to circumcise a baby boy may be unethical because it diminishes his right to good health. Surveys suggest a strong link between faith and altruism. A cross-national investigation on subjective well-being has noted that, globally, religious people are usually happier than nonreligious people, though nonreligious people also reach high levels of happiness. Despite honor killings occurring in multiple cultures and religions Islam is frequently blamed for their institution and persistence. Steven Weinberg , for example, states it takes religion to make good people do evil. Results can vary from mild discrimination to outright genocide. During the 19th century, the conflict thesis developed. According to this model, any interaction between religion and science must inevitably lead to open hostility, with religion usually taking the part of the aggressor against new scientific ideas. In addition, some historians contend that religious organizations figure prominently in the broader histories of many sciences, with many of the scientific minds until the professionalization of scientific enterprise in the 19th century being clergy and other religious thinkers. Recent examples of tensions have been the creation-evolution controversy , controversies over the use of birth control , opposition to research into embryonic stem cells , or theological objections to vaccination , anesthesia and blood transfusion.

### Chapter 9 : Quick Arguments Against Religion - Think Atheist

*"Religious fanatic" is the word to define that person who is sure that only his religious truth is actually true, and who dismisses all others as being false, and every person who does not follow his religion as being an infidel.*