

I am aware this is late and I would appreciate consideration regards extension of time.

For your consideration of a submission to the Inquiry into Multiculturalism in Australia.

The nature of the submission particularly relates to a request a Bill of Rights be incorporated as quickly as possible to protect women in particular and new citizens from being framed by a violent irrational text which is even now causing the requirement for vast scarce resources to be diverted to protect the security of its citizens which could be used for health, infrastructure , education, etc.

SHARIA LAW A TOTAL DISREGARD FOR THE AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTION AND IT'S INTENT

"Regards "Muslims use multiculturalism to push for sharia" by Patricia Karvelas THE AUSTRALIAN May 17 2011

Plato had some very good advice regards text informing evil outcomes and we should take it on board now before it is too late or we will reap a terrible harvest for our apathy.

Commonwealth of Australia Act 1900

116. Commonwealth not to legislate in respect of religion The Commonwealth shall not make any law for establishing any religion, or for imposing any religious observance, or for prohibiting the free exercise of any religion, and no religious tenets shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust under the Commonwealth.

Clearly the request by Muslims to incorporate Islamic Sharia law is in total disregard for the Australian Constitution and its intent. For no established a recognized state religion which would be in essence what would occur if a Religions dogma is incorporated into State law. Also it enforces by Sate imposition a religious observance as Sharia Law is an integral part of Muslim religion not a separate entity in its own right.

Still the constitution should be changed to make it absolutely clear Sharia law or any other Religions dogma will not be incorporated into law to inform differing judicial outcomes for the same crime or process.

The fact is once this Rubicon is crossed there is no going back as we have seen in other countries such as Malaysia, Indonesia and now Turkey where Islamic ethics are informing legislative action counter to enabling the maximum relative independence of the individual citizen particularly women.

Do we really want in a Democracy the following excerpts from not all the foundation chapter of the Quran regards Other "THE COW" – not even looking at the rest of the terrible vitriolic Islamic text against Other in the Quran. Are we to allow the proven building blocks of genocide against Other, we have seen since the seventh century, informing our Australian Societal Template.

"rejecters of Faith!" = Deaf, dumb, and blind, they are the fools, in utter darkness, deceive themselves, their hearts is a disease, hangout with their evil ones, wander like blind ones, bartered Guidance for

error, lost true direction, in utter darkness, make mischief therein and shed blood, transgressors, Be ye apes, despised and rejected., ignorant (fool)!, illiterates, do nothing but conjecture, seek gain in evil, God's curse is on them for their blasphemy, sold their souls, in insolent envy, wrong-doers, most greedy of life, idolaters, perverse, blasphemers, buyers of (magic), they conceal, evil-doers, in schism, wrong, wickedness, .. etc

We really want this as a part of our Australian culture informing new citizens what their opinion should be of fellow non-adherents citizens and even informing, as we have seen inter Muslim conflict because other Muslim sects are seen as 'rejecters of the" True "Faith". We have all seen the evil outcomes of this thinking as it grows in other countries as it informs increased evil against Other particularly women.

Why allow it here? – change the Australian Constitution to make sure Sharia Law cannot be introduced in Australia.

What Is More Important Wealth Or Society's Happiness, Harmony And Security

In regards to immigration debate there is no such thing as a non-discriminatory immigration policy as there is no such thing as Freedom – Why pretend there is? The mere existence of an 'immigration policy' dictates discrimination or promotion of a select group, class of people's whether it is economic or otherwise. In fact Societies set up 'immigration policies' purposefully to be discriminatory.

What's wrong in stipulating an immigration policy which as its first principle promotes happiness harmony and security by demanding new immigrants accept enabling the relative maximum independence of others first as Australians guiding foundation ethic and theirs rather than Revelations from a demented violent conduit of a non-existent supernatural being whose tenets clearly inform Societal schism not common purpose within a pluralistic Democratic society.

'Immigration Policy' is simply a Societies rules for joining like any other of Societies entities secular or religious. The question here is what are more important wealth or society's happiness, harmony and security? As a person's lack of, or existence of economic valued qualities of wealth and /or skills are positive and negative on an economy of a State, is it not also of equal importance, if not much more, the presence or absence of belief in certain tenets which deliver good or evil impacts within Society and therefore must be addressed within immigration policy with at least equal vigor and diligence?

Clearly existing Societies citizens have the right and an obligation to effectively address and reject those whose culture is diametrically opposed to its foundation ethics. The idea of allowing Multiculturalism and Freedom of Religion to go unchallenged to enable the preservation an ethic of cultural vilification and 'grievous harm' against other which in fact destroys societal harmony and security is a gross absurdity.

What needs to happen is text be it secular or religious which vilifies other and justifies grievous harm, which seeks to undermine women's rights needs to be challenged and deleted from forming the basis for instruction of new citizens.

Also a bill of rights which specifically defines and enables judicial penalties against entities whose textual constructs contain such notions be created.

As well our immigration policy require any new Australian citizen to be accepted only on the proviso they sign up to and continue to abide with the notions contained within that bill of rights or they are booted out of our society.

In creating the Bill of Rights it is important that we no longer utilize Religious based authority to inform its contents as these same religious entities whole purpose is to stop dead the creation of any Societal template which is counter their own so called divinely revealed through Man Revelations. The Insanity of allowing Religions the main input into such a document is because they are the actual creators of this insidious bigotry against Other in the first place.

RELIGIOUS AND THE STATE MUST REMAIN IMMUTABLY SEPARATE

The Religious and the State must remain immutably separate so insanity is not allowed to once again overwhelm reason and citizens become subject to inequitable strictures based on tawdry Man made Revelations derived from a supernatural being. This is very important because invariably women are the subject of these strictures given God was manufactured in the first place to give authority to Mans timely self-serving Revelations woman was indeed worth less and to institutionalize the violence necessary to maintain such an irrational state of affairs of women being subject to Mans will – in all things. The nature of rape and inequity in the workplace are just two of the myriad of examples derived from such irrationally derived Religious text which places women subservient to man.

Do we want an Australia where for ALL women there is an equal opportunity with Man to drive home from a fulfilling day at a career of their choice and be able to determine herself as to the manner and timing of engaging in sexual activity or any other activity for that matter or condemn some or all of women to the following by not making sure new citizens are given the intellectual space themselves to determine their own beliefs rather than have them imposed?

As legislators it is your response now which will determine one or the other – History awaits.

Men have affairs because wives neglect their responsibilities, MP tells parliament April 8, 2011 SMH

Malaysian men have extramarital sex because of "wives who neglect their responsibilities" to their husbands, a Malaysian MP has told his country's Parliament, outraging women's groups.

"Husbands driving home after work see things that are sexually arousing and go to their wives to ease their urges," said independent lawmaker Ibrahim Ali, according to online portal Malaysiakini.

"But when they come home to their wives, they will say, 'wait, I'm cooking,' or 'wait, I'm getting ready to visit relatives,'" Mr Ibrahim said.doctorate

Mr Ibrahim heads Perkasa, a right-wing Malay nationalist group, seeking to protect ethnic Malay dominance in politics.

His strident comments came as he asked about plans by the government's religious development department to educate wives on their responsibilities.

Wives "failing in their duties" pushed men to go to "private places to satisfy their urges", he said.

Malaysian men have extramarital sex because of "wives who neglect their responsibilities" to their husbands, a Malaysian MP has told his country's Parliament, outraging women's groups.

"Husbands driving home after work see things that are sexually arousing and go to their wives to ease their urges," said independent lawmaker Ibrahim Ali, according to online portal Malaysiakini.

"But when they come home to their wives, they will say, 'wait, I'm cooking,' or 'wait, I'm getting ready to visit relatives,'" Mr Ibrahim said.

"IN ISLAM, WIVES ARE SUPPOSED TO STOP EVERYTHING TO FULFIL THEIR HUSBAND'S DEMANDS."

Mr Ibrahim heads Perkasa, a right-wing Malay nationalist group, seeking to protect ethnic Malay dominance in politics.

His strident comments came as he asked about plans by the government's religious development department to educate wives on their responsibilities.

Wives "failing in their duties" pushed men to go to "private places to satisfy their urges", he said.

There is no such thing as Freedom only the relative independence nature and fellow humans allow.

It is in enabling the maximized relative independence of other first that we can maximize our own independence.

There appears to be a direct correlation between the level of subjugation of women in a religion and the amount of fear and terror required to maintain it. In other words the greater the relative independence of women in any societal construct the greater the reduction in violence projected internally and externally to maintain the societal structure. i.e. Increased women's rights = Increased security and peaceful coexistence for all.

Also there seems to be a proportional inverse relationship between violence and fear generated externally and internally with the believability of a text utilized as a Societal template to create it and subsequently maintain it.

An interesting study would be the into the background unstated level of threatened and real violence of the Male Female relationships informed by Religious based ethics – which may explain why women are not only always feeling guilty but always saying sorry. Good for Man to finally realise his place in this.

The Enabling of any Cultures Religion to dictate Australian Societal norms will be the deathnell of independence for a portion or all of Australians – particularly women.

Was GOD created by Man to enforce his sexual gratification upon women and inform Mans belief, and even secular text, women are worth less and therefore fair game?

I came to this conclusion - Yes - on seeing a recent photo of some 15 Muslim women in Saudi Arabia demonstrating in the streets covered from head to toe without even being able to discern the place were their eyes should be.

The nature of how these chains were applied via the generation of Religious text justifying women's subjugation to Man is clearly revealed in Mohammad's opportune Revelations, after the fact, to justify his actions regards women.

Anyone today reflecting on a Male today suddenly having so called Revelations from a God to justify such behavior would be rightly given short shrift and a white coat. But Mohammed was only building on a tradition based on an ancient text which had centuries before jettisoned the inconvenient notion God had a female partner. One can only imagine the fundamental change this meant to the nature of God was informed in the same manner of Mohammad's timely fortuitous and self-serving Revelations.

It is not new Religious or Secular leaders taking advantage of their positions of power.

"THE HEAD of Canberra's Tibetan Buddhist community has apologized to members of the society after allegations he had sexual relations with several women from the group.. Lama Choedak told the group that rather than being angry, they should use the experience to improve themselves." Canberra Times 1-5-2011

Errr.. 'use the experience to improve themselves' – Am I really so far from the truth of the matter?

Who could blame Man, from such positions of power, regards such sacred unchallengeable Revelations, other than an ethically inclined person informed by twenty first century women's rights, to make such notions permanent for their own convenience? Which clearly Man has otherwise would the following and millions of examples like them occur?

Just two of the many Mohammed examples, which inform the terrible circumstance of women in the Quran relative to men, of how Men down the ages have turned lies into fact because of so called Revelations from a supreme invisible unchallengeable being:

"Since Muslims were limited to four wives and Mohammed had 11, it took a divine message to explain the difference. The Revelation was received when Mohammed had nine wives, not counting the slave-girls." Informing Mohammed "We (God) have

made lawful to you the wives ...slave-girls ... other women who gave themselves to you... This privilege is yours alone, being granted to no other believer."

"Mohammed had promised Hafsa, one of his wives that he would no longer sleep with a Coptic slave, but he was (who couldn't tell this would happen) subsequently discovered with her." Mohammed then heard the following message "Prophet why do you prohibit that which Allah has made lawful to you, in seeking to please your wives. Allah is forgiving and merciful. Allah has given you absolution from such oaths."

Etc.. "The Popular Encyclopedia of World Religions", Richard Wolff , 2007

Yes it all true-yet a significant number of women persist in the belief these types of Revelations are actually truly from a God and not from what are in fact Misogynistic, Lying, unfaithful, twofaced-Men.

CNN, April 5, 2011 "The attempt to discredit al-Obeidy as a promiscuous, un-Islamic woman ties into the idea of sexual shaming in a conservative Muslim society where it's commonly believed that a woman who has been raped has lost her honor, said Mona Eltahawy, a columnist on Arab and Muslim issues."

NYT, April 4,2011 Bangladesh: Islamist Strike Shuts Cities:, "Schools and businesses were shut in the main cities on Monday as a hard-line Islamist group enforced a general strike demanding the adoption of Islamic law and the scrapping of a new government policy that gives women equal rights to inheritance."

Al Jazeera 21 Apr 2011 20:09: Pakistani court upholds gang-rape acquittals "All but one of six suspects freed in case of Mukhtaran Mai, who was gang-raped in the name of "honor", Five men accused of gang-raping a Pakistani woman in 2002 under orders from a village council have been acquitted by the supreme court of the country, their lawyer says. Following the judgment, Mai said she had "lost faith" in the legal system, and she was now worried that the acquitted men would harm her.

Farzana Bari of Centre for Gender Studies at Qaid-I-Azam University in Islamabad, told Al Jazeera: "The kind of lacunae we have in our criminal justice system, it is not geared to provide justice to women who are especially victims of sexual violence."

"In Islam, wives are supposed to stop everything to fulfill their husband's demands." Malaysian MP tells parliament April 8, 2011 SMH. The article made it plain the MP was in major part talking about sex.

Bin Laden's wives -- and daughter who would 'kill enemies of Islam'. By Brian Todd and Tim Lister, CNN May 9, 2011 "In keeping with conservative Sunni tradition, the wedding celebrations were an all-male affair."

"all-male affair" - Now is it not abundantly clear this is a Religious text create by Man for Man - where I ask is the Other important half in this equation - an equation of equality not an equation of misogyny which such actions clearly display.

Etc.. -You know many more examples.

What better way than having women believe a supreme power and not something as unimpressive or unconvincing as Man demands women be subject to Mans wants.

God clearly was and is a trick.

Not being able to rationally convince women they should be subject to Mans whim some misogynistic male bright spark happened across frightening women with the unknown as a way of getting what he wanted – God.

What better foil – It's not me a mere male it is God the Supreme Authority who has given me authority over you – dare you disobey God the Almighty? – apart from me smiting you down wait until Gods finished with you.

Probably invented on Aprils fools day 10,000 BL (Before Logic)

We really have to rewrite religious text and the secular based on it to get rid of this very bad joke once and for all.

So all this time you thought as I had there was some noble rather than utilitarian point to GOD – turns out sadly GOD is simply another deceitful advertising gimmick to sucker in the venerable.

Also please note there appears to be a direct correlation between the level of subjugation of women in a religion and the amount of fear and terror required to maintain it. In other words the greater the relative independence of women in any societal construct the greater the reduction in violence projected internally and externally to maintain the societal structure. i.e. Increased women's rights = Increased security and peaceful coexistence for all.

(I have also come to the conclusion there is a proportional inverse relationship between violence and fear generated externally and internally with the believability of a text utilized as a Societal template to create it and subsequently maintain it – but that is another story.)

God was created by Man to be the unchallengeable authority in confirming Mans view at a particular point in time regards relationships both with the environment and more importantly each other. Clearly Man needs to revise a despicable error not only in text but in the thoughts and actions it informs – God /Man has no authority to deem women as less and treat women so despicably.

Change the Text or Change Nothing.

Another example how Man has utilized and is utilizing Religion, a connection to an unchallengeable spirit world, and exploited and continue to exploit women's faith in a lie the notion of God(s) which enable Man to exploit Mans own erroneously textual constructed special connection to God(s) to manipulate women for their own sexual gratification as did Mohammed above as well as the Buddhist Priest.

This time a "holy man" with Christian connections – a Tony Golossian, a Syrian-born Catholic with his co-accused, Arthur Psychogios and his wife Frances Psychogio.

"A Sydney "holy man" who repeatedly raped two women during religious prayer sessions has been sentenced to 15 years in jail."

"His co-accused, Arthur Psychogios, was also convicted of raping the women and jailed for 12 years."

"His wife Frances Psychogios was jailed for nine years for her part in the crimes."

"Judge Penelope Hock said the men had carried out a deliberate and calculated plan to take advantage of the women's vulnerability and their faith."

"The offenders orchestrated an elaborate plan designed to exploit beliefs deeply held by (the women) regarding (their) religion and culture," Crown prosecutor Ms Huggett said.

"In prayer sessions between 2001 and 2008, demonic voices told the women that if they did not participate, their families would fall ill and die."

"TWO women have cried while telling a judge how their lives were shattered from being forced into sex "prayer sessions" to rid themselves of black-magic curses."

"The terrified Greek Orthodox women were told black-magic curses were placed on them and their families involving cancer, reproductive problems and horrific fatal accidents."

ABC May 6, 2011, 2:52 pm, 7pm TV News NSW Fri May 6, 2011 1:24pm AEST,
THE AUSTRALIAN April 01, 2011 5:32PM

The most important point I am trying to show are the psychological mechanisms by which Religion has been framed specifically to enable advantage of Man be it one specific case as in Mohammed's revelation he was entitled to more women than anyone else or more as in this case were another man (men) also took advantage of women's faith in a lie.

The lie being Man is connected directly to a God(s) who can actually deliver worldly benefit or disaster.

Also it points to the fact-so what if others are promoting the belief to be true whether it be one or Billions does it make it so. Particularly when we see how these self-serving beliefs have been arrived at by the exploitation of particularly women in the societal construct. Even other women themselves participating in the lie as we see above does not make it any truer.

How often have we seen women in particular being cursed for their behavior and the fact told explicitly women's non-compliance with a Mans defined religious text will bring harm on their families and even earthquakes to their communities.

Do we not see in the Quran "THE COW" for Mohammad again through self-serving Revelation provide the authority on earth derived from God to apply such curses to those deemed to act against the Islamic defines societal textual template.

Are these curses not reflected in a Muslim cultures shouts of 'Death to...' and Muslim clerics accusations certain women are 'meat', down through groups to family households where women are being threatened not only with Islamic authorized physical violence of beatings but of erroneously being shamed but even threatened as with the above "holy man" with calamity not only on themselves but their families and communities?

Face it there are even beliefs each of us have at this very moment which if we looked closely enough are based on a false premise fed to us by somebody or other.

The above is exactly the way notions contained in religious text were formed. Clearly "men had carried out a deliberate and calculated plan to take advantage of the women's vulnerability and their faith" to take advantage of women sexually and otherwise to inform the despicable notion Man is master and women are worth less.

Change the Text or Change Nothing.

Wasted Opportunity for Real Change:

Religion Must Elevate, Not Violate or Discriminate: Concluding Statement of The Carter Center Human Rights Defenders Forum,

April 56, 2011

<http://www.cartercenter.org/resources/pdfs/news/pr/hrd-forum-2011-full-statement.pdf>

Human Rights and Religious Leaders Call on Religious Leadership to Stand for Equal Rights for Girls and Women

Religions do discriminate because religions are the humans which constitute the religion. Religious text which forms the ethics base by which these Humans interact with the world textually discriminate against women.

Although I understand the importance of what is trying to be achieved here clearly you have missed an opportunity to actually change anything. The reason being the real culprit which informs new citizens has been left untouched to continue its heinous task of setting one against other be they male or female – Religious text - be its interpretation be it misconstrued or not, its existence unamended will continue to be the cause of unfathomable human grief.

"It's not religions that discriminate, but humans," said Abdullahi An-Naim, Emory Law School professor and expert on Islam and human rights, who attended the conference. "It is the people who interpret the Holy Scriptures."

Religions do discriminate because religions are the humans which constitute the religion. Religions are not inanimate objects. Without any humans a religion would cease to exist.

This type of argument may validly be stretched to an inanimate object a Gun. It is said Guns do not kill Humans, Humans do. Even then, clearly if we did not have Guns one significant means of murder would be removed. Also when a Gun is used to kill a Human clearly a Gun was used to kill the person therefore a Gun as an integral composition of the act means Guns do in fact kill humans.

Religions do discriminate because unlike a Gun an inanimate object, which does not come with inherent instructions Religions inform action based on Religious text.

Religions are not inanimate objects. Religions are embodiments of ethical templates for living, breathing, thinking humans which inform their actions for and against other. These templates for living come directly from textual constructs within Religious text.

Unlike a Gun which requires an external force derived from an external idea to cause it to fire Religions are the idea and the force in one. For human action is derived by being insinuated in religion love, hate, discrimination etc are the outcomes.

It is the Religious text informing human ethics which drives actions for and against other.

The statement made above by Abdullahi An-Naim is not only gratuitous but obscene for it is so clearly a fallacious lie that religious texts do not lay the hard ground work for the edifice of discrimination against women.

The fact is religious humans discriminate against women. To separate the religious dogma which forms the actual ethics base which forms the ideas, motivation and subsequent appalling action against women is such an abuse of logic as to be laughable if it was not so serious.

The fact is if the religious text did not itself, formed by humans, create the textual construct which forms the moral base for each new citizen from generation to generation to enable the discrimination we would clearly be free from what are clearly major impediments to Women's right to equality Religious text.

Religions to this day enable the most appalling against other derived from Religious foundation text which must be identified amended or deleted. Until this is done such gratuitous statements made in the Concluding Statement of The Carter Center Human Rights Defenders Forum, April 56, 2011.

This is not to say secular discrimination does not exist but the fact is there is a clear link between secular notions developed based on the religious notions of discrimination. I contend I believe justifiably the two are not mutually exclusive because major religious texts have contributed significantly to the secular vision of women.

Religious leaders such as Abdullahi An-Naim are going to have to face the fact religions are responsible for discrimination against other particularly against women because religious templates for life do so. Identify this text against other then change the Religious and Secular foundation texts which inform each new generation or very little changes.

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/middleeast/2011/03/2011310185818570316.html>

<http://english.aljazeera.net/programmes/everywoman/2008/05/2008615165711906854.html>

Men have affairs because wives neglect their responsibilities, MP tells parliament
April 8, 2011 SMH

Malaysian men have extramarital sex because of "wives who neglect their responsibilities" to their husbands, a Malaysian MP has told his country's Parliament, outraging women's groups.

"Husbands driving home after work see things that are sexually arousing and go to their wives to ease their urges," said independent lawmaker Ibrahim Ali, according to online portal Malaysiakini.

"But when they come home to their wives, they will say, 'wait, I'm cooking,' or 'wait, I'm getting ready to visit relatives,'" Mr Ibrahim said.

Mr Ibrahim heads Perkasa, a right-wing Malay nationalist group, seeking to protect ethnic Malay dominance in politics.

His strident comments came as he asked about plans by the government's religious development department to educate wives on their responsibilities.

Wives "failing in their duties" pushed men to go to "private places to satisfy their urges", he said.

Malaysian men have extramarital sex because of "wives who neglect their responsibilities" to their husbands, a Malaysian MP has told his country's Parliament, outraging women's groups.

"Husbands driving home after work see things that are sexually arousing and go to their wives to ease their urges," said independent lawmaker Ibrahim Ali, according to online portal Malaysiakini.

"But when they come home to their wives, they will say, 'wait, I'm cooking,' or 'wait, I'm getting ready to visit relatives,'" Mr Ibrahim said.

"IN ISLAM, WIVES ARE SUPPOSED TO STOP EVERYTHING TO FULFIL THEIR HUSBAND'S DEMANDS."

Mr Ibrahim heads Perkasa, a right-wing Malay nationalist group, seeking to protect ethnic Malay dominance in politics.

His strident comments came as he asked about plans by the government's religious development department to educate wives on their responsibilities.

Wives "failing in their duties" pushed men to go to "private places to satisfy their urges", he said.

Compare the above with this below.

This appears to support my theory:

"The degree of violence generated externally and internally regards any societal construct is proportional to the degree this same construct dictates women be subject to the demands of Man."

Kalasha: Happiest people in Pakistan?

Sexually liberated women, colorful clothes and lots of festivals -- happiness comes easy to this animist tribe living in Chitral

By Jini Reddy 28 March, 2011 CNN

Read more: Kalasha: Happiest people in Pakistan? | CNNGo.com
<http://www.cnn.go.com/mumbai/life/kalasha-happiest-people-pakistan-261067#comment-185647009#ixzz1JkQTQ3jf>

"Gul Sayed, 25, sports a grin a mile wide as she hugs me, a lone foreigner in her home. She is a member of the Kalasha, a peace-loving pagan tribe living in the remote villages that lie between Northern Pakistan's Chitral Valley and the Afghan border. .. -- numbering around 3,000 -- prefers to make love, not war.

Proud of their warm, caring, crime-free culture, these could just be the happiest people in Pakistan.

We sing, gossip and sew. No chores— Gul Sayed, member of Kalasha"

Sexually free

Loveless liaisons hold no appeal for the spirited Kalasha women: "We choose our husbands, and if they don't treat us well, or it doesn't work out, we can leave and find a new partner," says Gul, as her two friends, teenage mothers Farida and Asmar, nod and blush.

Nothing to shout about if you're a Western woman, but under rural Pakistan's strict Islamic code, it's a radical divergence from the norm.

Year round, the Kalasha dance their way through a stream of festivals and rituals, and socially and culturally, theirs appears to be a joyful existence.

The only shadow on their rich, textured lives are the attitudes of some local Muslims towards their beliefs.

"They call us 'Kafirs,' unbelievers," says Gul, who like many of the Kalasha are fearful of their Islamic compatriots who live outside the valleys.

In years gone by the Kalasha were threatened with forcible conversion to Islam, now the tribe receives government protection, improved health and education services, and -- bar an

isolated incident when a Greek volunteer was kidnapped by the Taliban in 2009 and later released -- are largely untouched by the region's political troubles."

Now let's take the nature of women's condition of either side of Gul Sayed above of women not only in Pakistan and Afghanistan but in a supposed advanced Asian state as Malaysia - notice the very profound difference.

Does it start to make sense?

The greater the degree of women's independence in any society the greater the potential for peace and harmony external and internal. That is, be it based on a religious or secular textual construct the maximized independence of women is very critical to the level of peace and harmony for all.

This also leads to a linked conclusion the sole purpose of the violence is to preserve the relative subjugation of women and not as is falsely claimed to protect some notion of a religion other than as it relates to women.

It also leads to the most profound answer to a question -- Why did Man create GOD.

I will leave this one to you.

Discovery News > History News > God's Wife Edited Out of the Bible -- Almost

GOD'S WIFE EDITED OUT OF THE BIBLE -- ALMOST

God's wife, Asherah, was a powerful fertility goddess, according to a theologian.

By Jennifer Viegas

Fri Mar 18, 2011 07:00 AM ET

<http://news.discovery.com/history/god-wife-yahweh-asherah-110318.html>

'uncomfortable conclusion' what an understatement.

It is really a profound and when you think of it an obvious progression which aligns with the changed definition of GOD enabling MAN to enforce his will on women. If there was any question of equal status and power this could not possibly work.

I have been working on the idea GOD was created by Man to control women for Mans own purposes and this fits into a evolutionary act to justify the unjustifiable a GOD Male hermaphrodite so Man can present himself as closer to GODs image and in fact a Male GOD— no wonder Religions need fear of the spirit world of devils and such like, hells of various levels and when this fails, exclusion at the least to 'grevious harm' to enforce their Religious fantasia notions for clearly reason ceases to exist.

Maybe the Male ownership of GOD was more in the mode of a corporation take over.

Clearly this was a point where MAN sought to own GOD and what utilitarian purpose would this be for and who would be the losers?

It also underlines clearly these so called foundation texts are nothing like it at all but fabricated versions of a personal opinion at various times in history which have dramatically changed the notions of womens position in society and their relative power to determine their own future.

Having not studied the period who knows what womens relative power was, dependent I suppose on the textual construct of Asherah's relationship to Yahweh (GOD). It would appear there was still a clear hierarchy with Asherah's subservient toYahweh.

But clearly the status of women would not have been improved by ditching duality for Male monotheism. It certainly has informed the current position of women in a clearly negative way.

Man has certainly by this act itself moved to control the notion of God for Mans benefit.

It is time for humanity to once again revisit these religious texts and set the record straight from a twenty first century humans rights perspective particularly as the text relates to the subjugation of women and the vilification and justified 'grevious harm' against other.

The religious and secular need to get together identify this evil text amend or delete it for the sake of current and future generations so Hate of other and the subjugation of women becomes a thing of the past.

The other very important fact which this reveals is the false notion of infallibility of foundation text. For what has been shown to occur is the supposed infallible text has been altered to change the nature of God quite dramatically which is impossible.

Reply

True Believer says: 12:10pm | 08/04/11

To which of the many “gods” do you refer. There are any number - I think the Hindus have some thousands. Would be helpful if you designated which you are referring to. Thank you. Cheers.

Reply

says: 12:46pm | 08/04/11

says:

It is a generic quality situated at the core of religious text whatever wafts about it terms of phantoms are superfluous. Gods can be for whatever aspect of informing human behavior - what I am referring to are the core values as they pertain to women within religious texts which invariably have women submitting to Man.

What I am saying as with any building there are core components which inform the integrity or otherwise of a building – at the centre of religions are the notion of the subjugation of women – Why? It has to be for the reason to benefit someone – clearly it is not women – clearly it is Man.

No sensible women would accept such notions of subjugation to Mans will on a rational basis – therefore?

Is it really outside the bounds of reason to say therefore – God was created by Man because Man found out by establishing GOD(s) they could get what they wanted from women without negotiating on a equitable footing?

Are you saying Man has got nothing to gain by setting up this notion of subjugation based on substantiating Mans authority by some unchallengeable Super Being? As clearly they do.

Would you really put it past Man in the past and present if they could and clearly have, get away with it?

The fact is women today are being tricked by such doctrine – if trickery was not the purpose – why is it occurring?

Also there may be a thousand Gods – what of it – if the cumulative effect of their creation is the subjugation of women to Mans will – where is your argument?

Reply

True Believer says: 01:24pm | 08/04/11

No argument from me my friend - people throw “god and religion” around in here without saying what they mean.

I think you will find misogynistic men do not need “religion or a ‘god’ ” to subjugate and abuse women. I have know a fair few atheist who fit that category.

Jesus of course, who I happen to follow and know, before you tell me he is a figment of my imagination, Son of the Living God never treated women thus, in fact his disciples were often mystified because he broke the religious and racial “rules” of the day and included women, He never excluded them.

Thank you for clearing up though, where you are coming from. Many even who call themselves “Christian” (does not mean they are, Jesus decides who His followers are, no woman/man) do try to control women as do some of the cults and religions and also those without any beliefs.

It is part of the fallenness of the world and the sin that comes with it.

No person is an object for another and no person can “possess” another - it is downright evil.

Reply

says: 02:39pm | 08/04/11

@True Believer says

Your observations about Jesus are not reflected within the nature of Christian text, the culture the text reflects nor history. As with Muslims claiming their text does not inform terror against other you are clearly doing the same. For the reality you must admit is vastly different than the two observations made one by you regards women’s status within Christian culture and Muslims about the absence of violence derived from their text.

It is interesting regards Jesus able to be regarded as gentle and forgiving on the one hand yet violent and approving genocide on the other when he is not agreed with – depends which text you pick.

“Let a women learn in silence with all submission.

And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence.

For Adam was formed first, the Eve.

And Adam was not deceived but the woman being deceived, fell into transgression.

Etc”

If Jesus was so clear in his attitude to women as equals to Man it was not translated into text from those closest to him – or do they as Plato says lie in fables about the true nature of the Gods?

The fact is the above is only a small part of the bible which informs the notion women are of less worth than Man and subject to Mans direction and submissive. Clearly this text above informs current Christian culture regards women in a negative way?

I am not alone in making observations regards the status of women in religions but although it is a surprise to the author of the following comments for reasons explained by me previously it is not to me. The reason being utility is a necessary component of any societal construct – in other words nothing is benign – something is to be gained but by who?

“It is remarkable how religious texts of most traditions are opposed to the rights of women.” ... It is remarkable how it is almost universal witness of all faith traditions that women are second class citizens. And it is not surprising that the majority of “orthodox” traditions have real problems with the affirmation of women. The battle for women’s rights over the last 300 years in the West is a battle that most religions have only belatedly joined and even then only the liberal forms of those religions.”

“DO MORALS MATTER?” A Guide to Contemporary Religious Ethics” Ian S. Markham

The question is why is the matter of women’s rights – enabling the independence of women – so problematic to religions – Who loses – Women?

Clearly there is only one other lure of religion one of life’s lottery - one more pray pull the lever - maybe not enough prayers, tithes, maybe you did not pull the handle hard enough.

But the tangible pay off exists daily for Man - women’s submission to Man.

“A nod’s as good as a wink to a blind bat!”

Reply

True Believer says: 03:03pm | 08/04/11

Thanks for you reply.

The text you quote was from Paul not Jesus - and if you took the time to read books on the subject such as "God's Word to Women" you would find that it has probably been misinterpreted by the Jewish scholars.

I assume you do not know Jesus so not much good talking about His nature to you I guess. I know He is very different from what you think, but you must live with your prejudices.

Jesus never mentioned tithes by the way. Get to know Him, not just what you think the Bible says about Him, then your eyes will be opened to the Truth. Blind leading the blind with you just now. :0) Have a great weekend.

Reply

says: 10:30pm | 08/04/11

@True Believer

Jimmy Carter discusses the impact of the Arab Spring on women's rights.

<http://www.cnn.com/video/#/video/world/2011/04/07/carter.ivory.coast.women.rights.cnn>

I assure you I am not prejudice I understand the nature of faith having been there. I did not say what I have said about Jesus without due consideration.

Jesus: "He who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me scatters abroad."

This is love and tolerance of others – this is not violence? You may remember before Bush went into Afghanistan he used the first part of the Statement to infer what? The second part.

Consider the seed of justified violence and potential genocide in such comments. How does one scatter human beings abroad for non-belief - out of their homes and countries – a lovingly fashioned whip of cords perhaps? Made of soft silk?

Each of us clings to the fact we are not in error – in fact we cling to it even harder than our desire to seek truth even though it leaves other to terrible circumstance. The need to be right to be certain is truly a key to the tragedy humanity face each day.

The fact is even by his own admission Jesus was human. I understand most clearly the nature of Jesus – from my perspective as do you. I am informed not only by what Jesus is supposed to have said and done but the nature of those expressed by their Gospels of those Jesus chose to spread his word – or as Plato infers some of his word subject to the texts formers have made up themselves to inform on their own view rather than Jesus.

Anyone given this has just come out may believe it was done just for your consideration. Sometimes I have to wonder.

Paul informs Christian belief is this not that the case - I inferred quite clearly it was not Jesus.

Even if you believe Apostles do not represent Jesus the fact is this text does inform Christian belief as you hear from X President Carter above where he also raises issues regards women in other religions.

Also the apostle where told to go forth and spread the word of Jesus are you saying Paul's as well as the other apostles statements do not represents Jesus' ideas – how then can we trust anything the apostles say regards not only the nature of the type of life's template to lead or even what Jesus said himself? We are getting it second hand.

Plato did say poets had clearly misrepresented the Gods in evil ways – and it may be some comfort to know I have some justification Jesus' genocidal statement was flinched in major part by an apostle from Plato so Jesus from my own opinion which pretty much aligns with yours did not say it anyway – though I still have grave problems with his premeditated violent attack on animals. birds, and humans in the temple which from an ecclesiastical writer in the middle ages was used to justify violence against other.

The accusation of prejudice is really not an answer to the question, just an excuse not to answer it and a failsafe to say the other person is wrong to make you feel morally superior.

Are you prejudiced in knowing?

Afghan women risk death to learn to read

In Kandahar, Afghanistan, women study in secret, risking their lives to learn to read. CNN's Nick Paton Walsh reports.

<http://edition.cnn.com/video/#/video/world/2011/05/06/walsh.afghan.women.reading.cnn>

Change the Text or Change Nothing.

Why is it possible to worship a Wheel Barrow instead of God.

Both are vehicles for the transfer of rubbish & Both are invariably controlled by Man.

God is the imaginary rock upon which man gained a delusionary assurance of permanence in the face of clear evidence of impermanence. This permanence relates to the nature of authorization – the purpose of God is to lend authority to Mans wish to create permanency.

The impermanence is the fallibility of Man as the authorizing agent of devised societal strictures particularly regards the control of women by Man. Thus the creation of infallibility through Mans self-serving Revelation to himself of Men God conduits to enforce Men's will over women.

Something had to be found which underwrote the authority of those in power or who wished to obtain it.

The nature of understanding which modern science has provided continues to pick apart the perceived supernatural elements from the weather, planets, stars, comets, disease, etc used to create fear reinforced by the notion of Hell a necessary dualism to create fear where physical violence would not suffice.

Trouble is where reason does not exist fear takes its place firstly by the inherent violence in the Man Woman relationship manifesting itself in religious text as the Quran authorizing Mans beating of women to have women conform. Secondly the notions of Hell in an attempt to again exploit the unknown – the darkness in humanities limited understanding of life in its fullness. Thirdly and most significantly the development of the notion of guilt on the behalf of women regards practically all aspects of their lives where saying sorry is a continual ritual which Man is not subject to.

God is a purely authorizing agent nothing more and only exists as a diabolical means to justify the unjustifiable subjugation of women through fear derived from actual and threatened violence as well as nightmare made manifest in delusionary Man revelations of Hell and Males textual construct women are worth less.

SENIOR Iranian cleric – Burka prevents earth Quakes, etc

Cognisant human beings are formed and deformed by human text. Not God. As food is fuel for our bodies human text is fuel for our thoughts and subsequent actions.

Eating the 25 points of the National Socialism (Nazi party) manifesto of 1920 clearly has the same deleterious effect as eating the "The Cow" quran manifesto on non-adherents. SENIOR Iranian cleric Ayatollah Kazem Sedighi would be advised to change his misogynistic diet.

"A SENIOR Iranian cleric Ayatollah Kazem Sedighi has claimed that dolled-up women incite extramarital sex, causing more earthquakes in Iran, a country that straddles several fault lines, newspapers reported today.

"Many women who dress inappropriately ... cause youths to go astray, taint their chastity and incite extramarital sex in society, which increases earthquakes," Ayatollah Kazem Sedighi told worshippers at overnight prayers in Tehran.

"Calamities are the result of people's deeds," he was quoted as saying by reformist Aftab-e Yazd newspaper.

"We have no way but conform to Islam to ward off dangers."

The Islamic dress code is mandatory in Iran, which has been under clerical rule for more than three decades.

Every post-pubescent woman regardless of her religion or nationality must cover her hair and bodily contours in public. Offenders face punishment and fine."

Aftab-e Yazd newspaper 17/4/2010

Comment: If we had only known this sooner.

If the "dangers" of Islamic terrorism were not enough we have the attractive additional incentive (without any additional cost other than liberty and independence) of joining the motley Islamic crew to avoid being subject to grievous harm from nature as well.

Who would have thought - Cheap at half the price – with the belief the earth is flat thrown in as a non-obligatory extra.

I suppose the rumor "spending half your day bowing down to Mecca cures piles" must be true – it is not a complete waste of time after all.

Enabling these entities to spread their destructive text at our expense regards tax concessions and subsidies for educating children with this nonsense needs to be stopped.

Also, at least this again 'exposes' the absurd tenets for women having to wear the Burka and similar denigrating garb to reinforce the notion of men, me boss – inciting excitement – naughty.

"The women should have been layered in half a ton of black fabric, if she had your honor I would not have raped her" – sound plausible now I have been enlightened by our SENIOR Iranian cleric Ayatollah Kazem Sedighi.

.. and lest we forget the cattle stampedes, trains hurtling through tunnels, Swiss yodeling etc.

It is now clear why that meteorite wiped out the earth millions of years ago – a girl dinosaur neglected to adjust her palm fond correctly – devastating.

Clearly the above reinforces the reality the burka is as much a political statement as a naked woman walking in the streets to advocate public nudity as a right which should be accepted by the rest of society.

Nudism is a cultural and political movement advocating and defending social nudity in private and in public. It may also refer to a lifestyle based on personal, family and/or social nudism.

Society in general has decided public nudism can be very confronting, inappropriate, and even regarded as obscene by some. Although nudism is often practiced in a person's home or garden, either alone or with members of the family and in restricted venues public nudity is a behavior which society in general have deemed should be restricted and subject to judicial penalty.

In my opinion the burka is much more of an obscenity than nudity. For where nudism seeks to expand the societal bounds and diminish prejudice the burka politically advocates a denigrating , subservient role in society for women.

The burka reinforces the notion women are not only to blame for men's behavior towards them in regards sexual assaults but also women's aspirations should necessarily be different and subservient to a man's definition of what a woman's life should be.

The public wearing of the burka is a categorical political act which seeks to advance the notion of the acceptance of the subservience and restriction of women's opportunities in life relative to men which is absolutely obscene and must therefore be subject to judicial penalty.

Everything we do is political. A woman deciding to wear shorts given human history is a political statement in itself. For it can be deemed as simply a relatively freely decided fashion statement. The Burka is an antithesis of this and very much a political statement of subjugation and in no way can be regarded as a fashion statement or a modern principle. No matter how many times and subtle colorful variations get dragged down the catwalk.

The serious issue which this statement reveals, which underlies most religious dogma, is that human actions or lack of them are determined to be the direct cause of negative outcomes in human's lives, from the niggling to the catastrophic.

For individuals and communities within which they reside this unleashes a burden of retched guilt for whatever may befall the adherent, their family and communities because they have been bad. The only way humans can be saved not only from this guilt and shame of having been bad, but also more importantly the catastrophes themselves is to adhere completely to the dictates of the religious entity.

"We have no way but conform to Islam to ward off dangers."

In essence although most of us on this site can laugh it off, the earthquake analogy provided by the SENIOR Iranian cleric Ayatollah Kazem Sedighi is a core accepted discourse within most religious entities. Bad things happen to bad people or these bad people, such as witches, Christians, communists, democrats etc in our community have caused God to be angry. Result we lose our job, our child dies, we are raped, earthquakes etc – We are to blame. Not nature or other human beings or simply bad luck.

If bad things continue to happen you just haven't been trying hard enough.

If you have been determined naughty by the religious elite and bad things do not result, as we see in Islam and with the Spanish inquisition in the past, they will make it happen. 'Death to..' , 'She's a witch', Movie Director, etc

When you are hardwired since birth to this text of badness, bad things happen to bad people, guilt and shame for simply being human without any intellectual room to consider alternatives it makes life very difficult for some to live with such a continuing burden. Particularly when you are told repeatedly the only way out is kissing the Bishops hand, if you're lucky, or participating in blowing people to bits.

The only derived benefit I can see is in staying in these textual mad houses is it saves you from being ostracized or even killed for suggesting maybe you want to try a more constructive belief system.

This unleashed burden of retched guilt from the pulpit does not result in a benign outcome for it does make many lives retched in the extreme by having individuals take on the responsibility not only for uncontrollable natural events but those arising from simply being human.

Such notions of fear and shame of simply being human are instilled from birth by these religious entities as they seek to undermine the confidence of an individual to make independent decisions in their own right.

To be made ashamed by statements such as those above for simply being a woman for instance – covering ones body either burka or headscarf – hiding ones body behind the sold notion of honoring God – where in fact, the reality being it is to continually reinforce the notion women are owned and controlled by the men in those communities. It is simply a badge of control as chains to a slave.

For if it is the case this is needed to honor God why does it not apply to men?

Why should men not be locked in their homes going mad with boredom only able to venture out at the behest of women – covered from head to toe – in stifling black material?

Is this a just an equitable God which condemn human beings to such inequality?

Yet from the sexual, being a woman, to not bowing to Mecca the appropriate number of times, not genuflecting you name it, earthquakes, killed for not going on a jihad, loss of a child etc they would have you believe it was because you were

wicked – such a diabolical rationality requires the most severe condemnation for we know that it is only said so the religious elite can go on pretending madness is sanity – to justify the unjustifiable.

Why people raising the simple point this is unmitigated madness are attacked each day and at times killed are because such states of being cannot be justified by reason and therefore must be justified by fear and apportioned shame from the pulpit and the bloody sword in the streets.

It is important as one more voice is silenced many more voices rise from the depths, as each satirical cartoon is burnt thousands more are published, as threats are made against popular culture that culture must replicate amongst the community. The bleeps are not applied with the depiction of the ridiculous exponentially increased.

We must not be cowered by crude threats and visitation of violence we owe it to those to come to leave a world as devoid as possible of retribution for simply wanting to have a relatively independent life for ourselves, our families and communities.

Please note the inherent insanity in the excerpt below though why I say this given it is so obvious? It states scoffers of the ridiculous text must not prosper otherwise we look like we are selling a shoddy product. Most importantly of all we must make the killing of such scoffers very public and vicious so we scare those twits into submission.

“We may accept it as a Law of God that the opponents of His Messengers and Apostles meet with destruction and prove an object-lesson for others.”

I am of the view this text is a terrorist training manual. That can't be right it is a religion and we are told Islam is such a peaceful religion - maybe I am looking at the wrong version Islam must have a peace quran with flowers on it. The Iranian regime loves flower arrangements so gosh their a peace loving bunch they must have a copy I could borrow.

Yes it would be a shame when those adherents went around checking on scoffers and truth tellers of the insanity of this twisted text and they were observed leading happy lives – outrageous. So let's make up a cock and bull story so we can kill them – really what a pack of dangerous deluded morons - revelations of idiocy.

God understandably refuses to get his hands dirty with such despicable acts but as usual humans can come up with the most insane excuses to destroy other who dare to point out the reality their text is crap and unable to be justified by cogent reason – instead they use vicious force to remind the rest of us how truly demented they are.

<http://www.alislam.org/books/invitation/arg7.html>

"The Holy Quran and enemies of God's Messengers

It appears from the Holy Quran that what seems so clearly indicated by our own nature and judgment is in full accord with God's Own teaching. Enemies of God's Messengers must suffer for their misdeeds.

The Holy Quran says: 'And who is more unjust than he who forges a lie against Allah or gives the lie to His Signs? Surely the unjust shall not prosper.' (They do prosper if they are left alone to do so.) 1

To forge lies (if forgery is truth then I agree) against God is serious (it is only serious if humans make it so – God couldn't care less); equally serious is deliberate enmity and hostility (you advance the notion people who openly disagree with Islam should be killed, women should be second class citizens and expect them to bow down and kiss your feet) shown to His true Messengers. Forgers of lies (truth) against Allah cannot (will) succeed, according to the Holy (you are advancing killing people and have the audacity to call this book holy) Quran. No more can they who choose to oppose and defeat the true Messengers of God. (We do and we will for anyone who believes their a messenger of God is two planks short of a canary so it will not be too hard)

'And surely have the Messengers been mocked at before (and for very good reason) thee but that which they mocked at encompassed those of them who scoffed. Say, "Go about in the earth, and see what was the end of those who treated the Prophets as liars". (Nothing if a pack of scummy brain dead losers didn't go around and hack them to death)'2

Those who scoff at true prophets become victims of their own machinations. (No they become victims of idiots like you who blow them to bits in subways) God-fearing people must ever remember what happened to those who decried true prophets as impostors. (Yeah they were viciously killed by insane zealots – who would forget that)

There are many verses of this kind. (Yeah I can imagine) The point need not be stressed further. (Yeah we need more time to clean the bodies out of the cellar) We may accept it as a Law of God (Law of Human idiots) that the opponents of His Messengers and Apostles meet with destruction and prove an object-lesson for others. (What can any rational person say regards this drivel)

Hazrat Mirza Sahib had the same assurances on the subject. One of his revelations says: 'I will humiliate him who seeks to humiliate thee. (I have had a revelation. If it is Gods word how is it this text cannot convince by the power of Gods words alone? If it was actually Gods word no one would need to be humiliated. Therefore?)

This promise revealed to Hazrat Mirza Sahib is in accordance with God's eternal law. The enemies of Hazrat Mirza Sahib suffered defeat and disgrace enough to make everybody think. (Yeah the vicious B we remember him how could we forget.-

There is a clearly proven Health and Safety issue for humanity with this product.

How come these idiots can keep operating whilst Smoked Sausage firms are closed down in haste when found to be selling infectious virus, bacteria, and parasitic laced sausages?)

The following link details the demented reasoning which aligns directly with Ayatollah Ahmad Janati's view though this time to dissenters and scoffers of the Islamic text.

<http://www.alislam.org/books/invitation/arg7.html>

Although we may laugh at the 'Earthquake' analogy this is an extremely serious issue for the same logic is used to justify the murder of innocents across the globe in the past and today.

The nature of the statements by Ayatollah Ahmad Janati simply underline the major method by which clerics control their flocks, fear of real human induced or nature based negative outcomes arising from not taking sufficient notice of the requirements of dogma, simply ignoring it or opposing it.

One of the real negative outcomes against humanity arising from this methodology based on hoodoo voodoo, that bad things happen to bad people relates to persons who are scoffers of Islam, those naughty satirists. Even citizens who exist in communities where satirist reside, had nothing to do with the satirists output, have been determined by Islamic clerics to be able to be subject to grievous harm.

It rather reminds me of an advertisement aimed at older people to have them take out funeral insurance. The spokesperson starts off by saying 'Death Happens' – which is reassuring but a bit puzzling, isn't it obvious – then lays on the guilt of burdening the children with financial expenses.

Although much more severe in outcome it is the same for the Islamic web page above but this time 'Death Happens' only to bad people who scoff at Islam. Particularly disease happens only to bad people who scoff and satirize Islam in a manner that is much swifter than one would expect under the Islamic version of circumstance.

We do not hear of the next door devotee adherent suffering from a lung disease as inexplicably as the scoffer as we know scientifically they do. It is as if disease in the dialogue simply does not exist for devotees.

Under this dialogue devotees and scoffers alike are threatened with a much shorter life span not only by the sword but by disease. It is so ludicrously unscientific as to be regarded as absurd by rational people but this is what drives the fear of many devotees to remain under the yoke of ignorance and results in diminished lives.

Either conform to the religious entities unjustifiable doctrines or they will kill you or you will die a terrible painful death subsequent to you telling them they a pack of deluded fools.

The Christian bibles new testament has examples of instant death when anyone attempts to short change the Church. Yet although modern humans, even most believers, would decry such notions as absurd it does not seem to occur to them therefore the rest of the text has to be as equally suspect as being derived from God.

Hard wired since birth on this guff makes it difficult for many to realize they are living in a lie. Some are so resistant to facing the fact they would rather spend their time killing you rather than spend the time going through the traumatic experience of facing the fact they have wasted a portion of their life living someone else's vision of life rather than their own.

The Difference between Racism and exposing violent text.

Most Muslims and Christians, Mormons, etc wish to and do lead lives which do not conflict with others. Live and let live. But the sad fact is the text they base the positive aspect of their lives on, to live in harmony with others, also contain text which provide violent discriminatory caveats to those positive statements within their texts.

To point these caveats out and the despicable physiological and violent mechanisms' by which they are enforced in the past and before our eyes each day are regarded by some as racism.

Rather than confront the fact the violence is clearly being enabled by their respective text and is not an aberrant erroneous interpretation they attack the messenger with the word 'racism' without providing a cogent explanation to themselves let alone anyone else.

To claim 'Oh we do not use those bits' or worse 'Demeaning and violent text against other simply does not exist in our texts you're a racist.' is a sickening response. Not because of the hypocrisy and blind sighted nature of the response but the fact we know such a state of mind means the terror will continue.

I was speaking to a Muslim the other day and he informed me if I said anything derogatory about his text he would be in his rights to attack me. This is where the meaning of innocents diverges from modern definition

This is a textual world where if I was to point out to an architect there was in my opinion (true or false) a critical piece missing from his plan which would lead to death and injury I could be justifiably killed by this architect and/or his friends for simply raising my concerns.

Instead of attacking people who raise these issues should not the racist callers be redirecting their chants to the people who create the violent version of Islam (it does exist if you have not noticed) or better still amend or delete the text upon which the violent versions are derived so there will be no confusion in the future – peace will reign.

Until then we are in for more of the same, chants of racism, denial and terror.

We in the west are attacked from the decadent dress of women, greed, avarice any numbers of wickedness. Also on visiting various countries we persevere under the most draconian laws, even being spat on in the streets, to simply walk about western women are forced to accept wearing demeaning clothing or be attacked or jailed, etc.. Yet when we raise the fact there is an enormous plank sticking out of the others

eye and object to the demand we should accept deleterious aspects of a culture in our own communities, one of which is to accept the idea we should be able to be grievously harmed for raising glaring deficiencies in that culture which are clearly contributing to terror of fellow human beings - gosh that's naughty.

Rather reminds me of the Taliban demanding the right of freedom of the press to advertise their suicide bombings live to press. You have got to admire the Taliban's dedication to freedom of the press.

There was a question asked by a very anguished member of one of the attacked communities "Why us?" he cried amongst the carnage.

The New York Times:

"A coordinated series of explosions struck a party headquarters, two mosques, a market and a shop in Baghdad on Friday"

...at least 58 people dead and wounded scores more in Baghdad and elsewhere in Iraq"

They ask "Why us?" – This is why.

I once told a Buddhist surely mans capacity for murdering fellow human beings was approaching its zenith, the Buddhist disagreed.

On finding the following web link and reading the above I now agree with the Buddhist.

<http://www.alislam.org/books/invitation/arg7.html>

Mans capacity for killing knows no bounds when they hold in their hand not a gun, or a sword, or suicide belt, or roadside bomb, or even a nuclear weapon - but the text above.

For cognisant human beings are formed and deformed by human text. Not God. As food is fuel for our bodies human text is fuel for our thoughts and subsequent actions.

The text shows as mentioned above eating the 25 points of the National Socialism (Nazi party) manifesto of 1920 clearly has the same deleterious effect as eating the "The Cow" quran manifesto on non-adherents.

It is not a question of if a person has a suicide belt but if a person has a suicide belt in their left hand and this text in their right.

<http://www.alislam.org/books/invitation/arg7.html>

It is not a question of if a person has control of an aircraft but if a person holds the aircraft controls in their left hand and this text in their right.

<http://www.alislam.org/books/invitation/arg7.html>

It is not a question of if a person has a car filled with explosives but if a person holds the steering wheel in their left hand and this text in their right.

<http://www.alislam.org/books/invitation/arg7.html>

It is not a question of if a person has gun but if a person holds the gun in their left hand and this text in their right.

<http://www.alislam.org/books/invitation/arg7.html>

It is not a question of if a country has a nuclear weapon but if a country has a nuclear weapon in their left hand and this text in their right.

<http://www.alislam.org/books/invitation/arg7.html>

It is without doubt therefore it is text which defines the danger not the weapon.

Clearly we are in great danger. Yet we do not act to remove the fuel from the fire – because this is a religion.

If this was a secular organization promoting such text of destruction and the obvious carnage it causes it would be hounded into oblivion.

One could raise similar concerns regards the continuing existence of an organization whose crimes of pedophilia continue to be revealed each day across the globe. What if it was a secular childcare agency? Both organizations provide access to defenseless young children. Would we allow the childcare agency to continue to operate and their executives allowed to travel the world unchallenged. Clearly excused insanity takes precedence over the defenseless – Why?

The tragic irony for these Islamic communities is their own Islamic text is destroying them as well as authorizing the murder of non-Islamic communities.

There are organizations in Australia and elsewhere which clearly prescribe to this text why have they not been shut down?

How many times must humanity suffer tragic circumstance before it acts against a text which drives this known source of insane justification of terror against fellow human beings?

Until legislation to define human right principles are created upon which laws can be based to apply harsh judicial sanction against organizations and/or individuals promoting such text of violence against other, whether they be secular or religious we will continue to have 'permanent' terror?