



American Primer

[Podcast :: The Precipice](#)

[Podcast :: Project Schoolhouse](#)

Claiming the 1st

The ongoing fallacy that Church and State are constitutionally separated is not only silly, but impossible. This idea stems from the presupposition that there is a supreme law in America protecting us. Good. Keep thinking that. So, what right do you have to be protected from religion? And, what instrument (not an AR-15) do you suspect is shielding you from the irreligious? One in the same. The United States constitution and bill of rights. The first amendment—the right to have a view, and the right to do something about it. You are not protected from another person's views, but enjoy the opportunity to compete for your own.

It's not going away

Religion produces denomination and politics produces party. A religious sect or political party are experientially the same thing—subgroups of likeminded individuals who are trying to promote or enforce their views. A view is therefore faith that something will work, and policy is the lawful implementation of such faith. Faith is believing in something you have not yet seen, like a marijuana law, a new speed limit, or tax incentive—you don't know exactly what *will* happen, so policy is always a faith issue. Unless of course, it has been tried before—then your views require less faith, and more history. Many Muslims have chosen not to drink alcohol—but trying to ban it in the United States was futile. Many Christians have chosen not to engage in politics, and this position has set historical precedents. Germany had many Christians, but the Nazi party had very narrow views. 60-80 million dead because Hitler's religion won.

A political party is like a religious denomination; among Christianity, denominations such as Pentecostal, Lutheran or Catholic. Some ideas are shared, others are not—but they have this in common: practicing those views, away from each other, and out of the public space. A Muslim might identify Sunni or Shi'a, but they go to different mosques. Judaism has multiple branches. Irreligious people are often agnostics, atheists, anarchists or even Satanists. Anarchists believe that government is unnecessary. Extreme anarchism is the absence of law, and moderate anarchism is the faith that people will cooperate voluntarily. ***In the real world, there will always be politics (enforcement) and religion (views);*** therefore, anarchy is the quintessential example of religious zealotry—a blind faith so naïve, one trusts in humanities' ability to cooperate without either. In this sense, most orthodox Christians are political anarchists. They won't touch politics, or cross denominational lines. Churches are competing for members, but their views are not competing in the real world.

Political parties and governmental entities have the power to create and enforce law; to collect taxes, arrest you and even take your children. This is serious. Anyone that has the power to do that, must strongly believe in the need for rules in society—must be driven by strong views—must be deeply *religious*. If you think that a belief in God or gods is the essence of religion, then you already lost. Plenty of atheistic, amoral and irreligious people are vying for political power. Likewise, plenty of *believers* are deliberately ignoring politics. Religious organizations are not governments—today, they have zero civil authority (501c3). They are miniaturized monarchies role playing like adolescent boys at the park—swinging fake swords and reenacting battles they

are not willing to fight. *Many fake a religion or view, to get access to a party. Make fake a lifestyle or doctrine, to get access to a church.* A real believer will compete for their beliefs.

American government is currently controlled by two parties. There are 330M people here, thousands of religions and denominations cohabitating. 70% claim to be “Christian”. The current political landscape, would, by this logic, reason that the state of the Union reflects the views or policies of the Christian majority. Knowing this is false, then either the 70% are lying, or simply uninvolved. Perhaps it is the *religion* of many politicians to keep *majority views* out of their party? Perhaps it is the *policy* of modern priests to keep minority opinions out of their pulpits? At least you can get something done in politics—because religion without politics is cowardice.

Inseparable

Religion and politics are inseparable. Historically, they were the same thing. Early Jews would settle their civil disputes in the temple. Early Muslims conquered with Islamic law; religion was political identity. *The essence of religion is to believe something on faith, facts, or a combination of both.* Politics is the power to propagate our views; and again, these are the things we accept by faith. To believe that murder is wrong (unlawful killing of another human being with malice aforethought), takes little faith. Most people only talk about their “views” (faith). Christians, Muslims, Jews, agnostics and the like, could talk about murder; or, they could do something about it. If a political party, or a religious denomination wants to get serious, then they must collaborate—they must agree that some form or system of adherence is necessary. They accept that government (not their opinion) is the enforcer—that merely accepting party views is not enough—that writing and ratifying party doctrine (laws) is essential. To adopt law is as much a religious duty as a vocational practice. *To believe something is good for yourself, is to believe it is good for others (with some exceptions). Religion is the means (faith), politics is the end (action).*

What’s good for the goose

If a Muslim grocer believes that all Halal meat should be packaged with a Halal label, then he has a view. If he feels such view should be enforced on local or national markets, then he is a strong *believer*. Whether his desire to see the label is for business or religious reasons is irrelevant—whether one or both, without law, he is left to suffer his views in the mosque. The same is true with a Jewish grocer who wishes to see the kosher insignia appear on her products. Unless the grocers’ views are codified, they are accepting of the status quo. If this label issue, is a matter of personal religious convictions, then they better do something about it, else their faith (view) is worthless.

Naturally, if something is bad for one, it might be bad for all. If Muslims, Christians and Jews all believe that internet pornography is bad for society, they have two jobs; firstly, to keep their people away from it, and secondly, to keep others away from it. If we only talk about our views, then we are worthless—we are individuals exchanging words in our churches, mosques, synagogues and social clubs; sharing opinions (that won’t become law) with fake friends, to ease our conscience. Christian, do you want your son to be addicted to pornography? Muslim, do you want your daughter to marry a man who is? What we will discover, is that our faith is increasingly harder to experience, without law. We can barely handle our own people, let alone those around us—therefore, the best option for *true believers*, is to form a political party—a religiously heterogeneous group focused on a core tenant. In this example, the abolishment of pornography. It’s not enough to preach about it, or filter it, or go to great lengths to avoid exposure. You can

organize a conference, teaching everything on the topic. You can regulate it. But it won't be enough. In this case, you must seek to criminalize those who might produce it or consume it. When avoiding pornography is more work than criminalizing it, you are doing something wrong; you will continue to work harder, and harder, to avoid a growing industry. It will be worse when your kids grow up. Likewise, when regulating abortion is more costly and time consuming than abolishing it, those who participate in the regulation are guilty of *faith without action*.

To have a worldview, is to accept the need for government. A religious leader wants their views to become reality. They are left wanting. What came first, the chicken or the egg? Just as chickens make eggs, so do governments make laws. Governments are filled with religious people, and always will be. This is why the United States Constitution is a type of bible in America. The Churches, mosques, synagogues, cathedrals, schools, political parties and all the wild fringe groups are supposed to share this monumental idea—that we all get to have an idea, and fight for it. Religion is the experiment, and the constitution is the control. The three tenants of our shared 'religion' have not changed: life, liberty and happiness. Millions of believers in America (Jews, Christians and Muslims), not only share the moral position on abortion—a child's right to live, but share the constitutional assumption and provision to make this right unalienable for their unborn neighbors.

Abolish

Product labeling, digital meat markets or even human trafficking are subordinate to this fact—they sidetrack us from our priorities. The 1st amendment was placed at the top, because it is the most important way to keep this experiment from blowing up. So I will unapologetically speak my religion; I will claim the first, escalate the tension and expedite the priority—life over liberty, and abolition of abortion over any medical freedom or career happiness. We seek out doctors to prevent illness or death, and therefore abolition as the best preventative medicine available. A bill of abolition is the surest prescription, predicated all happiness or misery. This is the glaring reality—we cannot have politics, religion, products, porn or anything else for that matter, until we have life. To live, and breathe and speak is the foremost goal—before a liquor license, a marriage certificate, building permit or certificate of death, we must live. The right to live should not need law, but somehow now it does, and far be it from us *believers* to sit idle—law does not diminish the promise of salvation (Galatians 3:17). So why pass a bill of abolition right now, in each and every state? Why work across religions denominations, and parties? Because the bible (the constitution) told me so.

Galatians 3:19-20

19 Why, then, was the law given at all? It was added because of transgressions until the Seed to whom the promise referred had come. The law was given through angels and entrusted to a mediator. 20 A mediator, however, implies more than one party; but God is one.