



American Primer

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. But it's not what you think. Friend, what right do you have to be protected from a religion? And, what instrument (not an AR-15) do you suspect is shielding your values from annihilation? 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.*** Why are patriots pissed off that Muslims are in the public square? There is no religious test for public office. You are not protected from another person's views. In America, you enjoy the opportunity to compete for your own (so far).

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 people 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. Therefore, there is no separation of views and their enforcement. The prevailing political views, will rule over you, if you do not compete.

A political party is like a religious denomination; among Christianity, three primary branches exist in many forms: Evangelical, Protestant and 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. 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, pure 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 and Catholics are political anarchists. They won't touch politics, or cross denominational lines. Catholics are unified, Evangelicals are competing for members, yet "Christians", Christ's people are not competing in the real world. Wake up pastor...bishop...elder

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 cowboys and clowns are vying for political power, and winning. Likewise, plenty of *true 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. Whether big churches with fog machines, or small quiet fellowships, they are nothing more than social clubs and synagogues. *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 in public.

American government is currently controlled by two parties. There are 338M+ people here, thousands of religions and denominations cohabitating. 70% claim to be “Christian”. It would reason that the state of the Union reflects the shared moralities of this 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 poor church *government* that keeps the Church from advancing the views they broadcast from the pulpit. At least you can get something done in politics—because religion without politics is cowardice.

Inseparable

Religion and politics are inseparable. Rather, they are the same. Early Jews would settle their civil disputes in the temple. Muslims conquer with Islamic law—religion is political identity. Today’s dysfunction is light-years from the religion and politics of the men who arrived on the Mayflower. *The essence of religion is to believe something on faith, facts, or a combination of both—and take dominion.* 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) on human rights, narcotics, immigration or education. Christians, Muslims, Jews, agnostics and the like, could talk about problems; or, they could do something about it. If a political party, or a religious denomination wants to get serious, then they would collaborate—they would agree that some form or system of adherence is necessary. They accept that government (not their opinion) is the enforcer—that merely joining a Church is not enough. That accepting party views is not enough—that writing and ratifying party doctrine (laws) is both historical and indispensable. 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).* Welcome to the Mayflower, are you sea-sick yet pastor?

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*. Without law, he is left to only talk about his views in the mosque. The same is true with a Jewish grocer who wishes to see the kosher insignia appear on 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 (in homes and places of worship), and secondly, to keep others away

from it. Muslims truly believe that what is good for them, is essential for us to. They actually want to make us like them. 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 trafficker? Jew, did your child get an abortion?

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 politicize—bond together a religious and heterogeneous group focused on a core tenant. In this example, the abolishment of a societal evil. 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, consume it, or promote it. When avoiding evil 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 evil 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 like a second bible for all people 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.* And if Christians are 70% of our nation, then why aren't we winning? 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

Meat labeling, pornographic meat markets, narcotics, abortion, human trafficking and the rest. What is your religion? What are your politics? The 1st amendment was placed at the top, because it is the most important way to keep this experiment from blowing up. So unapologetically speak your religion; claim the first, escalate the tension and expedite the priority—life over liberty, the abolition of abortion. This is the glaring reality—we cannot have politics, religion, art, economies, or anything else for that matter...until we have life. To live, and breathe and speak is the pinnacle—before a liquor license, a marriage certificate, building permit or certificate of death—we must live. The right to life should not need law, but somehow now it does, and far be it from us *believers* to sit idle in our churches, synagogues and social clubs waiting for a religious figure to return. Or waiting for God's people to finally organize and conquer.

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.