

Reflecting on Religious Liberation Theology and Intersectionality



“On personal level, I respect Buddha as much as I respect Karl Marx. Indeed, I respect Buddha since his spiritualism indeed is helpful on our daily lives full of workplace pressures and interpersonal conflicts. I respect Karl Marx since his class analysis indeed was unique and detailed from ancient utopian socialists. I respect Muhammad as he became a founder of a religion from merely a trader who got married to a rich lady. His story is at least more inspiring than the children of billionaires who are millionaire CEOs nowadays. I respect Ali and Fatima for their brave resistance against Abu Bakr, the first caliph.

Yet, I won’t defend Buddha, Karl Marx, Muhammad, and Ali for their sexist views. Same goes for Chen Duxiu, Mansoor Hekmat, Periyar Ramasamy and Dr. Ambedkar if they have similar errors. I have made a lot of mistakes on my readings, and so on. We’re human, we are not immune from mistakes. Same goes for Buddha, Karl Marx, Muhammad, and Ali.”

By Hein Htet Kyaw



While this text references state abuses as they link with religion, this specific text does not touch directly upon the current anti-junta struggle in Burma. We want to acknowledge the ongoing revolution against the military dictatorship. The people demand the fall of the regime!

Published on April, 20, 2024 at
<https://libcom.org/article/reflecting-religious-liberation-theology-and-intersectionality>

Cover set in **Karma**

Body Text set in Atkinson Hyperlegible

READ MORE

To read about the oppression of the Rohingya in Myanmar/Burma, and how it relates to some sections of the authoritarian left, go to: www.libcom.org/article/rohingya-genocide-and-passive-involvement-burmese-authoritarian-left

To read about the early state of the revolution against the military junta (circa 2022) go to:
<https://libcom.org/article/myanmars-spring-revolution-forgotten-revolution-ongoing>

To read another perspective against the oppression that religion can bring (and its relation to anarchism,) read the following threads on twitter from the Federation of Anarchism Era (in Iran & Afghanistan):
<https://x.com/asranarshism/status/1661709636234539008>
<https://x.com/asranarshism/status/1662710764145344513>
<https://x.com/asranarshism/status/1665214136937226241>

Table of Contents

Notes and Foreword 3

Communists' vs Religion 4

Personal Reflection 6

Buddhism and Intersectionality 7

Bhikkuni Ordination in Burma 7

Sexism, Patriarchy, and Misogyny 8

Islam and Intersectionality 9

Patriarchy and Sexism 9

Strict Nuclear Family 10

Interfaith Marriage 11

Eunuch Male (could be gay or trans) 12

Slavery 13

Reformists or Conformists 14

Reform or Revolution 17

Political Atheism 19

Reversed Beefsteak Nazis among the Left (Anti-Fascist Until Endorsing Fascists) 25

Decolonial Anarchism 27

Summing Up 31

Note From The Author When Posted To libcom.org:

I didn't use "Reflecting on Religious Theology and Anarchism" or "Reflecting on Religious Theology and Marxism" as these labels are too sectarian. I'm using "Intersectionality" as it's something you can see among left-liberals, social democrats, Marxists and anarchists. The only difference is the extent of their loyalty to the way they challenge the intersectional oppressions. Some says they believe in intersectionality, yet in reality, they're already part of the problem itself.

Please feel free to share the disagreements or remarks if you would like to.

Foreword

Recently, I've seen a lot of friends and comrades talking high of Religious Liberation Theology not only for Burma but also for global scale. Some encouraged me to use Buddhism as a mean to organise the people. Thiha JP, one of two anarchists from Burma (the other anarchist is comrade Katsu from 44 and YAA) whom I think of a great thinker and efficient anarchist among their generation of anarchists, shared me his story of using religions as a tool to organise the people as well. That was included in a previous article I published via libcom. Thanks to all friends and comrades, I gave some time to myself reflecting some thoughts on religious liberation theology and using religious identity to organise people.

SPACE FOR NOTES AND THOUGHTS

that most leftists especially those religious ones doesn't even read the scriptures of the religion they adhere to. I believe that's why people like Periyar Ramasamy wrote the following verses in 1900s:

"Any opposition not based on rationalism or science or experience will one day or other, reveal the fraud, selfishness, lies and conspiracies. "

Reference: "Collected works of Periyar E.V.R." by Tantai Periyār, (p. 504), 2005.

I don't expect all people to become atheists. I've seen people making statues of Li Dazhao in China and praying to it. I've seen people in India thinking Ambedkar as a Bodhisattva. People, especially those who are mentally or spiritually weak will always try to find something to worship or cling to. They will think it's spiritualism but yet, I think it's a symbol of their spiritual weakness.

At the end of the day, people are entitled to their views until their views will consequently oppress other people.

Communists' vs Religion

The mentality of the revolutionaries regarding religion always had been a hard question since the time of Karl Marx and Engels. Even at the time of Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Lunacharsky and Bukharin, there were a lot of conflicting views about how communists should perceive religion. Even among anarchists, there were conflicting views between anarchists like Peter Kropotkin, Bakunin, and Leo Tolstoy. Even among these scholars, indeed, the way the thinkers think is unique for each individual thinkers regardless of their race, ethnicity and religious background. However, in general, the way the thinkers from the European region thinkers and the Southeast Asian thinkers as well as Arabic thinkers think are unique generally.

For example, people like Lenin, Leon Trotsky, Stalin, Bukharin and Mao Zedong were anti-religion to different extents from the perspective of class politics. People like Anatoly Lunacharsky endorsed a view which he called "God Building" in contrast to anti-religion approach of other Bolshevik leaders. "God Building" is a similar tactic used by the liberation theologian left-wingers and nowadays new left/woke in layman terms.

So, in my observation, we have four types of leftists. (This could be wrong as this is oversimplified generalization).

- Militant Atheism of Anti-Religion: mostly found in some anarchists, Marxists, liberals and so on.

- Marxist anti-religion: People like Lenin and Trotsky who think religious workers can be recruited to the party first and then can be educated to become atheists. The solution to the religion according to them is only through class struggle. People like Bukharin and Lenin believe that "Religious communists will be reactionary, and counter-productive". They believe state should be non-religious but not necessarily anti-religion.

- God Building and Religious Liberation Theology: people like Lunacharsky and Leo Tolstoy who think religious communists and religious anarchists are all good. People like Bukharin and Lenin thought of this position as opportunistic and liberal.

- Anti-religious Stalinism: Stalin and Soviet under his rule was

anti-religion. Stalin and some Stalinist Bolsheviks from League of Militant Atheists were extremely anti-religion, confronting directly against religion.

Lunacharsky in his article with a name “Religion and Socialism” wrote that “Socialism unites secular and religious ideological groups in the struggle for the proletariat. Any action aiming to merge socialism with religious fanaticism, or militant atheism, are actions aimed at splitting the proletarian class and have the formula of divide and rule, which plays into the hands of bourgeois dictatorship.”

Bakunin and Lenin thought of religion as the tools used by the ruling class and the state.

Lenin in his article “The Attitude of the Workers’ Party to Religion” said “Marxism has always regarded all modern religions and churches, and each and every religious organisation, as instruments of bourgeois reaction that serve to defend exploitation and to befuddle the working class.” Lenin however didn’t really have anti-religion mentality unless it’s about class struggle. His writing “A Marxist must be a materialist, i. e., an enemy of religion, but a dialectical materialist, i. e., one who treats the struggle against religion not in an abstract way, not on the basis of remote, purely theoretical, never varying preaching, but in a concrete” will be perfect example to prove that point.

Lenin detested the view Lunacharsky holds on the religion and rejected. Later, Lunacharsky became an atheist.

However, what’s common between these thinkers is that they never quoted literal religious classical texts or documents and criticized the religions seriously internally. They only criticised it from the abstract level, basing their analysis from the class politics. Even League of Militant Atheists, the anti-religious organisation of Bolshevik party didn’t really visit the original scriptures of the religions and failed to see the underlying problem and social injustices of the religious scriptures. On the other hand, people like Dr. Ambedkar, Periyar Ramasamy, Nawal El Saadawi and Mansoor Hekmat indeed quoted the religious texts, and criticise how these organised religion works as well as how the clerical social class behaves and so on. This is exactly what is needed in the era. Intersectionality is a lot more than class struggle.

sexist views. Same goes for Chen Duxiu, Mansoor Hekmat, Periyar Ramasamy and Dr. Ambedkar if they have similar errors. I have made a lot of mistakes on my readings, and so on. We’re human, we are not immune from mistakes. Same goes for Buddha, Karl Marx, Muhammad, and Ali.

However, what is irony during these days is that those who are triggered by some remarks of Donald Trump will defend the similar thing said by Muhammad or Karl Marx or Bakunin or GOD/Allah itself. I despise such people, especially if they claimed to be left-wing revolutionaries. Compared to those scriptures, Donald Trump is nothing. Yet, these people are mad at Donald Trump, but praying to the GOD who gave them the scriptures? Why not mad at all of them? Why being selective here? If a so-called leader/master even if it’s GOD who oppresses a social class, resistance or conformity are the only two options. Anarchists indeed will resist that oppression as much as they can, in my standard. That’s unwritten mentality we will see in every anarchist. Just as Periyar Ramasamy said “If GOD is the root cause of our degradation, destroy that GOD”.

I would like to quote an article called “The True Meaning of Life” by Chen Duxiu, he wrote as follow:

“In a word, what’s the ultimate purpose in life? What should it be, after all? I dare say:

During his lifetime, an individual should devote his efforts to create happiness and to enjoy it, and also to keep it in store in society so that individuals of the future may also enjoy it, one generation doing the same for the next and so on unto infinity.”.

Summing up

So, I believe all these forms of leftists are fine as long as they acknowledge the oppressions caused by religions and be the first to stand up against it.

If people are not hesitated to acknowledge the oppressions caused by religions and be the first to stand up against it, that would not be really hard to know if they’re genuinely leftists or just reversed beefsteak nazi with culturally conservative values. The problem we are facing today is

colonialism are silent on these issues.

Afterall, my anarchism is not necessarily atheist as well. If I consider myself a Buddhist anarchist, I will be the first one to rage against the Buddhist scriptures that hold discriminatory views and those who like to apply to the laws of the state. If I consider myself a Muslim anarchist, I will be the first one to rage against the Islamic scriptures that hold discriminatory views and those who like to apply to the laws of the state. Believing so, I think of so-called religious anarchists who are not vocal enough about discriminatory views or scriptures within the religion they subscribe as trojan horses. If they think these scriptures are altered, they will have to be vocal about it. If they think the scriptures are misinterpreted, their activism should base on the activities to spread the right interpretation to the mass. If they don't do these and attend all the protests preaching about anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism that could potentially get supports from the religious fanatics, that's not anarchism. That's populism. Such trojan horses are scarier than the right-wingers in my opinion.

I don't think anarchism has a definition other than "question authority and value liberty". I just cannot comprehend those who believe in a dogma of a GOD being able to send you since you made him mad and pretend like you value liberty, and you question authority. Literally, slavery and exploitation of women slaves were fine, and that GOD will be mad over some pre-marriage sex and put me into hell? Or GOD will mad over some meats I eat but not the concept of slavery? That's a vile hypocrisy for me.

On personal level, I respect Buddha as much as I respect Karl Marx. Indeed, I respect Buddha since his spiritualism indeed is helpful on our daily lives full of workplace pressures and interpersonal conflicts. I respect Karl Marx since his class analysis indeed was unique and detailed from ancient utopian socialists. I respect Muhammad as he became a founder of a religion from merely a trader who got married to a rich lady. His story is at least more inspiring than the children of billionaires who are millionaire CEOs nowadays. I respect Ali and Fatima for their brave resistance against Abu Bakr, the first caliph. Yet, I won't defend Buddha, Karl Marx, Muhammad, and Ali for their

Personal Reflection

I myself is deeply involved with religious reformist movements. There are two-three Buddhist revivalist movements which are highly oppressed by the Theravada ruling class establishment in Burma that are relying on me for their digital presence, preparing study materials, video editing, photo editing and social media channels. They're kind of strong in numbers on ground and actively involved in the democratic movements, yet they cannot publish books, audios and videos due to the highly surveillance they suffered from the military junta and the nationalist/conservative Theravada monks. Most of their followers including their leaders were arrested, interrogated and seized by the state for believing in a progressive Buddhism. I created apps, hosted all books on telegram channels, publishing their recorded audios and videos as a direct action against the blasphemy laws by the state. Not only these reformist monks but also, I was threatened to be arrested for doing so. Some of them were dragged into mental asylum by the authorities for believing in and sharing atheistic Buddhism in the past. Some of them were arrested for 3-4 decades for believing in and sharing atheistic Buddhism.

I used to attend the interfaith seminars hosted by Ahmadiyya Muslim community in Burma and know most of their leaders personally. They once offered me to teach Urdu for free.

I recently developed a library website for Shia Muslims. Having this kind of website, any Shia imam can publish and host their books without having to acknowledge the majority mob rule of the Deobandi people, who refused to accept Shia Muslims as Muslims.

Yet, I honestly don't think religious reformism will lead to the liberation of the individuals from the oppressions caused by the religious fundamentalism. Let me share the reasons why I think that way here. First of all, as disclaimer, as someone who was born into a mixed religious family of Islam and Buddhism, I will only discuss about them. I am not interested in those saviour complex racists from the western left with white guilt who wants to defend Islam. I'm like 75% sure every point I argue on the question of Islam can be found in Christianity and Judaism since they copy from each other's anyways.

So, before jumping into detailed discussions, the following reasons I give are not all the quotes you might find in their books. This is an article, not a book, I might only show you one or two quotes in every point I try to make. There will be hundreds of similar quotes you can find those books with thousands of pages.

Buddhism and Intersectionality

Bhikkhuni Ordination in Burma

Buddha stated that females could attain nirvana and clearly ordained nuns and become bhikkhunis. That is commonly accepted all over the world but in Burma, women becoming bhikkhunis is still illegal. This is not Buddha's problem, but most likely Burmese Theravada problem. Myanmar, historically known as Burma, is where Ayya Saccavadi Bhikkhuni was born in 1965. She completed her education at Rangoon University in Myanmar, where she graduated in 1986 with a B.A. in Burmese literature. She was ordained as an 8-precept thilashin nun (usually the slave of a male monk) that same year. Seven years later, having excelled in the majority of her Buddhist classes, she was awarded the Dharmacarya (Teacher of Dhamma) degree, the highest degree available to Buddhist nuns in Myanmar. She did quite well on the Buddhist examinations, where memorizing a large portion of the Tipitaka is required.

She spent several years studying in Sri Lanka before graduating from Kelaniya in 2000 with a master's degree in Buddhism. She was ordained in Sri Lanka in 2002 as a sameneri, or female novice. She and Ayya Gunasari were the first two Burmese bhikkhunis in modern Sri Lanka to be granted dual higher ordination (bhikkhuni upasampada) in 2003. After her father became unwell in 2005, she went back to her native Myanmar, where she was arrested on suspicion of "impersonating a Buddhist monk" and arrested in Insein prison until she consented to leave the country and go back to Sri Lanka. She arrived in the US in 2007 and settled in with Ayya Gunasari Bhikkhuni and Thilashin Uttamatheri in Samadhi House at the Dhamma Dena Desert Vipassana Center upon Ruth Denison's offer of women's monastic quarters. She is second renewed Bhikkhuni in Burma. The first Bhikkhuni in modern

Yet, strangely, I ended up agreeing a lot with anarchists. Thus, I concluded that the anarchism is not a cult-like dogma like Marxism or any other ideology.

I've discussed with some religious leftists from Malaysia who found their aspirations from Mohamed Abdou's Islamic Anarchism. Those individuals I have encountered told me that "atheism" is a western(white) invented concept and anarchism doesn't have to be atheistic. They couldn't be more wrong. In fact, there used to be an Indian materialist philosophy called Charvaka philosophy long before the myth of Jesus and the birth of Christianity. The readers can find such evidence not only in the historical records of India, Persia, and the China region but also in the religious records of Buddhism, Hinduism, and Jainism. Charvaka philosophy is inherently atheistic, materialistic, and nihilistic in a lot of sense. Furthermore, the western civilisation and its white supremacist power only became colonial powers around 1500 CE. Persian philosophers like Ibn al-Rawandi and Abu Bakr al-Razi, as well as Arabic scholars like Abu Isa al-Warraq, had identified themselves as atheists long before 1000 CE.

In addition, the spread of philosophy and theology from religions such as Islam and Christianity, came to the Southeast Asia along with genocides, war crimes and colonialism. We can take "Padri War 1 in Minangkabau" of Indonesia.

We (Burmese Muslims), and other Southeast Asian Muslims having to learn Arabic just to pray to the GOD who is supposed to be all knowing since he only accepts the Arabic language, that's a colonial attempt towards our indigenous language. Our Ulama (Islamic councils) issuing fatwa not to participate in Malaysia indigenous or Burmese indigenous cultural festivals like Thingyan and so on seem to me a colonial attempt towards our indigenous culture. When the western world does the similar thing against their culture, I'm pretty sure those people who are supporting the fatwas will outcry as if they're being oppressed by the western secularism. Same goes for Buddhism too. Having to learn dead languages, Pali and Sanskrit to recite the mantras, sounds a bit fringe. Anyways, these are all fine if individuals would like to do. However, that's a bit hypocritical those who called themselves to be anti-settler

Chen Duxiu, a Chinese Trotskyist leader who later showed his loyalty to only “Democracy”, influenced me about loyalty on Democracy. That way I became sympathetic to Paris Commune after reading about it. I became sympathetic to Kronstadt Revolution after reading about it, not Bolsheviks. I became sympathetic to Pitchfork uprising after reading about it, not Bolsheviks. I became sympathetic to Shanghai People's Commune after reading about it, not Mao's CPC. I believe those individuals from Shanghai People's Commune, and Kronstadt Commune are the ones that stood up for progress while Mao and Bolsheviks were the defender of the oppressive regime machines and status quo. I haven't read intensively about anarchist thinkers like Proudhon, Bakunin and Peter Kropotkin. But I'm influenced by people like Periyar Ramasamy who never used the term “anarchism” to his politics and a social democrat Dr. Ambedkar on the question of “intersectionality”. So honestly, I tried to read basic tenets of those anarchist thought of schools like platformists, synthesis anarchists, anarcho-communists and anarcho-syndicalists. I am really convinced by (anti-left) post-left anarchists when it comes to broader values. To me, anarchism simply means “long live the individuals” which basically means I will have to be aware of the intersectional oppressions. I don't really care if I can find a large group of people or not. Most of the direct-action projects I did were the products of my labour with the help of average normal working-class people. I didn't work closely with most anarchists until I was approached by those comrades from YAA. Even now, I distance myself from comrades from YAA on personal level as I don't like being around people and I need personal space as an introverted nerd. In my version of anarchism, I don't care to defend Proudhon, Bakunin and Peter Kropotkin. I found almost little inspiration from Proudhon, Bakunin and Peter Kropotkin. Most of my political inspirations are not from books and dogma. Marxists like Chen Duxiu, Mansoor Hekmat, and post-left rationalists and social justice revolutionaries like Periyar Ramasamy as well as social reformer like Dr. Ambedkar influenced me with their writings on my journey of searching a way to solve the issues I'm facing.

Burma is Ayya Gunasari, who never flew back to Burma and settled in US.

Sexism, Patriarchy and Misogyny

The Theravada Pali texts are quite misogynistic and clearly state that a female can never become a Buddha due to the fact that she experiences several karmic disadvantages compared to males, especially menstruation, pregnancy, and childbirth, but also including inferior social status (see Peter Harvey, Introduction to Buddhism, p. 285).

Furthermore, women are associated with samsara because they are the “door” through which rebirth takes place. A bodhisattva will never have a female rebirth in his final rebirth because he must be the “best of men,” free of all common afflictions, but not yet a Buddha, in his final rebirth. There is little doubt that the 32 characteristics of a great guy are solely male. This is, without a doubt, the conventional or orthodox view of those who take the Pali Canon as their source.

The Dalai Lama has made it quite evident that a woman may become a Dalai Lama; but, as he is a bodhisattva and not a Buddha, he is not going through his final incarnation. If he were, there would be no Dalai Lama lineage. Due to his vocal criticism of this theory, Ajahn Brahm was expelled from his Thai lineage.

However, here I have no option but to admit that sexism and misogyny are only found in Theravada Pali Canon. Mahayana Buddhism is the only Buddhism that is not altered intentionally to be politically correct but yet already politically correct. Stating this line, since Ambedkarite Buddhism was altered by Ambedkar to suit itself with social justice values.

According to the Lotus Sutra from Mahayana Buddhism, women can attain Buddhahood in this lifetime. This sutra being the only sutra that says this accounts for its popularity among women over the centuries. In Mahayana, Avalokiteśvara is a tenth-level bodhisattva associated with great compassion (mahakarunā). He is often associated with Amitabha Buddha. Avalokiteśvara (Guanyin) is more often depicted as a woman, though there are some scriptures saying Guanyin is genderless. Imagine having this Queer bodhisattva who is at its highest level which is too close to become Buddha. Yet, I couldn't see Mahayana scripture stating that their final bodhisattva life will be male. I found Theravada Buddhism

stating that though.

In Vajrayana tradition, Tara Buddha is considered as a female Buddha. She is one of the most important female deities in Vajrayana and is found in sources like the Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa, and the Guhyasamāja Tantra.

I would argue it's generally safe to consider Mahayana Buddhism as a politically correct religion. For me, I personally view the whole Buddhism as a philosophy. There are at least two-three main philosophies we can find within Mahayana Buddhism if we don't necessarily believe in mystical religious faith. The author of Mūlamadhyamakakārikā, Nāgārjuna is an important India Buddhist philosopher who has a lot of Hegelian traits in his writings. His dialectic indeed seems more attractive to me than Hegel's.

Indo-Aryan Buddhist philosophers like Asanga and Vasubandhu were indeed inspiring too. Their version of Mahayana Buddhism, Yogachara is simply a psychoanalysis tool to know more about more minds and be mindful. For me, I don't think these practises to give me some mystical religious realm. I considered them philosophers as much as I consider Hegel, Nietzsche, and Albert Camus. I just find philosophers like Asanga, Vasubandhu and Nāgārjuna to be more insightful.

On the contrary, Buddhaghosa, a Theravada Buddhist philosophers played an important role interpreting the Theravada Pali canon in Burmese Buddhism. His work "Visuddhimagga" is sort of like orthodox approach of restricting people's freedom into a dogma. I refuse to follow Buddhaghosa in a same way I refuse to follow objective philosophers like Ayn Rand.

Islam and Intersectionality

Patriarchy and Sexism

Verse 34 from Surah An-Nisa according to English - Sahih International stated as follow:

"Men are in charge of women by [right of] what Allah has given one over the other and what they spend [for maintenance] from their wealth. So righteous women are devoutly obedient, guarding in [the husband's] absence what Allah would have them guard. But those [wives] from

In 1923, Communist party members and Nazis stood arm in arm collecting money for the strike. The strike was about transportation and rent strikes.

The role of Nazism nowadays is held by the religious fundamentalist of any religion. The religious right is the traditionalist, nationalist (communist) and theologians. The role of KDP is taken by people like George Galloway want support from. I highly doubt even if this is the right example. It seems to me that George Galloway kind of left-wing fascists represent Hitler's fraction (NSDAP) from Harzburg Front and religious right represent the DNVP from Harzburg Front.

Apparently, this red-brown alliance fascism is portraying itself as socialism. It's super irony that political parties who always claim they're antifascists are the one literally endorsing the fascists. Maybe, there were also fascists in the first place. There are little differences between (Marxism-Leninism) Stalinism and Fascism in the first place. It's a bit odd Trotskyists like SWP(UK) joined the gang though.

Decolonial Anarchism

I was informed that there are several forms of anarchism. So far, people tell me that there are platformists, synthesis anarchists, anarcho-communists, anarcho-syndicalists, post-left anarchists and so on. I generally believe in libertarian/anarchist values like "Mutual Aid", "Egoism", "Free Association", "Individualism", "Anti-statism", "Class War", and "Liberty". Yet, I don't know which thoughts of anarchist I belong to.

I deeply lost my respect on the global left-wing movement on the question of Charlie Hebdo around 2016. When I was a Maoist, I mostly read people like Nikolai Bukharin, Lenin, Stalin, Che, Thomas Sankara, Liu Shaoqi and so on. "How to be a good Communist" by Liu Shaoqi and "Red Little Book" by Mao Zedong used to be my favourite books until 2018.

I was convinced back to the left-wing movement by Slavoj Žižek book when I arrive to Australia. Right now, I am inspired by Iranian Marxist thinker like Mansoor Hekmat, Burmese Marxist thinker like Thakin Soe, and Chinese Marxist thinkers like Chen Duxiu and Li Dazhao. However,

pennant from Palestinian youth in the West Bank he added “we are with you” and then in Arabic, “Until Victory! Until Jerusalem”. With a new electoral vehicle, Respect, or rather, “Respect (George Galloway)”, Galloway won Bethnal Green and Bow in the 2005 general election. He attended a far-right “forum” in Kazakhstan, where he was photographed hugging Steve Bannon, the Leninist dude behind Trump campaign. During the EU referendum, he supported “Leave” and happily appeared on platforms with Nigel Farage, Bill Cash and Peter Bone. In the 2019 European elections he supported the Brexit Party. He proudly called himself a nationalist.

In recent election, he used the language that’s against LGBTQ++ community to win the vote from the religious fundamentalists. He said there are only two genders. He literally said “I believe in men and women, God created everything in pairs”.

Yet, SWP (UK), Communist Party of Britain, and Socialist Party (UK) are endorsing him. This is the repeat of the history. Nationalist dude who believes in conservative values who is being endorsed by far-right nationalists and who attended a far-right “forum” in Kazakhstan is a leftist for some political organisations like Socialist Workers Party (UK), Communist Party of Britain, and Socialist Party (UK). This stupidity is beyond my small brain.

Historically, in last century, the Communist Party of Germany collaborated with Nazi (National Socialist) Party of Germany against the Social Democratic Party of Germany. In 1931, the KPD united with the Nazis, whom they referred to as “working people’s comrades”, in an unsuccessful attempt to bring down the SPD state government of Prussia by means of a referendum. In other words, in the 1931 Landtag Referendum in Prussia, the Communist Party endorsed, at Stalin’s behest, a Nazi referendum to overthrow the SPD government.

In 1923, the leader of the KPD in Berlin, Ruth Fischer, had given a speech to Nazi college students and attempted to appeal to them with abhorrent antisemitism, declaring that, “Those who call for a struggle against Jewish capital are already class fighters... You are against Jewish capital and want to fight the speculators. Very good. Throw down the Jewish capitalists, hang them from the lamp-post, stomp on them.”

whom you fear arrogance - [first] advise them; [then if they persist], forsake them in bed; and [finally], strike them. But if they obey you [once more], seek no means against them. Indeed, Allah is ever Exalted and Grand.”

Interpreting this quote, I find three important information.

I interpret “Men are in charge of women” as patriarchal value.

I interpret “righteous women are devoutly obedient” as patriarchal value.

I interpret “God allows husband to strike women if they don’t obey them” as patriarchal value. Some people say the strike is to be lightly. However, If God only allows men to strike women, that’s fishy for me. Lightly or not, a strike is a strike.

Sahih al-Bukhari, Hadith 7099 stated as follow: “During the battle of Al-Jamal, Allah benefited me with a Word (I heard from the Prophet). When the Prophet heard the news that the people of the Persia had made the daughter of Khosrau their Queen (ruler), he said, “Never will succeed such a nation as makes a woman their ruler.”

Interpreting this quote, I find one important information.

Prophet Muhammad thought women incapable of leading an army or a nation. When Donald Trump says something similar, the entire nation will become feminists, that’s for sure.

Sahih al-Bukhari, Hadith 2658 stated as below:

The Prophet (Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam) said, “Isn’t the witness of a woman equal to half of that of a man?” The women said, “Yes.” He said, “This is because of the deficiency of a woman’s mind.”

Interpreting this quote, I find two important information.

Prophet Muhammad said women worth half of men and woman are deficient. Again, I’m pretty sure when Donald Trump says something similar, the entire nation will become feminists.

An-Nisa Verse 4 clearly stated that “Allāh instructs you concerning your children [i.e., their portions of inheritance]: for the male, what is equal to the share of two females.”

Strict Nuclear Family

Surat An-Nūr 24:2 clearly stated as below: “The [unmarried] woman or [unmarried] man found guilty of sexual intercourse - lash each one of

them with a hundred lashes, and do not be taken by pity for them in the religion of Allah, if you should believe in Allah and the Last Day. And let a group of the believers witness their punishment.”

Interpreting this quote, I find two important information. One is that Islam endorse “nuclear family”. Another one is that “most of us will not do well if this becomes a law”.

Interfaith Marriage

Surat An-Nūr 24:3 clearly stated as below: “The fornicator does not marry except a [female] fornicator or polytheist, and none marries her except a fornicator or a polytheist, and that has been made unlawful to the believers.”

Interpreting this quote, I find one important information. One is that Islam does not allow Muslims to marry non-Muslim polytheist people. So, in reality, what will happen? Forced conversion or pressure conversion. That’s for sure.

Eunuch Male (could be gay or trans)

A mukhannath (eunuch) is the one (“male”) who carries in his movements, in his appearance and in his language the characteristics of a woman.

Sahih Muslim 2180 clearly stated that “Umm Salama reported that she had a eunuch (as a slave) in her house. Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) was once in the house that he (the eunuch) said to the brother of Umm Salama: Abdullah. Aba Umayya. if Allah grants you victory in Ta'if on the next day, I will show you the daughter of Ghailan for she has four folds (upon her body) on the front side of her stomach and eight folds on the back. Allah's Messenger (Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam) heard this and he said: Such (people) should not visit you.” Sunan Abi Dawud 4930 clearly stated that “The Prophet (May peace be upon him) cursed effeminate men (mukhannathan) and women who imitated men, saying: Put them out of your houses, and put so-and-so out. (that is to say, the effeminate men).”

patriarchal, misogynistic, racist, castes and discriminatory?

In every form of populism, religious fundamentalism and culture conservatism are embedded. Some religions cannot be reformed as much as Nazism cannot be reformed to a more attractive version for most normal sane people.

Thus, just as Bhagat Singh once said “if religion is separated from politics, then we can all come together in politics even if we belong to different religions”.

Reversed Beefsteak Nazis among the Left (Anti-Fascist Until Endorsing Fascists)

Beefsteak Nazis mean nazi (brown) outside but communist (red) inside. Nowadays, we have a lot of reversed beefsteak nazis among the left. There are a lot of leftists who are leftists in virtue signalling but in deep down nazi (fascists with racism).

A lot of left-wing groups especially the Marxist-Leninist (Stalinists) groups and Trotskyists groups are practising the populist tactics of recruiting religious fundamentalists and cultural conservatives from the immigrant populations and the working class.

There are several examples to be included here. Some groups like SWP (UK), Respect Party (UK) and Socialist Party (UK) are the best examples of such regressive opportunistic populist left. However, these groups don’t consider themselves as such. They operate like cults and their members behave like cultists. Yet, they think they’re organising revolutions. Imagine the irony of wearing the Antifa flags and working closely with the literal fascists. That irony is beyond imagination. Yet, it’s happening on-ground.

People like George Galloway are portraying themselves as leftists in UK. Nick Griffin, a far-right nationalist from UK endorsed him publicly on Twitter by saying “Only one candidate can beat the System's warmongering uniparty in #Rochdale, and he's George Galloway”.

While on a delegation of European MPs to Iraq in 1994, George Galloway spoke the words that should follow him to his death, to Iraqi dictator and butcher Saddam Hussein. “Sir, we salute your courage, your strength and your indefatigability.” While presenting Hussein with a

the point is that since the caste system is clearly written in Hindu scriptures especially Manusmriti, unless Hinduism itself as a religion is criticized and raged, the liberation of the untouchables will never happen.

Leftists of today will have to educate themselves about religions. The left-wing mentality against religion were always the same. Bukharin and Stalin were anti-religion as much as Lenin and Trotsky. Bakunin was anti-religion as much as Peter Kropotkin. Yet, there is an increase in leftists who would like to practise Hegelian dialectic approach of synthesising religion and left-wing ideology. Last time, when some people tried to synthesise the nationalism with socialism, the result was not too good. That's for sure.

Last time when some people tried to synthesise Buddhism with socialism, the result was not good for the socialism in Burma. Last time when some people tried to synthesise Arab nationalism and Islamism with socialism, the result was not good for the socialism in Arab region. They all ended up as far-right fringe ideologies that cost a significant amount of human lives.

Here, political atheism is nothing but merely saying that when your religious scripture can be interpreted in a sexist, homophobic, transphobic, racist, misogynistic, and patriarchal, you seriously need to reconsider taking it as your liberation ideology.

On Jun 17, 1932, a Self-Respect Conference was held in Mannargudi under the chairship of Smt Kunjitham, a young graduate and wife of "Kuthoosi Gurusami", EV Ramasamy's confidante. In this conference, Smt Kunjitham spoke –

"The Congress under Mr Gandhi wants to keep Hindu, Muslim and Christian faiths as they are and seek unity among all Indians. However, we wish to destroy all such religious faiths as we believe only freedom from such faith can lead to social unity. "

We have seen people like Leo Tolstoy endorsing Christian anarchism, people like Mohamed Abdou endorsing Islamic anarchism and people like Bhante Sujato. Have they ever become the leading figure of their religion? Have we ever seen them publicly denying or at least criticising the scriptures that are sexist, homophobic, transphobic, queerphobic,

Slavery

An-Nisa Verse 24 clearly stated that "Also forbidden are married women—except female captives in your possession".

Sahih Muslim Book 16, Hadith 147 clearly stated as follow: "Abu Sa'id, did you hear Allah's Messenger (Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam) mentioning al-'azl? He said: Yes, and added: We went out with Allah's Messenger (Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam) on the expedition to the Bi'l-Mustaliq and took captive some excellent Arab women; and we desired them, for we were suffering from the absence of our wives, (but at the same time) we also desired ransom for them. So, we decided to have sexual intercourse with them but by observing 'azl (Withdrawing the male sexual organ before emission of semen to avoid-conception). But we said: We are doing an act whereas Allah's Messenger is amongst us; why not ask him? So, we asked Allah's Messenger (Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam), and he said: It does not matter if you do not do it, for every soul that is to be born up to the Day of Resurrection will be born."

Sunan Ibn Majah 2517 clearly stated that "We used to sell our slave women and the mothers of our children (Umahat Awaldina) when the Prophet (Sallallahu Alaihi Wasallam) was still living among us, and we did not see anything wrong with that."

Sahih Muslim 1501b which is also known as "The Book of Emancipating Slaves" clearly stated that "If anyone emancipates his share in a slave and has enough money to pay the full price for him, a fair price for the slave should be fixed, his partners given their shares, and the slave be thus emancipated, otherwise he is emancipated only to the extent of the first man's share."

Not only slavery is allowed, but also sexual exploitation against the female slavery is allowed according to the scripture. Here, I used "is" as most religious people including those from the left believe their scripture is true universally without time limitation. A slave is needed to pay a certain price to be emancipated according to the scripture. Here, if messenger or the GOD wanted the slaves to be emancipated, he could've added a simple verse simply with five words "No one shall own slaves". Apparently, there is no verses like that. So, the moral objective of its pro-claimed universality is highly debatable. The scripture unlike

popular opinion, might not come from above, but written by some Machiavellian people.

Reformists or Conformists

These days, not only in workplace organising but also in online channels, there are a lot of efficient religious working-class union organisers. That's something I cannot just ignore. Yet, that's a different struggle. That's organising for class struggle.

We still need to talk about Women's rights, LGBTQ's rights and so on. Here, I used the words "rights", "not liberation" for several reasons. Some people say "my religion doesn't compromise my commitment to liberation". I remember Bukharin in his famous work "ABCs of Communism" wrote about the conflicts of interests between religion and party. I would argue the same thing he discussed but replace the words "party" with the "cause of social justice".

What is the response of these people for those quotes I quoted from the original text? Some apologists would say "You're interpreting it wrong". My argument would be that "You cannot wrongly interpret the Statement of Human Rights Declaration of Independence to match with the languages used by Hitler's Mein Kampf". Interpretation can be slightly different for everyone, yet that should be a line drawn. I believe no one would be stupid enough to interpret the Hitler's Mein Kampf with Communist Manifesto. I'm aware that there were some NazBols who did that. However, the point is that such interpretation would also be too apparent to spot if someone tried to do so.

So, the real question here is that how do these people prove that their religion doesn't compromise their commitment to liberation. I don't have the perfect answer, yet what I'm sure that "apparently not by being silent when their local monk or imam says some patriarchal values in the monastery or mosque but too loud to respond with false so-called phobia accusations when the actual progressives are pointing out their hypocrisy". That's the basic thing.

Revolutionaries, at worst, should maintain and dare to stand the ground for their radical views in their local monastery or mosque even if they're minority. This is at worst. Revolutionaries, at best, should be able to

Reference: Collected works of Periyar E.V.R., p. 511, 2005.

To make the audience who might not be aware of the caste system and the oppression I'm talking about to be aware of the situations, let me quote some direct verses from Manusmriti.

-Manusmriti 11-135 clearly stated as follows: A hundred-year-old Kshatriya must treat a ten-year-old Brahmin boy as his father. Yet, this is not even about untouchables. This is Kshatriya, the second level caste.

-Manusmriti II-2 clearly stated as follows: The Brahmin should never invite persons of other varnas for food. In case, the latter begs the Brahmin for food, the Brahmin may give them some left-over. Even these left-overs must be served not by the Brahmin but by his servants outside the house.

-Manusmriti IV-78 to 81 clearly stated as follows: A Shudra is unfit to receive education. The upper varnas should not impart education or give advice to a Shudra. It is not necessary that the Shudra should know the laws and codes and hence need not be taught. Violators will go to as much hell.

-Manusmriti VIII-50, 56 and 59 clearly stated that as follows: Any Brahmin, who enslaves or tries to enslave a Brahmin, is liable for a penalty of no less than 600 PANAS. A Brahmin can order a Shudra to serve him without any remuneration because the Shudra is created by Brahma to serve the Brahmins. Even if a Brahmin frees a Shudra from slavery the Shudra continues to be a slave as he is created for slavery. Nobody has the right to free him.

Here, as I quoted Mahatma Gandhi's belief of Hinduism not relating at all to caste, the readers may compare and contrast with the original scriptures like Manusmriti.

Also, imagine the Hindu leftists protesting for anti-slavery and Black Lives Matter, yet, in their very own religion is teaching them how to properly own slaves. That level of hypocrisy is beyond imaginable.

Here, a Shudra means an untouchable. However, it's more complicated than that, to be honest. Shudra and Dalits are used interchangeably sometimes but they represent different caste in a lot of sense. However,

found within Hindustan region. Almost every single god found among the Hinduism are non-critical of caste system.

Ambedkar searched two burning values concerning Hinduism: “Does Hinduism recognise Equality and Liberty?”

Ambedkar answers each question in the negative by unveiling through scriptures (primarily the Manusmriti), the blatant inequality, orders of subservience and seeds of inter-caste hegemony and hatred entrenched in the sacred texts.

The four-caste system in short is as follow:

- Brahmins: Vedic scholars, priests or teachers.
- Kshatriyas: Rulers, administrators or warriors.
- Vaishyas: Agriculturalists, farmers or merchants.
- Shudras: Artisans, labourers or servants.

The four-fold caste system thus decries the interests of the Shudras while the worst is meted out to the Untouchables, who are not only ostracised from the four-fold caste system but cornered to the darkest recesses of society. Ambedkar approaches the subject of the Untouchables at the end of his argument. Afterall, Ambedkar considered Hinduism incompatible with equality and liberty for its caste system. People like Mahatma Gandhi, a privileged Brahmin tried his best to save Hinduism and tried to put make up on the caste system. This type of counter-revolutionary role is taken by some of those religious left nowadays. At the end of the day, Ambedkar, an untouchable himself, said the following public “I will not die as a person who calls himself a Hindu”. He endorsed untouchables to convert to Buddhism, a religion founded by Gautama Buddha who was born into Kshatriyas. However, Gautama Buddha didn’t accept the norm of caste system and encouraged his followers to focus only on the quality of the contents. Ambedkar didn’t accept random version of Buddhism. He appropriated a Buddhism which has social justice values and progressive values in it. Such kind of reformism is indeed needed these days. Not the apologist kind of reformism like Mahatma Gandhi. Periyar Ramasamy also remarked the caste system as: “It is absurd to quote religion or God or religious doctrines to render the people as lowest castes.”

organise in their local monastery or mosque and reform them so they can tolerate towards the progressive values. Even here, tolerate doesn’t mean ignoring the outsiders but tried to oppress the community members from those different gender in secret.

I have seen a lot of self-claiming leftists from different tendencies who followed a religion. Even though those kinds of leftists are silent when their religious leaders and the religious scripture of their religion oppress the minority social class based on any spooks like gender, race, sex, and so on, they will be super triggered and accuse the opposite side with several red-herring phobia to defend their hypocrisy.

-Unless someone who consider themselves as Theravada Buddhist actively challenges the oppressions that can be founded in the Theravada Buddhist society, they’re not religious reformists. They’re conformists.

-Unless someone who consider themselves as Theravada Buddhist actively challenges the oppressions that can be founded in the Theravada Buddhist scriptures itself, they’re not religious reformists. They’re conformists.

-Unless someone who consider themselves as Sunni Muslim actively challenges the oppressions that can be founded in the Sunni Muslim society, they’re not religious reformists. They’re conformists.

-Unless someone who consider themselves as Shia Muslim actively challenges the oppressions that can be founded in the Shia Muslim society, they’re not religious reformists. They’re conformists.

-Unless someone who consider themselves as Sunni Muslim actively challenges the oppressions that can be founded in the Sunni Muslim scriptures, they’re not religious reformists. They’re conformists.

-Unless someone who consider themselves as Shia Muslim actively challenges the oppressions that can be founded in the Shia Muslim scriptures, they’re not religious reformists. They’re conformists.

Even though most Sufis and Ahmadiyya are commonly known to be moderate, it's unknown to the public that Ahmadiyya are considered laughing stocks or non-Muslim by most Sunni and Shia. Yet, even among Sufis and Ahmadiyya, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, and religious discriminations and segregations are present. That means a significant population of Sufis and Ahmadiyya have drawn a line against political correctness.

Nikolai Bukharin in his book "ABCs of Communism" on Chapter 11: Communism and Religion" wrote that "Many weak-kneed communists reason as follows: 'Religion does not prevent my being a communist. I believe both in God and in communism. My faith in God does not hinder me from fighting for the cause of the proletarian revolution. This train of thought is radically false. Religion and communism are incompatible, both theoretically and practically". He even wrote another interesting line in the same Chapter, "The struggle with religion has two sides, and every communist must distinguish clearly between them. On the one hand we have the struggle with the church, as a special organization existing for religious propaganda, materially interested in the maintenance of popular ignorance and religious enslavement. On the other hand, we have the struggle with the widely diffused and deeply ingrained prejudices of the majority of the working population."

I've seen a lot of active Buddhist leftists and Muslim leftists in Australia so far. Like especially in Socialist Alternative, there are significant number of Muslim leftists. They seem to be super active with protests every week on the questions of Australia imperialism, anti-racism, LGBTQ++ rights and so on. Australian National Imams Council issued a statement called "Islam's Clear Position on Homosexuality". It was a statement against the first Australian gay imam. Why these Muslim leftists are not bothered about it at all? Isn't it more productive to conduct series of debates with Australian National Imams Council who literally is denying the rights of a gay Muslim imam than attending some protests where people will forget after a few minutes? In my opinion, if I were one of them, first of all, I will make sure that first Australian gay imam can survive in his community without being discriminated. Instead of circle jerking within organisation, that would be crucial to talk to the

existence in society of a force that does mischievous things. This force is inertia. Its strength is really much greater than the force of progress."

Reference: Li Ta-chao and the Origins of Chinese Marxism, Maurice Meisner, Pg.73.

It's the same thing for the religious liberation movements. The conservatives and the fundamentalist religious forces are much stronger and greater than the progressive religious. There has to be a reason for it. Since the scriptures were written by people from the feudal era with full of misogyny, sexism, homophobia, patriarchy, casteism, and so on, those scriptures are indeed inclined to be influenced by these values. Just as Chen Duxiu said in his article "The True Meaning of Life", all religions, laws, moral and political system are but necessary means to preserve social order. Chen Duxiu believed that Confucianism was a religion of "indoctrination".

Consequently, Chen Duxiu, Li Dazhao and Mao Zedong had to rage against Confucianism with the writings in "New Youth Magazine". Chen Duxiu even led the New Culture movement that endorses "vernacular literature", "free love", "democracy", and "critical historiographical approach".

This is the legacy of the founding fathers of the Chinese Communist Party before they founded CPC. This is the legacy of the genuine left. That could be the reason Leon Trotsky said "Whoever fails to struggle against religion is unworthy of bearing the name of a revolutionist". Quoting Chen Duxiu again, "Old Culture suppresses and hinders the birth of democracy and science. Unless you knock it down, new ideologies cannot stand." As long as the religious scriptures that are full of texts with misogyny, sexism, homophobia, patriarchy, antisemitism, and casteism are not considered as hate speech, there will be new religious fundamentalists. To avoid this, we will have to make sure that people are informed enough to revolt against those religious texts that are based on misogyny, sexism, homophobia, patriarchy, antisemitism, and casteism.

Another example could be the "Dalit Movement" from India. Caste system presents deeply within Hinduism. Hinduism is not an organised religion but loosely connected and contradicting mystical movements

might still be religious in a lot of sense. There is no formal definition for political atheism. It's a handful of traits we can find in some previous revolutions that're different from the analysis of Lenin and his class reductionist politics.

If we stick to the privileged position of Lenin and Trotsky's analysis about religion, Dalit people should sit and wait until a global revolution with some good Brahmin involvement and patiently asked for their human status at the feet of the Brahmin who have always oppressed them? The obvious thing here is that this whole left-wing dogma of privileged people like Lenin and Trotsky as well as their dogmatic cult followers are super shallow and reflect their privileged lives.

That's why I believe intersectionality is inherently political atheist since there are oppressions in every religion. I sometimes pray as a remembrance to my father as he taught me how to do namaz. I meditate to help myself from the workplace pressure. I still remember the Buddhist mantras my mum taught me. I have nothing against religions if they're not discriminatory. I myself is a cultural Muslim and cultural Buddhist who is politically atheist. We just have to either belong to the oppressed social group or visit the scriptures by ourselves. Don't do some argumentum ad hominem and abstract level Homunculus fallacy to the scriptures.

For example, in China, one of the very first progressive movements "May Fourth Movement" and its main vanguard "New Youth Magazine", had to rage against Confucianism in order to promote progressive values such as "Democracy", "Science" and "Socialism". Here, let me quote Chen Duxiu, one of the founders of Chinese Communist Party and the first General Secretary of it.

"Science, modern democracy, and socialism are three main inventions, precious beyond measure, of the genius of modern humankind."

Reference: Gregor Benton, Chen Duxiu's Last Articles and Letters (1937-1942), Pg 10.

I believe Li Dazhao, one of the founders of Chinese Communist Party and the father of Marxism in China wrote the following quote for the same reason.

"The general un-progressive pattern of mankind is really due to the

mass and do a survey about their views. Then, I would talk to local imams and promote the progressive imams who are tolerant on the LGBTQ++ questions for the elections of Australian National Imams Council. I believe one of the acts is virtue signalling and one of the acts is a future proven productive tactic.

This is what I did on Burmese Buddhist reformism as well. I talked to monks from every political spectrum. So, I can keep the records of their views. It's the only way to find out which monk is progressive, which monk is moderate and which monk is fundamentalist. Joining a protest random with some Buddhist banner and saying we Buddhist treat equally to women with microphone within a circle jerk crowd who already agreed to us won't help those females who are being persecuted for trying to become bhikkhunis by the Buddhist establishment in Burma. Similarly, I talked to Shia imams, Ahmadiyya imams and some Sunni imams. I might not necessarily be able to convince them, but I can keep the records of their views. It's the only way to find out which imam is progressive, which imam is moderate and which imam is fundamentalist. We don't have a single woman (cisgendered female) imam leadership in Burma, yet, let alone LGBTQ++ imam. We don't have a single woman (cisgendered female) bhikkhuni in Burma, yet, let alone LGBTQ++ monk. Almost no leftists in Burma, including most feminists are not talking about bhikkhuni issue too. That's a shame since most leftists in Burma claim they're woke. Surely, they're not woke enough. They're woke in terms of virtue signalling, not woke for rights or liberations. Bhikkhuni liberation is an indigenous liberation movement deeply rooted in Burmese Buddhist culture. Woman imam and LGBTQ++ imam movement are also indigenous liberation movement deeply rooted in Islamic culture as well. If Buddhist leftists are not doing it, they're not serious about gender liberation and intersectionality. If Muslim leftists are not doing it, they're not serious about gender liberation and intersectionality.

Reform or Revolution

Religions like Capitalism cannot be reformed. It's sort of irony for those people who said capitalism cannot be reformed and yet still subscribe to

the day-dreaming faith of religions capable of getting reformed. For the same reasons capitalism and the system cannot be reformed, the organised religion is the same.

I have seen enough Theravada believers who are actively struggling against the patriarchal Theravada monks. Such an example would be the question of Bhikkhuni. Same goes for some progressive Muslims. There is some western academia trained Muslim feminists who are fighting for the imam status of Muslim women.

However, the catch here is that

- “There were no female Buddha in Theravada Buddhism”.
- “There were no LGBTQ++ Buddha in Theravada Buddhism”.
- “There was no female messenger/rasul (not prophet/Nabi) of GOD/ALLAH in Islam”
- “There were no LGBTQ++ messenger of GOD/ALLAH in Islam regardless of sects”.

Also consider these verses I referred above too.

What can be the justification of it? There are several directly quotes and verses that degraded womanhood and LGBTQ++ people in both religions. How do these legit religious reformists justify these?

In the end of the day, no matter how so-called progressives or reformers defend their beloved religions, the religions were the products of the patriarchal society of that time. Given the fact that these scriptures claimed to be last revelation and only reflected the cultural norms of the patriarchal society of that time, it's safe to consider that they're far away from objective truth, let alone the only truth path.

So, instead of justifying with false interpretations, the real reformism is more about investigating the authenticity and the integrity of the scriptures. For example, an article named “The Quran, Hadith, and Support for LGBT Identity: An Interpretative Exploration” was written by someone called Aisha Khan in medium. She wrote and I quoted.

“Indeed, there are Quranic verses that highlight the vast diversity of Allah's creation. Surah Al-Hujurat (49:13) reads: O mankind, indeed We have created you from male and female and made you peoples and tribes that you may know one another. Indeed, the most noble of you in the sight of Allah is the most righteous of you. Indeed, Allah is Knowing

and Acquainted. While this verse does not directly address transgender or non-binary identities, it emphasizes the variety and diversity of Allah's creation. The distinction between male and female here can be viewed not as a binary but as ends of a spectrum, within which a range of gender identities can find validation.”

In her quote itself, she referred to Al-Hujurat (49:13) which literally said we have created you from male and female. That's already binary gender roles for the people in 570–632 CE. That can be proven by referring to this hadith. According to Al-Tabarani in al-Mu'jam al-Awat: 4157 and Al-Bayhaqi, Su'ab al-Iman: 5075, it's reported by Abu Musa al-Ash'ari that the Prophet stated: "If a woman comes upon a woman, they are both adulteresses, if a man comes upon a man, then they are both adulterers." Besides, Quran Al-Isra 17:32 clearly stated that: “Do not go near adultery. It is truly a shameful deed and an evil way.” So, after all, a woman comes upon a woman and a man comes upon a man is still considered as a shameful deed and an evil way according to the scriptures.

Again, this level of patience by people by Aisha Khan to reinterpret the Mein Kempf as Universal Human Right Declaration is something I cannot imagine at all. That's not productive in long run. That's for sure. Strasserism was more moderate than Hitlerism, yet, it doesn't stop Strasserism from being antisemite, nazi and disgusting. Same goes here.

Political Atheism

The only difference between racists and revolutionaries is that racists think religious people are the danger, and revolutionaries think religious people are the first-hand victim of the religions, the oppressive tools used by the ruling class. They became the zombies of the religions to oppress the other people. Also, racists tend to single out one religion and refused to acknowledge the same problem they're pointing against other religion to their religion. That's another hypocrisy you can find among the racists.

Political atheism is nothing alike militant atheism. Militant atheism is about rejecting the GOD as a concept. Political atheism is about rebelling against the oppressive values within religions. Political atheists