

Qx11 – Questioning “Revealed” Policies in “The Gospel According to Matthew” – 1

Dear: In this chapter, I want to begin examining policies advocated in the New Testament (which I’ll usually abbreviate as “NT”), i.e., the part of the Bible most important to Christians (and to Mormons). I’ve found the task to be difficult for many reasons, including the following.

- Consistent with my conclusions described in the previous chapter, I’m strongly inclined to show you, first, results from my examining a question similar to: “[What makes you think they give a damn?](#)” That is, I’m strongly inclined to start by showing you that the NT is just another priestly fabrication of propaganda to establish another priesthood. But I’ll try to constrain myself from showing you this until the “excursion” Yx.
- After examining the NT from an historical perspective (as I’ve done to produce Yx), it’s difficult to ignore what I’ve learned and to focus only on the apparent policies. I imagine that it’s like being witness to a murder and then being required to sit and listen through months and months of bickering by lawyers about bogus alibis, challenges to the reliability of evidence, mind numbing discussions of statistical uncertainties of DNA testing, and so on. But again I’ll try to constrain my desires – to scream bloody murder!
- This week [as I write this], your father informed his mother and me that, after 20 years commitment, he was quitting Mormonism. In a later chapter, I’ll go into details about why. Of course we received this as stunningly good news, but it’s also been just stunning – especially because it’s not yet clear what the consequences will be for certain grandchildren: he has suggested that you’ll continue to participate in Church activities with your mother while he won’t. Usually, such an arrangement isn’t healthy for a family.

So, Dear, please bear with me. I’ll do my best to pull this cart up the hill. I’ll try to make sure that my harness is secure, that my blinkers are fixed securely, and that I keep facing and plodding forward. And though the load is really not that heavy, and the hill is really not that steep, I should probably remind you of some characteristics of this old horse: I’ve always been adverse to wearing a harness, constraining myself stresses me, stupidity stresses me even more, when I get stressed, I tend to become even more cynical and sarcastic, and upon being sufficiently stressed, I’ve been known to seek relief by trying to write poetry.

Enough said for now. To get this cart on the road, if you plan to come along for the ride, then please grab a Bible (mostly I’ll be using the *New English Version*, mostly because it’s easier to read) and join me in reviewing the NT,

beginning with the gospel that appears first therein, i.e., “The Gospel According to Matthew” (which I’ll usually abbreviate to *Matthew*).

By the way, although there’s some uncertainty about the derivation of the word “gospel”, my dictionary suggests that (rather than “gospel” meaning “good news”, which is so commonly repeated), it may be an abbreviation of the Old English word *godspel* meaning “good story”, where *spel* (as in spelling!) appears to have the Indo-European base word *pel*, meaning “to speak loudly”. As for who the person Matthew might have been, I’ll comment on that in appropriate context below and show you a little more in **Yx**, but in summary, it’s not at all clear who he was.

At any rate, whoever Matthew was, he starts his story poorly. He lists a huge “genealogy”, apparently attempting to show that “Jesus the Messiah” descended from King David, thereby proposing to show that the birth of Jesus was consistent with two (silly) “prophecies” in the Old Testament (OT) that I’ll show you in some detail in **Yx**. Anyway and as a result, I can imagine that some sarcastic cynic in the crowd would interject:

“Hey Matthew, whadaya up to?”

“I’m showing that Joseph, the husband of Mary (the virgin mother of Jesus) was descended from King David.”

“You say she was a virgin – even though she gave birth to Jesus?!”

“Yup, she was a virgin all right: before her marriage to Joseph, she ‘found that she was with child by the Holy Spirit’.”

“And Joseph bought that story?”

“Of course! As I wrote (*Matthew 1*, 20):

... an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream. “Joseph son of David,” said the angel, “do not be afraid to take Mary home with you as your wife. It is by the Holy Spirit that she has conceived this child. She will bear a son; and you shall give him the name Jesus (Savior), for he will save his people from their sin.” All this happened in order to fulfill what the Lord declared through the prophet: “The virgin will conceive and bear a son, and he shall be called Emmanuel”, a name which means “God is with us.” Rising from sleep Joseph did as the angel had directed him; he took Mary home to be his wife, but had no intercourse with her until her son was born.

“Hey, wait a minute there Matthew!”

“What?”

“Where are you reading that stuff about ‘The virgin will conceive and bear a son’...?”

“Right here in the Old Testament.”

“Really – and have you ever read the original?”

“What original?”

“The original, written in Hebrew.”

“Well, this is the Greek translation of the original. Why?”

“Cause in the original it says that a young girl will give birth to a son – there’s nothing about her being a virgin!”

“Well, that’s not what it says in my holy book, and it’s what I believe.”

“I see – and tell me, about the business about Joseph receiving a message: is the usual way to receive messages from the Lord *via* angels in dreams?”

“Of course. What did you expect?”

“Well, I dunno. I suppose a cell-phone call or a fax message would be out of the question... But I wonder: was Mary anywhere near, when Joseph was dreaming, or did she put extra garlic in his soup the evening before?”

“I can’t comment on that. All I know is what the angel said to Joseph in his dream.”

“You were there?”

“No, of course not; it happened before I was born.”

“So how do you know it happened?”

“Cause that’s what I was told.”

“I see... But you know, I’ve been told tales about lots of different ways women can become pregnant (like being violated when they’re sleeping, seduced by a spirited holy priest, and so on), but I never heard this one about being impregnated by a holy spirit.”

“Oh, it’s quite common.”

“Really?”

“Oh, yes, many sons of gods were born by immaculate conception of virgins, the Egyptian god-son Horus and the Indian god-son Krishna are two of the most famous.”

“Fascinating... Yet, there’s still one thing that puzzles me?”

“What’s that?”

“Well, Matthew, I know you said you went through Joseph’s genealogy to show that Jesus was a descendant of King David, but whereas you said that Joseph never had sex with Mary until after Jesus was born and that Mary was impregnated by the Holy Spirit, then what’s Joseph’s genealogy got to do with it? I mean, if Joseph wasn’t Jesus’ father, then who-in-hell cares about Joseph’s genealogy? Shouldn’t you give us the genealogy of Mary – or of this fellow you call ‘the Holy Spirit’?”

“You don’t understand.”

“That’s my point; please enlighten me.”

“Well, first, women aren’t like men.”

“Do tell.”

“Well, women are like the soil. Of course the soil is important, it must be fertile and not barren, but what’s really important is the seed planted in the soil, and the man plants his seed in the woman.”

“I see. And because women are like soil, then it’s okay to treat them as dirt?”

“Well, those might not be the exact words I would use, but you seem to have picked up the general principle.”

“Whatever – and so then, why give us Joseph’s genealogy?”

“Well, according to the laws of Moses, when a man adopts a son (as Joseph adopted Jesus) then the son is entitled to full inheritance; therefore, an adopted son inherits his foster-father’s lineage.”

“Well, maybe that’s the law, Matthew, but instead of giving us Joseph’s lineage, to give us a true idea of the lineage of Jesus, why don’t you give us the genealogy of this fellow you call ‘the Holy Spirit’?”

“The Holy Spirit isn’t a ‘fellow’; it’s the Holy Ghost!”

“Ghost? You mean you believe in ghosts?”

“Of course!”

“I see. And ghosts can impregnate women?”

“Of course!”

“Amazing. And just exactly how do they do that? I mean (not to get too technical) do ghosts actually ejaculate sperm – or in your words, do they actually plant their seeds in the women’s soil?”

“Oh no. Not the Holy Ghost. He descends on people like a dove, like a bright light, like a nonburning flame?”

“Amazing. Well, not to bother asking you what the devil a “nonburning flame” is, I’d still like to ask you if you’re suggesting that a woman can become pregnant getting too close to this flame, so to speak.”

“Exactly so.”

“Amazing. And you have data to support this theory? I mean: do lots of women get pregnant from getting too close to the fire, or getting too much bright light, or playing with doves, or similar?”

“Well, I wouldn’t say ‘lots’, but as I already said, many women have reported that they became pregnant that way.”

“I see. But still – why don’t you give us this Holy Ghost’s genealogy rather than Joseph’s?”

“I already explained: an adopted son inherits his foster father’s lineage.”

“So then, what you’re saying is that Jesus didn’t get any genes from David?”

“What’s a gene?”

“I see... And I suppose no one considered doing a DNA test to determine who was the biological father of Jesus.”

“What’s a DNA test?”

“Well, maybe the details wouldn’t help you much, so maybe you could just tell me if the following is a fair summary of your policy statements:

- God prefers to communicate with people in dreams *via* angels rather than in person, using cell phones, sending faxes, or similar,
- Women’s reproductive capabilities are like the soil, and they can produce babies if ghosts plant seeds in them, and
- An adopted son has the genes of his foster father.”

“Well, some of your words seem rather strange, but otherwise: Yes, those seem to fairly well summarize the points I was trying to make.”

“So then tell me, Matthew, how you’d respond to the note by Frank Zindler, which you can find on the internet, that states:

Among mammals, a virgin birth (parthenogenesis) can only produce female offspring, for chromosomal reasons. Messiahs are mammals. Therefore, Jesus was... On the other hand, among turkeys, the chromosomal situation is such that all products of virgin birth are males. So if Jesus was a male, he might also have been...

“Well, I can’t comment on that.”

“Oh, you mean you don’t understand the meaning of ‘chromosomal reasons’?”

“Well, yah, that, too, but also, what’s the ‘internet’?”

“Ah, never mind.”

Sorry, Dear, but I tried to warn you!

Anyway, Dear, now please turn to *Matthew 2*. In **Ix**, I commented on some of its astrological features, and in **Yx**, I’ll try to show you how it borrows from myths about how saviors are saved from wicked kings. Here, I’ll try to summarize just some of the obvious policies it advocates.

- Not only does god communicate to people *via* angels in dreams, sometimes (when he’s of a mind) he communicates to people through movement and location of stars:

... astrologers from the east arrived in Jerusalem, asking, “Where is the child who is born to be king of the Jews? We observed the rising of his star...”
- The people of Israel are a bunch of sheep in need of a shepherd – and it’s Jesus’ job to be that shepherd:

“Bethlehem in the land of Judah... out of you shall come a leader to be the shepherd of my people Israel.”
- Astrologers are wise – except sometimes they’re dumb, stopping to ask for directions, even when the star they’re following was quite prepared to keep on moving and park directly over their destination.

... the star which they had seen at its rising went ahead of them until it stopped above the place where the child lay...

- God can work wonders: he can communicate (of course *via* dreams) to a single person to save that one person's adopted son. But sometimes, unfortunately, God's rather forgetful, forgetting (for example) to communicate a similar warning to all other parents of young children in Bethlehem and its neighborhood, who (as a result) were all slaughtered.

In *Mathew 3*, we find some amazing concepts, as well as policies promoted by John the Baptist:

- When people come to be baptized, to confess and repent their sins, and to have them washed away, apparently a quite acceptable greeting is:

You viper's brood [i.e., you sons of snakes]...

- Not only can God make people with genetic links to David, using ghosts planting their seeds in appropriate soil, but also with genetic links to Abraham even out of rocks:

God can make children for Abraham out of these stones here...

- Jesus will treat unacceptable people like chaff, burning them

... on a fire that never will go out

(whether it's because of the nature of the fire or because there's a steady supply of new people to burn isn't specified).

- John baptized Jesus, but exactly what sins he confessed and promised to repent is not specified, only that God willed that it be so:

"Let it be so for the present; we do well to conform in this way with all that God requires."

- The spirit of God is air-worthy and has a very good guidance-control:

... the Spirit of God descended like a dove to alight upon him [Jesus]...

- On special occasions, heaven can "open" and a voice can emanate, speaking (I assume) in Hebrew:

"This is my Son, my Beloved, on whom my favor rests."

Thus, apparently heaven can "open" without causing a rift in space-time, and God is quite capable of sending electromagnetic waves (modulated with a voice message) through space, perhaps then to interact with the ionosphere, changing the EM waves to acoustic waves that eventually reach the Earth's surface. How it is, however, that only Jesus heard this voice-message (rather

than everyone in the Middle East) isn't clear. Maybe the Holy Ghost implanted a special cell phone in Jesus' head. (Well, I mean, if the Holy Ghost could plant a seed in Mary's soil, I don't see why...)

It's also unclear why God has taken to making his children with the help of ghosts impregnating women, when previously he seemed to be content to make them by snapping his fingers (or whatever), molding people out of clay, or making them from the odd rib-bone. Do we know what this "Holy Ghost", this "Spirit of God", really is? Is a "nonbuning flame" a euphemism for 'orgasm'? That could explain a lot. But I hope there isn't a suggestion, here, that God found having sex with women to be more fun than snapping his fingers (or whatever). In the OT (*Genesis 6, 4*), we're told about the bad old days "...when the sons of the gods had intercourse with the daughter of men and got children by them..." Does this NT story mean that God, HIMself, decided to get on the action? That could explain why there are so many stories about so many virgins giving birth to so many god-sons. Who knows how many virgins God raped with his Holy Ghost.

But in any case, if Jesus had asked me for my advice, I would have advised him to take care. I mean, the previous person God reportedly made was Adam (thereby, in a sense, making Adam God's son), and it's well known how God treated Adam: didn't teach him the difference between right and wrong, then kicked him out in the cold for doing what God considered wrong, thereby depriving Adam of eternal life. I mean, I'd caution Jesus to be very careful if he hears (on his implanted cell phone) any promises of eternal life, because rumor has it that God's not big on having company (or competition). I'd advise Jesus to be very, very skeptical.

But that aside for now, I'll now move on to *Matthew 4*, which defines several interesting concepts and policies:

- The Spirit of God not only rapes virgins, but it leads people out to wilderness to be tempted by the devil, Satan. Whether this Spirit also leads people into bars, discos, and strip joints to tempt them, is not stated explicitly. And unfortunately, Matthew also neglects to tell us why, if God knows everything and can foresee the future, he would then waste his time testing Jesus, when the outcome was known. One similarly wonders why God tested Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden (if he knew the outcome) – which perhaps means that the premiss that God knows everything (or anything?!) should be examined.
- If you don't eat for 40 days and 40 nights, you'll be hungry. And you thought there wasn't useful information in this NT! As they say in Texas: "That'll larn ya."

- People are not to design experiments to test God. Experiments are performed to determine if something is false. People are not to test if God is false. Exactly why isn't mentioned.
- From a very tall mountain in Israel, Jesus could see all the kingdoms in the world “**in all their glory**”, including the kingdoms in China and South America. Subsequent observers, however, have failed to do so, presumably because subsequently the Earth changed from a flat plate into a big ball and air was introduced, which limits horizontal visibility to ~100 miles.
- Satan has the authority to offer people all the kingdoms in the world, in all their glory. Whether in fact Satan has this much power, however, was never put to an experimental test. Perhaps people are not to test Satan, either.
- If you're special, then angels wait on you; if you're not, then you'll need to wait for the waiter.
- Jesus was not above parroting John the Baptist's line: “**Repent; for the kingdom of Heaven is upon you.**” But whether this meant that the kingdom of Heaven was about to come, or was sitting on your head (so to speak), or in fact, is in your head (i.e., a state of mind), Matthew neglected to mention.
- Fishermen are fickle, foolish, and lazy. You might think they work hard to provide their families with food and other essentials; you might think they possess substantial resourcefulness and skill to acquire and maintain their equipment and boats; you might think they possess great strength, courage, and dedication for them to bravely face the elements in their struggle to wrestle food from an environment hostile to humans; and above all, you might think they must have in great abundance a most important characteristic of successful humans, namely, perseverance. But actually, if someone should wander by and say to some fishermen “**Come with me, and I will make you fishers of men**”, they'll think that it's such a cute little play on words that they'll just drop what they're doing and wander off.

And actually, Dear, also I could easily wander off, here, to show you that by parroting John's “**the kingdom of Heaven is upon you**” the Gnostics' Jesus (as opposed to the clerics' Jesus) apparently didn't mean that the “kingdom of Heaven” was coming soon (as the clerics claimed) but that it was already here, on Earth, and is a state of mind. Also, I could wander off to show you that the story about the fishermen is “written in the stars” (i.e., as with the story about the three wise men, it's more astrological nonsense), but I'll restrain myself (until later in this **Qx** and in **Yx**). Further, until later in this **Qx**, let me ignore the silliness that Jesus cured those who were “**possessed by devils**”.

Instead, for now, I'll pretend that I'm just one of the crowd of people who have nothing better to do than follow Jesus, even though he apparently never

told anyone where he was going. After all, Dear, don't you agree that people are like sheep and will drop anything and everything to follow someone who proclaims: “**Repent; for the kingdom of Heaven is upon you**”? Sorry, Dear, sometimes I use sarcasm to try to keep my sanity.

Now, Dear, if you've been following me this far, then be careful: so far, it's been fun and games, but soon, I plan to start criticizing this junk in earnest! Specifically, I want to comment more generally on some of the idiotic ideas about morality that are promoted by the stupid cleric (or clerics) who wrote this “Gospel According to Matthew”. And, yes, Dear, I could understand if you don't think I should use those adjectives (viz., *stupid* clerics with their *idiotic* ideas), but as I wrote before, I have a very low tolerance for ignorance. Again and again, my mind returns to the brilliance of Socrates' assessment: “**There is one good, knowledge, and one evil, ignorance.**”

Yet, once again, maybe I should add that Socrates' assessment needs if not a caveat then at least some comment. As I've written before, I'd prefer if his assessment were in the form: **there is only one good, willingness to learn, and one evil, refusal.** Further, giving Socrates the benefit of any doubt, I'm sure he meant that evil is not in ignorance, itself, but in actions that result from ignorance. Also, I'm sure that his main point was something even more powerful: that people commit evil only out of ignorance – if they had more understanding, their actions would be good.

Approximately 500 years after Socrates, in the *Gospel of Philip* (another of the Gnostics' gospels that Christian clerics tried to destroy and that were recently found buried in the sand at Nag Hammadi), an idea similar to Socrates' was repeated: “**Ignorance is the mother of all evil.**” But the problem with the Gnostics and their Jesus (where, again, the word ‘gnosis’ means ‘knowledge’) is that their claimed “knowledge” was actually mostly just primitive ignorance, i.e., that which can be described with Ralph Waldo Emerson's expression: “mere babblings of a diseased mind.”

Further, in general, it's not thoughts that can be evil but actions. As I've written before, if you were dying of thirst in the desert, then I guarantee that you would covet your partner's last drink of water. But the thought wouldn't be evil; it would reflect a physiological need. It could be evil, however, if you didn't recognize your partner's equal right to claim his own existence, i.e., if your thirst drove you to take your partner's last water.

But even in this case, even the act of taking your partner's water, might not be evil. As I've written before, the claimed moral imperative "thou shalt not covet... anything that belongs to your neighbor" begs the question: How did your neighbor (e.g., your partner in the desert) acquire what he claims belongs to him? Last night while you were sleeping, did he steal your water? Similarly, when a grossly overweight (viz., 'obese') cleric steps out of his Cadillac in his expensive clothes, I hope that the people would question not only the concept of coveting but also the source of the con artist's wealth, namely, the people's ignorance.

But enough of that for now. Later in this chapter I'll return to the nonsense (claimed to be made by the clerics' Jesus) about "evil thoughts." First, Dear, I want to show you more of the clerics' ignorance that they attribute to Jesus. And toward showing you some of this ignorance, let me first remind you of the concept of morality, then show you the clerics' contrived idea of "sin", and then turn to their asinine idea about praying for forgiveness (of sins). For this review, consider the following "bulleted" items.

- Recall that Mother Nature (aka experience) teaches us that morality is a value (say ranging from -10 to +10) that we assign to any act. In words, we can call the value -10 to be "totally bad", "pure evil", and similar (e.g., in olden days, "satanic") and the value +10 to be "totally good" and similar (in olden days, "godly"). The moral value (or morality) of any act would then fall in the range between -10 to +10.
- It's important to recognize that moral values have a range, which can be normalized to be between -10 to +10 (or 0 to 100, or whatever range one desires). Thus the moral value of stealing food when you are hungry is different from (and greater than) the moral value of stealing food "just for the fun of it". In contrast, simple people (such as most clerics) tend to recognize only the extremes on the "morality scale", judging every act as "good vs. evil", as if the world was just "black or white".
- Beyond teaching us there's a range of moral values, experience (aka Mother Nature) teaches us something else that's extremely important: as with any "value", moral values (or "morality") can be measured only relative to some objective. In particular, morality is a measure of the value of how some act promotes our objectives. Stated differently, morality is meaningless without reference to some objective.
- As far as I can make it out, the prime objective of all humans is our trio of survival (or "thrival") goals: our own survival, the survival of our families (whatever extent we recognize for our 'families'), and the survival (or promotion) of our other values (whatever the source of these other values might be, e.g., a desire to have eternal life in paradise, to enhance beauty, to help intelligence to continue to expand, etc.).
- Whereas essentially all our acts are in pursuit of some objective (save, perhaps, those acts we do when we're drunk or zonked out on some other drug) and whereas all our

other objectives are subsidiary to our trio of survival goals, therefore, the morality of any act can be related to our trio of survival goals.

- Although all humans seem to pursue their trio of survival goals, philosophical differences among humans arise not only from the methods we choose to pursue our goals (e.g., one person chooses to become a ballet dancer and another chooses to become an engineer) but also (and more significantly) from our choices of our “third survival goal”, i.e., the promotion of our values. Further, because any “value” is meaningless without reference to some objective, then philosophical differences among people primarily arise from the differences in objectives used to measure values.

For example, those of us who call ourselves Humanists define our values in terms of our dual survival goals, of ourselves and of humanity. I’ll explain this more fully in a later chapter (namely V, dealing with values).

For religious people, in contrast, they accept what the clerics tell them should be both their values and the objectives to which their values are to be measured. Thus, religious Jews, Christians, Muslims, Mormons, etc. accept their clerics’ directive that one of the prime purposes of humans (if not the highest-priority goal) is to serve God (whom the clerics just happen to represent). Consequently, because these clerics teach that their God is a jealous god who wants continuous praise, then for all religious Jews, Christians, Muslims, and Mormons, the act of greatest morality (a +10 on the morality scale) is to grovel to God with “prayers of adoration”.

You can see the claim of the Christian (and Muslim and Mormon and Jewish) clerics that the prime goal is to “adore” God, both in the Old and New Testament. Thus, in the OT, it’s the first of the Ten Commandments, and in the NT (e.g., at *Matthew 22, 37*), the clerics’ Jesus responds to the question “**Master, which is the greatest commandment in the Law**” with:

“Love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind. That is the greatest commandment. It comes first.”

Actually, though, the clerics’ claim is a ruse: obviously the prime goal promoted by the clerics for their religious followers is that the people are to obey as commanded; that is, they are to obey – and what that really means is: obey us (the clerics)!

In contrast, Humanists accept no other prime goals than those we deduce from data by ourselves (including the “data” derived from the insights of others). Thus, in my case (as I’ve tried to show you) all available data suggest to me that our prime objectives are our trio of survival goals – with

* Go to other chapters *via*

essentially all our values (the possible exception being in seeking “beauty”, “truth”, “symmetry”, and similar) being deduced from our dual survival goals (of ourselves and of humanity). In simplest terms, the data (plus Darwin’s insight) suggest that these DNA molecules (which have managed to survive for the past billion-or-so years) have thereby earned the right to claim and to maintain that “the good” is for them to continue living. Translated into human terms, with the dominant characteristic of humans being our amazing brains, “the good” (a +10 on a humanist’s morality scale) is therefore **to use our brains as best we can** – which includes basing our decisions on the best available data.

Using my brain as best I can, then (as I’ve written before), I discern two types of morality: personal morality and interpersonal (or social) morality. Further, using my brain as best I can, I conclude that the act of highest personal morality is to use one’s brain as best one can! And in the case of interpersonal morality, then again using my brain as best I can, I conclude that the acts of highest social morality can generally be described with such expressions (or “moral codes”) as **“be kind, if you can, but with keenness”**, or **“everyone has an equal right to pursue one’s own objectives”**.

If Humanists fail to act morally (i.e., fail to use their brains as best they can), then borrowing the clerics’ word, it could be said that such humanists “sin” – but we prefer to say that we made a “mistake”. And when we make mistakes, then Mother Nature (with her principle of causality) is always there to dole out suitable “justice” (including “punishment”, if it’s appropriate). That is, generally one pays for one’s mistakes; generally one gets pretty much what one deserves. Similarly, there’s “punishment” (viz., consequences) of the “sin” (viz., the mistake) of not being kind to other humans (with keenness) or not recognizing that others have equal rights to pursue their own goals, one of the best, down-to-earth summary statements of which is: **“What goes around comes around.”**

Now, Dear, I hope that the above review, outlining the “Humanist’s scheme” seems totally sensible to you. And if it doesn’t, then I hope very much that you (as a Humanist!) will use your brain as best you can (which should include evaluating all available data) to improve on the scheme! But then, Dear, for a startling contrast, please consider some of the ideas in the “Christian (and Mormon) scheme” that I’ll show you below. What I expect that you’ll see is that the NT promotes an astounding range of stupidities (as judged by any Humanist), which if transformed into actions, would be an

* Go to other chapters *via*

astounding range of immoralities (as judged by any Humanist); similarly for the Book of Mormon and the Quran, which I'll get to in later chapters.

An example from further ahead in the NT is at *John 12, 25*, according to which Jesus said:

“The man who loves himself is lost, but he who hates himself in this world will be kept safe for eternal life.”

Now, Dear, it's one thing to encourage people to show a reasonable amount of humility (because braggarts can be a bore), but this is humility gone berserk: not only not to love oneself, but even to hate oneself! That's crazy!

Dear, the immorality of hating oneself is right up there (or, better, “down there”, with a value close to -10) with the morality of choosing “to believe” rather than “to think”. You can “hate” what you've done (and, I trust, you'll try to do better next time – which is one of the greatest characteristics of humans, i.e., to try to correct and make amends for their mistakes), but there's no value (to your survival) of your hating yourself: in the limit, if you hated yourself enough, you'd kill yourself! Anyone who promotes people hating themselves is bonkers! Dear, if you ever start hating yourself, please seek psychiatric help. And if you know of people who doesn't love themselves (and if it's reasonable for you), then try to help them, for example, by encouraging them to see a psychiatrist – and by encouraging them to stay away from the damnable clerics!

But perhaps you think that the above quotation from *John 12, 25* is a misprint. Well, that's certainly a generous possibility, but now, let me continue on through “The Gospel According to Matthew”, and I think you'll quickly see that it's no misprint, because the NT is loaded with such ignorance, i.e., such immoralities. In particular, consider (one version of) the famous “Sermon on the Mount” that the clerics allege was delivered by Jesus. It starts at *Matthew 5*. Unfortunately, it's not clear to whom the clerics' Jesus allegedly delivered this sermon (whether to the assembled crowd or just to his apostles), but in either case, some policies proposed are the following – and I admit that my following comments ooze with sarcasm.

- Humans can exist in a state called “blessed”. For people in this state “the kingdom of heaven is theirs”; such people “know their need of God” and “suffer persecution for the cause of right”. From which it follows that, just because you're blessed doesn't mean that you don't have needs and aren't persecuted. The antithesis of being blessed and in the kingdom of heaven, I assume, is being cursed and in hell.

Therefore, even though you have no needs and aren't persecuted doesn't mean that you aren't in hell – I guess. Can you figure out what it means?!

- Whereas you're blessed if you're sorrowful, I guess you're cursed if you're happy. I wonder which state most people would choose.
- You're blessed if you have a gentle spirit; then, not only do you get “the kingdom of heaven” but also you get to possess the earth. From this, it apparently follows that Alexander the Great [dictator], various Caesars, Genghis Khan, various Popes, Hitler, Stalin, and various other megalomaniacs didn't quite have sufficiently gentle spirits, for none of them was quite “blessed” enough to possess the entire earth.
- Apparently there's such a thing as “right” (vs. “wrong”, I presume) and apparently “right” and “wrong” are so obvious that they need no definition. Various troublemakers in the crowd probably asked a variety of questions (whether it was right to force women to bear children or to permit abortions, whether it's right or wrong to honor dishonorable parents, whether one should think or obey, and so on), but apparently Jesus ducked such difficult questions.
- Jesus preached that, in general, it's a good idea to show mercy – but later demonstrated that, in some cases, exceptions should be made. For example, for those evil people who choose to think for themselves and conclude that all this rot is preached by the clerics so they can continue their parasitic existence, then Jesus was in favor of torturing such people for eternity in hell, showing them absolutely no mercy.
- If you want to see God, then you must have a pure heart. And in case troublemakers ask “What's a ‘pure heart’?”, let me assure you (and them) that it has absolutely nothing to do with the level of bad cholesterol in your blood. To have a pure heart you must have pure thoughts. The preachers will tell you which thoughts are pure and which are impure. Impure thoughts are those dealing with coveting and fornicating and stuff like that. You're not to have such thoughts. Understand? And if you don't see God yet, then stop thinking about coveting and fornicating. Look, the clerics told you to stop thinking about coveting and fornicating. How come you keep thinking about coveting and fornicating? Can't you stop thinking about coveting and fornicating? No wonder you can't see God – and no wonder the clerics can't!
- And still another way to be blessed, so much so that God will call you his son (or, I presume, “daughter”, if that's more appropriate) is to become a peace-maker. This is great. And maybe it's because of his peace-making activities that God called Jesus his son – a possibility that I'll explore later in this chapter. But for now, darn if I don't have some more questions, for example: just exactly how far should one go in order to make peace? I mean, surely it's obvious that anyone can “make peace” with a tyrant by succumbing to his whims: if a bully wants the candy, give it to him; if your boss wants to use you as a sex toy, then the way to peace is clear; and giving Hitler Czechoslovakia will surely yield peace in Chamberlain's time. But what if you have the audacity to think that you have rights (to your property, to your body, to your own thoughts, etc.) that are more important than peace?

In summary, Dear, what's served up at the start of Sermon on the Mount is a plate full of platitudes, dished out with a bunch of undefined words.

Just for the fun of it, Dear, think of the consequences if the damnable clerics had their Jesus start his sermon with something similar to the following:

Blessed are those who are happy to be alive, for by their example, others might learn to be similarly happy to be alive;

Blessed are those who rely on data to determine what is known, for their knowledge will be as reliable as possible;

Blessed are those of a venturesome spirit, for with their courage, they may be able to increase the storehouse of knowledge useful to humanity;

Blessed are those who are producers, who have provided humanity with so much, from the wheel to the internet;

Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for the justice in which everyone gets what they deserve;

Blessed are those with compassion for fellow humans, respecting that each has an equal right to claim one's own existence;

Blessed are those whose minds are clear, who can see through the smoke screens sent up by the clerics;

Blessed are those who yield to no one their right to claim their own existence; and

Blessed are those who suffered persecution for what they considered to be right, especially those who suffered through the tortures of the clerics and then were murdered by them, but who never yielded in their claim of ownership of their own minds.

And, Dear, it's not that I spent any time on the above to try to organize it or make it complete, but maybe the above is enough to make my point.

Meanwhile, the idiot clerics have their Jesus continue his sermon, advocating the following stupidities.

- Bless people who suffer on your account, especially those who accept the suffering with “**gladness and exaltation**” – even though I'm certain that I'm not alone in the world in not wanting anyone to suffer on my account.

- Never mind the elementary chemistry that if salt “becomes tasteless”, it’s no longer salt; instead, see through the analogy: people who don’t pay the clerics to follow Jesus are “good for nothing but to be thrown away and trodden underfoot.”
- Don’t praise people for doing “good”; praise God.
- Moses’ law is to stand. For example, to beat your slave to death or to sell your daughter into slavery, then...
- If you sneer at people (e.g., criticize all clerics as parasitic fools, or similar to John the Baptist and Jesus, if you call some of them a “viper’s brood”), then you (like John and Jesus, I presume) will “answer for it in the fires of hell”.
- Be a hypocrite: advocate that others make peace with their brothers, while not making peace with your own (e.g., the Pharisees).
- Don’t rely on your legal system to settle disputes; in particular, if someone brings a suit against you, don’t defend yourself; just pay. Why? Because Jesus said so. Are you one of those “evil-doers” who has the audacity to think for yourself?
- A man commits adultery if he just “looks on a woman with a lustful eye”. It’s similarly a crime if you covet someone else’s water when you’re dying of thirst. If that seems incredibly stupid, then guess what.
- And if it’s only your right eye that snuck a peak at the beautiful woman or handsome man, then right there in the airport or in the shopping mall or where ever, grab your right eye ball, “tear it out, and fling it away” – though (I presume) try to avoid splattering blood on those around you.
- And if you reach for that water (which you coveted, when you were dying of thirst) with your right arm, then “cut it off and fling it away” – but again (I presume) try to avoid splattering blood on those around you. For, so says Jesus (at least according to the clerics who wrote this garbage): “it’s better for you to lose one part of your body than for the whole of it to go to hell”.
- Thereby, don’t think that just your soul goes to hell, it’s your whole body, which burns and burns and burns, never being consumed, violating all sorts of laws of chemistry and physics. How can that be so? It’s just the way it is. How do I know? Cause the Bible told me so. Think for myself? No way. I ain’t gonna be one of those evil-doers who thinks for myself and ends up getting burned alive for eternity.
- A man can’t divorce his wife for other than “unchastity” and if he marries a divorced woman, then he’s headed for hell. “Why?” Because. “Because why?” Just because. Any other questions? And don’t ask about wives divorcing their husbands; women are like soil; so they’re to be treated like dirt.
- Don’t swear on your own head “because you cannot turn one hair of it white or black.” Why the ability to change the color of your hair is relevant to swearing on

your head (and beyond that, why anyone would want to swear on one's head anyway) is unclear, but there's no doubt that this rule, promulgated by the clerics' Jesus, was a very good rule – until people learned how to dye their hair.

- Don't defend yourself. “If someone slaps you on the right cheek, turn and offer him your left.” If someone sues you, pay; if someone wants something from you, hand it over; if a dictator dictates, obey. You have no property rights; you have no right to your own existence: anyone's claim on you and yours is more important than your own. Let there be no limit to your pacifism: if someone wants to kill you, let them; if someone wants to rape your child or grandchild; let them. You have no rights to your property, you have no right to protect your family, and of course you have no unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. (And may the clerics burn in their invented hell for promoting such a policy, which would transform life on earth into heaven for the parasitic priests and into hell for the people who produce.)
- “Love your enemies... only so [i.e., only in this way] can you be children of your heavenly Father... There must be no limit to your goodness, as your heavenly Father's goodness knows no bounds.” This is the same “heavenly Father” who murdered all those Egyptian first-born so the Israelites could have a story to tell? This is the same “heavenly Father” who advocated murdering all those people who were peacefully living on their land? And Jesus claims to be a child of the “heavenly Father”, because he shows how he “loves” his enemies – by sending them to be tortured in hell for eternity. Riiiiiiight.

Dear, I tried to warn you about my feelings: I warned you that I'd want to scream bloody murder. How long do you think I can constrain myself? If there was nothing else in this damnable Bible other than this Sermon on the Mount, all copies of the Bible (except for a few, for use by historians) should be burned for the evil it promotes. For example, Dear, as I urged you in an earlier chapter, please don't love your enemies: at a national level it's called treason; at an interpersonal level it would usually mean that you would betray the trust of your friends; at a personal level, you'll be abandoning your trio of survival goals (of yourself, your extended family, and your values).

But, Dear, if someone slaps you on the cheek, then I don't necessarily recommend that you immediately knee your attacker in the groin. Try to keep sufficiently calm to choose your best strategy: a knee to your attacker's groin may result in additional violence against you. Know for certain that the person who initiates violence is wrong, and commit yourself to making sure that the violator will be punished. If it seems advisable to you, rely on the police and our justice system to punish your attacker. Otherwise, do as you see fit – up to and including obtaining a weapon, so that you will have the advantage. If it seems appropriate, use pacifism – but only as a ploy, until you can defend yourself.

It's true that in some instances, pacifism is a productive policy (beyond just a ploy). As I mentioned in an earlier chapter, pacifism (such as used by Gandhi and King) can be a useful policy to alert a powerful majority to a specific injustice. But such pacifism is actually an appeal to the law of the jungle (i.e., might makes right), in which the strategy of the pacifists is to stimulate the powerful majority to act. Otherwise, pacifism only placates tyrants, promoting more tyranny. Free people must do whatever is necessary to terminate tyranny – but as an intelligent person, choose details of your retaliation that are most advantageous to you.

Meanwhile, what do the clerics propose to be the advantages of their stupid policies? Well, they go into this in *Matthew 6*: to gain a reward that “**awaits in you Father's house in heaven.**” Give up what you could have in this life for the clerics' promise of what you'll get when you're dead. Let the Hitlers of the world (and more significantly, the clerics) turn your life into a real hell, so that when you're dead, you can go to the clerics' imagined heaven. Make no claim to the existence that you now have, dismiss all thoughts of enjoying the one life that you have, show love to the Hitlers and clerics of the world (while, necessarily, simultaneously showing hate to family and friends), and you'll find happiness when you're dead. Show me a dumber policy; show me a source of greater evil; and I'll show you another cleric trying to grab control.

And why show acts of charity? Not to help other humans, but to help yourself: to get the biggest reward of all, to get eternal life in heaven. Such charity shows no love for others, only for yourself. You're not trying to help others; you're just making a “smart” (and small) investment for yourself. You're not trying to help people; you're just trying to make a profit – and an enormous one, at that. If anyone but con-artist clerics would promote such “charity”, it would be called what it really is: fraud, graft, corruption, extortion, bribery, embezzlement...

Surely even squirrels aren't sufficiently stupid to take the advice of the damnable clerics: “**do not store up for yourselves treasure on earth**” but “**store treasure in heaven**”. Maybe “**no servant can be the slave of two masters**”, but because you save for tomorrow, it doesn't mean that you're a slave to your savings. Dear: I'm sure I don't need to plead with you to plan ahead, but don't take it to a ridiculous extreme. Plan for your future, but let eternity take care of itself. The only data that support the clerics' con game show that they've become rich and powerful playing it!

And, Dear, don't be conned by their silly ideas about birds and flowers: “Look at the birds of the air; they do not sow and reap and store in barns; yet your heavenly Father feeds them” and “Consider how the lilies grow in the fields; they do not work, they do not spin, and yet... even Solomon in all his splendor was not attired like one of these.” That's cute phraseology, I can grant the author that, but it reeks with stupidity.

Should you desire, Dear, I'd encourage you to look carefully at how birds and flowers survive, for when you understand the details, surely you'll be inspired by how much this amazing DNA molecule has learned to do, by experience and perseverance, struggling to survive. And if you do study the matter, I trust you'll find ample evidence to support the statement that never once did some giant Jabberwock in the sky give even the slightest support to the birds or the flowers in their struggle to survive. Indeed, it's as if he didn't exist!

Next, at *Matthew 6, 24*, is the brilliance (and yes, Dear, I'm being sarcastic):

“No servant can be the slave of two masters; for either he will hate the first and love the second, or he will be devoted to the first and think nothing of the second. You cannot serve God and Money.”

It's hard to imagine how anyone's mind could be so warped as to write such rubbish. Why does the author think in terms of “servants” and “slaves”? Who in hell (or anywhere else) wants to be a servant or slave to anyone, including God? How in hell can a person be a servant or slave to money? Where did the author get the crazy idea that anybody “serves” money?! Some people may be “slaves” to excessive security or to desires that can be purchased by money (possibly because of childhood depravities), but even this extreme is not serving money: people save money for how it can subsequently serve its owner. As for how in hell anyone can be a slave to some imagined giant Jabberwock in the sky – well, it appears that they can, if they foolishly buy into the clerics' con game. But in reality, they're just doing what the clerics want, namely, being slaves to the clerics.

Separating people from what their money is, of course, the essence of all con games. But the Christian clerics added an astounding new twist to their con game: convince the marks that what they own is evil! Pity the poor Christians who had yielded their ability to judge.

“If you wish to go the whole way [i.e., what you need to do (besides obeying the commandments, to gain eternal life)], go, sell your possessions, and give to the poor, and then you will have riches in heaven; and come, follow me.” When the young man heard this, he went away with a heavy heart; for he was a man of great wealth.

What if the young man “of great wealth” had struggled long hours, at hard labor, to the best of his ability, to earn what he had, while those who are poor just goofed off? Goof-offs (such as the clerics) get to reap the rewards? For goofing off? How about a prize for the goofiest policy promoted in the Bible – save of course, it’s not goofy for the goof-off clerics to promote it! But what then of interpersonal justice (to get what you deserve)? The clerics are opposed to justice? I wonder why. Do they know what they deserve?!

But before you award the prize for the goofiest policy in the Bible to the above policy (rewarding goof-offs), Dear, have a look at *Matthew 7, 1*. There, the damnable clerics have their Jesus state:

“Pass no judgment, and you will not be judged.”

What mind-boggling stupidity!! – save of course, as a policy advocated by the clerics, cause they don’t want you to judge their goofy policies to be goofy – and evil.

As I’ve written before, please, Dear, never, Never, NEVER, NEVER follow such a stupid suggestion – never engage in the immorality of not judging. That’s what your brain is for! Never engage in the immoralities of either hating yourself or refraining from judging others. Judge people to be in ranges from friend to foe, wise to foolish, good to evil, etc. – and act accordingly. Similarly, Dear, judge policies advocated by anyone (including me!) – and especially including all policies advocated by any and all clerics.

Please, Dear, judge every sentence in this book, in the Bible, and in every book. Judge every statement ever made. If you decide some idea seems reasonable to you, then if it’s convenient for you, use it. But if it seems dumb, then trash it! In particular, I hope you’ll judge such recommendations by the damnable clerics who wrote the NT (such as to hate yourself and to not judge others) to be the babblings of severely diseased minds – or the tricks of astoundingly parasitic con artists.

Dear, if someone you know passes no judgment, then show this idiot his error by judging him to be a fool. Even if you could, never suspend your judgment: your judgment is the product of your mind; your brain is your

best resource. For example, when the clerics' Jesus proclaims “**You hypocrite**”, then judge him: he tells people not to judge others, and he just finished judging those he called hypocrites! He tells others to love their enemies, and he burns his enemies in hell for eternity. Who, then, is the hypocrite?

But then, maybe I would agree with the clerics' advice: “**Do not give dogs what is holy; do not throw your pearls to the pigs.**” That is, Dear, it's useless to try to talk some sense into the stupid clerics; they've learned “**ask, and you will receive** [from fools]; **seek, and you will find** [fools] , **knock, and the door will be opened**[by fools].” And now, they're too busy counting the money they've collected in their con game to consider the harm that they've done (and continue to do) to humanity.

And no, Dear, don't apply “**Always treat others as you would like them to treat you.**” Don't presume so much: how you want to be treated in a particular circumstance may be exactly opposite from what's best for another. As I described in an earlier chapter, you may like eating chocolates when you're sad; another person may be sad because she ate too many chocolates. Instead, Dear, use your brain as best you can. Even dolphins help one another. Help as best you can – remembering that **sometimes it's kindest to seem to be cruel.**

But then, again, I would agree with the clerics: “**Beware of false prophets... you will recognize them by the fruits they bear.**” Examples include the clerics' Jesus and every prophet described in this hideous book called the Bible (and every other “holy book” ever concocted). Some of the principal “**fruits**” that they have borne for humanity are increasing ignorance, sexism, slavery, racism, and war, while for the con artist clerics, they've born sufficient fruits to keep them fat and powerful. I'll show you more of the rotten fruits produced by these false and fat prophets in what follows, starting immediately with *Matthew 8*.

With the little story at *Matthew 8, 5*, the clerical authors introduce anti-Semitism (or, more accurately, anti-Judaism), a hallmark of their horror for most of the past 2,000 years. They tell the story of a Roman soldier (a “centurion”, i.e., the commander of 100 men), who proclaims his “faith” in Jesus. So the clerics have their Jesus reply:

“**I tell you this: nowhere, even in Israel, have I found such faith. Many... will come from east and west to feast with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob [aka Israel] in the**

kingdom of Heaven. But those who were born to the kingdom [i.e., the Jewish people] will be driven out into the dark, the place of wailing and grinding of teeth.”

Admittedly, Dear, the hideousness of suggesting that people with different views will be “driven out into the dark, the place of wailing and grinding of teeth” doesn’t match the horrors of the religious intolerance and racism preached by the clerics who wrote the OT, but it’s still horrible, and when amplified by worse statements later in the NT (which I’ll show you later), the consequence has been the murder of millions of Jewish people.

And then there’s the idiotic ideas at *Matthew 8, 22*, about which perhaps the best that can be said is that maybe it’s a misprint. A disciple of the clerics’ Jesus says to Jesus: “Lord, let me go and bury my father...” Jesus reportedly replied: “Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their dead.” Don’t worry if you can’t figure that out, Dear, because no one ever has. A son tries to obey the commandment to honor his father, by honorably burying his father’s remains, and Jesus tells him [in effect]: “No, don’t honor your father.” This is the same Jesus who said (*Matthew 5, 17*): “Do not suppose that I have come to abolish the Law [of Moses]” – which of course includes the commandment to honor one’s father! Does the clerics’ Jesus propose that all people who bury the dead are dead? How could one person insult so many people at once and with zero cause? Is the principle being practiced: kick them when they’re down?

“Pass no judgment”, says the clerics’ Jesus, “why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother’s eye, with never a thought for the great plank in your own?” Well, in *Matthew 8, 26*, when his disciples were afraid because the boat was sinking, a huge plank must have lodged itself in the eye of the clerics’ Jesus, for he passes his judgment: “Why are you such cowards?” Such is the craziness of the clerics – who in the next two paragraphs demonstrate their firmly held opinion that people are crazy because they are possessed by devils. Hmm... interesting... clerics are crazy... crazy people are possessed by devils... So this little syllogism means...

And don’t worry, Dear, if you didn’t notice the policy contained in *Matthew 9, 2*, for you’ll see it described so many times that, eventually, nobody can miss it. In this case, a man is paralyzed because he had sinned. How’s that for a sick policy? At times I think that no policy could be sicker (for again, it’s a case of kicking people when they’re down), but then I think of other policies that these damnable clerics promote, and see that their evil does in fact go even deeper – to the depths of hell.

* Go to other chapters via

And the clerics have the audacity to have their Jesus ask: “**Why do you harbor these evil thoughts?**” The more important question is why the clerics harbor such evil thoughts – and the obvious answer is they found it to be a great way to fill their collection plates and their fat bellies.

As an example of this idiocy, Dear, think of the policy behind the statement at *Matthew 8, 10*: “**When Jesus was at a table in the house, many bad characters – tax-gatherers and others – were seated with him...**” Dear, taxes are collected so that communities can undertake projects cooperatively. To be sure, paying taxes can be painful, especially if you disagree with the majority about the wisdom of a particular project. But there are reasonable ways to try to modify the majority’s opinion – and not a single one of them is to consider “**tax gatherers**” bad. That’s idiotic!

And of course there’s more, not only idiotic but twisted policies. For example, consider *Matthew 8, 13*, where the cleric Jesus (the hypocrite with a plank in his eye so big that he can’t turn his head without knocking sanity out of anyone still standing) says: “**I require mercy, not sacrifice.**” What a hypocrite! Does he show “**mercy**” for those he consigns to an eternity of torture in hell? If he requires “**mercy, not sacrifice**”, then why show no mercy for such people – and then propose to sacrifice himself? (A concept that I know you’ve been taught, Dear, and hints of which the clerics drop at *Matthew 8, 15*: “**The time will come when the bridegroom [i.e., Jesus] will be taken away from them [his apostles]**”.) What sort of a twisted teacher teaches one thing (“**I require mercy, not sacrifice**”) and practices the opposite? Answer: only a hypocrite, similar to the cleric Jesus.

At *Matthew 8, 14*, the clerical authors propose that the disciples of John the Baptist had a question for Jesus: “**Why do we and the Pharisees fast, but your disciples do not?**” What I wonder is: Why didn’t the clerical authors address the obvious question: after John the Baptist reportedly said about Jesus “**I am not fit to take off his shoes**” and “**[he] is mightier than I**”, and after all the miracles that Jesus reportedly pulled off, then why would John the Baptist still have disciples? Is the whole story by Matthew completely bogus?

By the way, Dear, at *Matthew 9, 9*, maybe the clerical authors of the NT try to drop a hint of who their fictitious Matthew is:

As he passed on from there, Jesus saw a man named Matthew at his seat in the custom-house, and said to him, “Follow me”; and Matthew rose and followed him.

But as I'll show you in Yx, Dear, the chance is essentially zero that this is the same Matthew who wrote this horrid stuff.

“Horrid” in part because of its stupidity and in part because of the clerics' apparent view of the people. For example, at *Matthew 9, 36*, they claim of their Jesus:

The sight of the people moved him to pity: they were like sheep without a shepherd, harassed and helpless.

Dear, if ever you are in the company of such “sheep” or in the company of those who think that the people are “sheep”, then please abandon either. Go to work on a farm, or on a fishing boat, or at a logging camp, or to a business in a city, or to a factory, a hospital, or a laboratory. Learn some of what the workers know – and learn to appreciate their diligence and perseverance. Then return to the clerics and any sheep that they have identified and reach your own conclusions.

And among all the hideous policies advocated by the clerics, I hope that you'll judge, as one of worst, the horrible concept that people are to be “followers”, like sheep. This stupidity permeates not only all Christian sects, including Mormonism, but also all organized religions, including Islam (which means ‘surrender’). The “followers” are to “have faith” in what the clerics' say, to “believe” what their “holy books” state, and to “obey” the clerics' god, for whom they just happen to be the spokesmen – and collecting agents – collecting not only “lost souls” but also loose money!

In sum, Dear, and although I haven't counted them all, I bet there are at least a hundred places in the Bible where the horrible policy of treating people like sheep is advocated. In later chapters I'll show you more examples (e.g., “the Lord is my shepherd...”), but for now, consider *Matthew 10, 5*, where (when the work of converting people to “the way” became too great for him, “the crop is heavy, but laborers are scarce”) the clerics' Jesus turns the job over to his disciples, saying:

“Do not take the road to gentile [i.e., non-Israelite] lands, and do not enter any Samaritan town; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.”

But setting aside the idea of sheep for a while, have a look at the statement at *Matthew 10, 1*:

Then he [Jesus] called his twelve disciples to him [one of whom was allegedly “the tax gatherer Matthew”] and gave them authority to cast out unclean spirits and to cure every kind of ailment and disease.

Jesus gave them “authority” to do this! Not medical knowledge, but “authority to cast out unclean spirits and to cure every kind of ailment and disease”. Pray tell, what possible knowledge could these ignorant clerics possess that would be of interest to modern humans? In fact, what possible knowledge could these ignorant clerics have during their own time, when (as I’ll show you in Yx) Hippocrates had already demonstrated (about 500 years earlier), that the idea of “spirits” causing ailments and disease was dumb? And to this day ignorant clerics promote policies proposed by such fools?!

But the stupidity (and the resulting evil) continues, for example, with the horrible statement by the clerics’ Jesus at *Matthew 10*, 34:

“You must not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword. I have come to set a man against his father, a daughter against her mother, a son’s wife against her mother-in-law; and a man will find his enemies under his own roof.”

And that, in fact, is what the clerics’ Jesus managed to do, quite likely causing more trouble in more families of our “western civilization” than anything else.

Can you imagine, Dear, if there actually was such a Jesus as the clerics depict: if someone could see that, *via* one’s policies, one could cause so much harm to humanity, then how could such a person be so evil as to continue?! And if a person bought into any of this ridiculous junk, would that person then not reach the obvious conclusion: whereas, from the Sermon on the Mount, we have been told that “peacemakers” were to be called the sons of God, surely this means that the clerics’ Jesus is not the son of any god – unless, of course, Satan is counted as one of the gods.

And the clerics’ Jesus continues in his infamy at *Matthew 10*, 36:

“No man is worthy of me who cares more for father or mother than for me; no man is worthy of me who cares more for son or daughter...”

Let’s hope that no one (!) is “worthy” of the clerics’ damnable Jesus! Dear, can you imagine such ignorance and evil? In all communities, even for animals, the family is the fundamental unit: this unity has been demanded by the DNA molecule for more than a billion years. And yet, the clerics’

Jesus promotes policies that destroy families – with the only benefit to the clerics' collection plates. This is modern-day clerics' idea of "family values"? To all of them I sincerely urge: rather than turn Earth into hell, why don't you just go to the hell that you concocted – and where your damnable Jesus obviously belongs.

And then, at *Matthew 11, 12*, there are hints that modern-day clerics have totally missed the meaning of the Gnostics' Jesus statement (the reference for which I'll give you in a later chapter):

“Ever since the coming of John the Baptist, the kingdom of Heaven has been subjected to violence, and violent men are seizing it.”

Such a statement makes no sense if one assumes that God is in control of the clerics' Heaven, located somewhere in space! On the other hand, it makes at least partial sense if one adopts the Gnostics' view of John the Baptist's theme “**the kingdom of Heaven is upon you**”, namely, that “**Heaven**” isn't a place in the sky, but rather, Heaven is here, on Earth, and is entered when one “enters” the “right” state of mind.

I'll provide you more details of this in later chapters, but here, let me give you two illustrations from the *Gospel of Thomas* (which is part of what can be called “the Gnostics' Bible”), so that you can better see what the Gnostics' Jesus meant:

Thomas 3: “Jesus said, ‘If your leaders say to you, “Look, the (Father's) kingdom is in the sky”, then the birds of the sky will precede you. If they say to you, “It is in the sea”, then the fish will precede you. Rather, the (Father's) kingdom is within you and it is outside you’.”

Thomas 113: “His disciples said to him, ‘When will the kingdom [of Heaven] come?’ [Jesus answered] “It will not come by watching for it. It will not be said, ‘Look, here!’ or ‘Look, there!’ Rather, the Father's kingdom is spread out upon the earth, and people don't see it.”

What a difference between the clerics' and the Gnostics' Jesus – and a huge difference was apparently that the Gnostics didn't have clerics with collection plates!

But, Dear, that's about all of the NT garbage that I can take for now. I gotta take a break. I suggest that you do the same – and get some exercise!