

Qx12 – Questioning “Revealed” Policies in “The Gospel According to Matthew” – 2

Dear: If I were to try to summarize all of the New Testament (NT) in a word or two, then rather than the single word “obey”, and certainly rather than what the Christian clerics recommend (viz., “love” or “good news”), maybe better would be the phrase: “salve for simpletons”. Perhaps you can see some justification for my suggestion from what the clerics claim Jesus said at *Matthew 11, 25*:

“I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for hiding these things from the learned and wise, and revealing them to the simple.”

What a damnable statement! Humanity has advanced from caves and hovels to air conditioned homes and offices, from cannibalism to computers, and from slavery to human rights, in large measure courtesy “**the learned and the wise**” – in spite of objections and obstructions from the simpletons (such as all clerics) who mainly seek to maintain the *status quo*. As Bertrand Russell said:

So far as I can remember, there is not one word in the Gospels in praise of intelligence.

Further, Dear, I hope that for you, too, red lights of warning start flashing when anyone promoting “simple solutions” adds something similar to what the clerics’ Jesus states at *Matthew 11, 28*:

“Come to me, all whose work is hard, whose load is heavy; and I will give you relief. Bend your necks to my yoke, and learn from me, for I am gentle and humble-hearted; and your souls will find relief. For my yoke is good to bear; my load is light.”

Beware of someone who simultaneously claims to be “**humble-hearted**” and to be the Son of God; that’s a mixed message if I ever heard one! And especially beware of anyone who invites you to bend your neck to his yoke!

Now, Dear, believe it or not, I’m trying to keep my emotions in check, to keep my blinkers on, to try to pull this cart up the hill, but let me tell you, it’s tough! Thus, when I read junk such as the above, about Jesus putting a yoke (pulling a joke?) on me, it stimulates me, if not to rear up and start bucking, then at least to kick off a limerick:

*Though Jesus was not one to joke,
He seemed like a regular bloke:
He flirted with girls,
Called tax agents curls –
And wanted our heads in his yoke!*

Sorry about that, Dear, but in earlier chapters, I tried to warn you.

Further, though, another problem is: once my “cynic juices” start flowing – especially if they start flowing in a measured manner (and with the measure matching the beat of my steps when I’m walking) –they’re hard to stop.

*It’s clear that their Christ was a fraud;
For certain, it’s definitely odd:
Of Him, whom they speak,
To claim he was meek –
Then claim he was son of some god!*

*With Jesus the clerics could reap:
They urged that with faith we should leap;
They didn’t inform us
The cost is enormous
When we become nothing but sheep!*

*I say Jesus was clearly a blight
(Though he claimed that his load would be light),
Cause it’s no kind of joke
With your head in some yoke:
Treating humans as beasts just ain’t right!*

*Though Christ (à la clerics) said do
To others what you’d have them do;
Yet others have known,
To leave others alone:
Don’t DO what you DON’T want for you!*

*Though Christ of the clerics meant well:
“Forgive and on failings don’t dwell.”
His model for man:
The hideous plan
To torture most humans in Hell!*

But again, I’ll try to constrain myself.

Yet, Dear, it's very difficult to keep my blinkers on, especially when I see reference (e.g., at *Matthew 12*, 18) to "Isaiah's prophecies". As I'll try to show you in later chapters (especially in **Yx**), this seems to be a blatant example of deliberate misrepresentations by Christian clerics of fabrications by earlier Jewish clerics. That is, surely the Christian clerics knew that Isaiah's prophecies had nothing to do with Jesus but instead deal with "the Messiah" (i.e., "the anointed one") Cyrus the Great, who died about 500 years before the alleged date of the birth of Jesus. And although I'll show you details later, Dear, you can see this immediately at, for example, *Isaiah 44*, 28, where God allegedly says:

"I say to Cyrus, 'You shall be my shepherd to carry out all my purpose...' Thus says the Lord to Cyrus his anointed..."

Further, not only did the Christian clerics misrepresent the prophecy dealing with who the "messiah" was, but as I'll try to show you in **Yx**, such statements weren't even prophecies in their own time: the Jewish clerics fabricated these stories about a century after Cyrus the Great "liberated" Babylon, with their fabrication a part of their successful ploy to palm off the Persian religion onto the Jewish people. But let me ignore all that for now, reset my blinkers, and try to pull this cart a little further up the hill.

At *Matthew 12*, 22 we find ourselves buried in the ignorance of 2,000 years ago, when arguments allegedly raged about how Jesus cured a person who was both blind and dumb (i.e., unable to speak, usually because of congenital deafness). On one side were the Christian clerics, who maintained that their Jesus cured people by driving out devils with his powers that he possessed as son of God, and on the other side were the Jewish clerics, who maintained that he cured people by driving out devils with his powers that he had obtained from Beelzebub, also known as Satan. Pity the poor people who were injured, ill, or handicapped because they were malnourished, or had picked up a virus, or had a genetic deficiency, or whatever, and who then had to contend, also, with all the ignorant clerics – who maintained that such illnesses and handicaps arose because the people were possessed by devils. And pity all the people who still can't see that the real devils were (and still are) the clerics of the world.

A little of the evil of these devils is illustrated at *Matthew 12*, 32, where the Christian clerics have their Jesus say:

* Go to other chapters *via*

“And so I tell you this: no sin, no slander, is beyond forgiveness for men, except slander spoken against the Spirit, and that will not be forgiven.... if anyone speaks against the Holy Spirit, for him these is no forgiveness, either in this age or in the age to come.”

Strip that infamy to its essentials, Dear, and what you have is this: we clerics have an idea; anyone who criticizes it is an unforgivable sinner. Surely that's close to the deepest depth of deprivation to which any human can sink.

In contrast, Dear, I trust that you'll find at least a few ideas in this book that I'm writing for you (and other youngsters) – and I will be deeply disappointed if you don't criticize every single one of them! Of course I hope that there aren't too many errors, but I'm certain there are many. And even if you agree with something that I've written, Dear, I hope that your agreement hasn't arisen until you first searched for my errors, criticizing me as much as you can. And if some clown ever demands (as did the clerics' Jesus, aka the clerics) that you accept an idea without criticizing it, Dear, then tell him to blow it out his ear.

And if you haven't quite seen sufficient stupidity of the clerics' Jesus, Dear, then look at *Matthew 12, 34*, where they have him say:

“You vipers' brood! [He loves to judge people and to compare them to snakes, perhaps because the plank in his own eye makes it impossible to see that he's judging.] **How can your words be good when you yourselves are evil?**”

First, Dear, try to judge the ideas people have – separate from how you judge the people. [And yes, Dear, I realize I'm not setting a very good example – but your prime job is to be an improvement upon your grandparents: that's the purpose of it all!] But more importantly, Dear, realize that people are never evil: acts of some people are evil, with such people showing varying degrees of ignorance. A good example of substantial ignorance is the clerics' Jesus. As I'll be showing you as I go along, his ideas go from dumb to dumber to dumbest. Other examples of ignorant people are all the clerics who have conned people out of their money and out of their humanity: within the clerics' genes is the wisdom to help humanity, but through their ignorance, they've managed to cause enormous harm.

Sometimes such ignorance is indicated by delusions of grandeur (a sign of insanity), such as is revealed by the clerics' Jesus at *Matthew 12*, 38-42. There, the clerics' Jesus reveals his opinion that he's greater than both Solomon and Jonah; if he'd been challenged, he'd probably also claim to be bigger than Jonah's whale! He also states the infamous line "**It's a wicked generation that asks for a sign**", to which I again respond: it's a stupid person who accepts an idea without testing it, seeking signs that it's false – a good indication of which is that its proponents refuse to submit (or permit) their ideas to be tested experimentally!

Oh – then there's the brilliant stuff at *Matthew 12*, 43-45. [And I'm sorry, Dear, but stupidity not only makes me cynical, it also makes me sarcastic.] Let's assume that the clerics' Jesus did all the wonderful things that the clerics claim, healing all those people by driving out "**evil spirits**". Surely that would be good. Right? Nope! Sorry, Dear, but now we learn, direct from Jesus himself (or better, from the clerics who concocted this crap) that it was all very evil:

"When an unclean spirit comes out of a man it wanders over the deserts seeking a resting-place and finds none. [I don't know why it doesn't try the seashore or a forest; for some strange and unexplained reason, unclean spirits apparently like the desert; nor do I know why the unclean spirits need to rest, but I guess that being an unclean spirit isn't the soft life that it's made out to be.] **Then it says, 'I will go back to the home I left.'** **So it returns and finds the house unoccupied, swept clean, and tidy.** **Off it goes** [I mean, spirits can just pop in and out of people whenever they want; it's not as if they only move when they're kicked out by Jesus!] **and collects seven other spirits more wicked than itself** [seven, of course, cause seven's a magical number; but as for why the unclean spirit would seek out others even more wicked than itself seems rather strange; I guess unclean spirits aren't so competitive as clean ones!], **and they all come in and settle down; and in the end the man's plight is worse than before."**

So, Dear, there you have it, direct from the mouth of the claimed son of God: all Jesus' healings weren't worth a damn. At first, you might have thought Jesus cured some fellow who was both dumb and blind, but two weeks later (or however long it takes for the unclean spirit to find seven of his buddies in the desert), the poor fellow is not only struck blind and dumb again but also: his hair falls out, he develops leprosy, his left arm gets stuck in an upright position, he breaks his right wrist, his bowels stop working, he loses the use of his right leg, and the nail on his little toe of his left foot becomes ingrown. (I think that makes seven!)

And, Dear, don't think I'm just kidding: this is serious stuff, revealed direct from God Almighty HIMself, as reported in the "holy" Bible.

Poor Jesus, his work was worse than useless. Every time he chased an evil spirit out of a patient, it was replaced by seven more. And not only that, his work apparently wore him out so badly that he no longer knew even who his mother was or who his brothers were (*Matthew 12, 49*) – which I guess is how he got away with violating the commandment to honor his mother. But most of all, pity the people: not only those he "cured" (leading to seven times worse illness than their initial affliction!), but all those whose minds he polluted ever since. Pity that he never heard of Hippocrates (who lived ~500 years earlier) whose first rule was: "[Do no harm!](#)"

And it's not just the clerics' Jesus who does harm; it's also the clerics who wrote this stuff. For example, look at what they wrote at *Matthew 13, 1*:

That same day, Jesus went out and sat by the lakeside, where so many people gathered round him that he had to get into a boat.

Dear: that's blasphemy! Everyone knows that Jesus didn't get into a boat: he simply stood on the water – or parted the water and stood on the ground – or...

Jesus goes to all that work to fill people with evil spirits, and the clerics insult him!

But then, maybe Jesus just forgot to stand on the water, because it's clear (from the reason he gave for speaking in parables) that he was definitely losing his mind (*Matthew 13, 10*):

"It has been granted to you [his apostles] to know the secrets of the kingdom of Heaven; but to those others [the people] it has not been granted. For the man who has [understanding] will be given more, till he has enough and to spare; and the man who has not [understanding] will forfeit even what he has. That is why I speak to them in parables; for they look without seeing, and listen without hearing or understanding."

That, my Dear, is an example of an incompetent teacher practicing evil. A competent teacher would find a way to increase even the poorest student's understanding, thereby "doing good" (i.e., helping humanity).

In contrast to “doing good”, see the evil submerged in his second parable (*Matthew 13, 24*): to “**harvest**” all the people who failed to understand (because Jesus was such an incompetent teacher) and then “**tie them in bundles for burning.**” And so, Dear, during the Dark Ages, the clerics went about “harvesting” the heathens (those who failed to understand the glorious message from God) and then tied them to the stake “**in bundles, for burning**”. Damn all clerics – including all Islamic clerics, still in their Dark Ages, who rather than bundle the unbelievers for burning, issue a *fatwa* to have them killed in any manner the killers desire (although consistent with Muhammad’s examples, they usually recommend chopping of our heads).

But apparently in the end, it’s only the clerics and their rabid followers who will be bundled up and burned in the hell of their creation – at least that’s what the clerics’ Jesus says at *Matthew 13, 40*:

“...at the end of time, the Son of Man will send out his angels, who will gather out of his kingdom whatever makes men stumble, and all whose deeds are evil, and these will be thrown into the blazing furnace, the place of wailing and grinding of teeth.”

That is, Dear, nothing has made humans “**stumble**” more than these “Abrahamic” religions (Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Mormonism), and no deed has ever been so evil as to dump all the crap contained in all associated “holy books” (e.g., the Bible, the Quran, the Book of Mormon) into the heads of innocent and impressionable children.

As for more evidence that the clerics’ Jesus was losing his mind (i.e., that the clerics who wrote this crap had lost theirs), consider the ignorance that they attributed to their Jesus at *Matthew 15, 19*:

“For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts...”

Gimme a break: the origin of thoughts that lead to evil acts is not someone’s “wicked heart” but ignorance – such as faulty premisses [e.g., God exists], errors in interpreting some data [e.g., the Bible (or the Quran or the Book of Mormon) is God’s “holy word”], untested or untestable hypotheses [e.g., God has told us, in his commandments, “**thou shalt not covet... thy neighbor’s... slave**”], or errors in logic [therefore, I shall not covet my neighbor’s slave]. In contrast, Dear, I covet everyone’s slaves (and especially the slaves of all the clerics) – so they can be set free!

Next, after various and sundry miracles, such as feeding five thousand with five loaves and two fish, plus walking on water (both of which happened only in the stars, as I tried to show you in **Ix**), the clerics' Jesus pulled off the biggest miracle of his career: he managed to stick his entire foot in his mouth (the original foot 'n mouth disease). Thus, at *Matthew 15, 10*, the clerics have their Jesus say:

“Listen to me, and understand this: a man is not defiled by what goes into his mouth, but by what comes out of it.”

Judging ‘defilement’ by the pollution dumped on the rest of humanity, then as I’ve been trying to demonstrate (and will continue to try to demonstrate), the clerics' Jesus currently holds the world’s record for how much one person can thereby be defiled – although Muhammad and Moses should always be recognized as strong contenders.

As an example of how the clerics' Jesus defiled himself, there’s the lovely little racist remark at *Matthew 15, 24*:

“I was sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and to them alone [so Dear, in case you ever wondered, the clerics' Jesus had no message for you, because you’re not related to the Israelites]... It is not right to take the children’s bread [i.e., his “enlightenment” for the children of Israel] and throw it to the dogs.”

And who were these “dogs” (besides you and me)? Why such people as the Canaanite woman who asked him for help. Don’t you know, Dear, that anyone but an Israelite is a dog? Maybe so – but then I wonder if it’s better than an obvious alternative: every time I open the Jewish clerics' Bible (both the OT and the NT), it sure smells like droppings from racist pigs.

At *Matthew 16, 18*, the contrivance of the damnable clerics, put into the mouth of their Jesus, screams for comment:

“You are Peter, the Rock; and on this rock I will build my church, and the power of death shall never conquer it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; what you forbid on earth shall be forbidden in heaven, and what you allow on earth shall be allowed in heaven.”

But, Dear, and although I’ll not show you details until **Yx**, let me just summarize with the following “guarantee” (as good a guarantee as anyone can give you about any religion): no historical Jesus ever made the

statement quoted immediately above. With this statement, the Christian clerics are just securing the foundation for their con game.

Yet again, Dear, cheer up, ‘cause it’s not all gloom and doom. Good old Jesus left us a test (in fact, more than one test, as I’ll show you later) to determine which clerics are the good guys and which ones are mere con artists, planning to use people to promote their parasitic existence. To see this test, consider *Matthew 17*, 19:

Afterwards the disciples came to Jesus and asked him privately, “Why could not we cast it [another devil] out?” He answered, “Your faith is too small. I tell you this: if you have faith no bigger even than a mustard-seed, you will say to this mountain, ‘Move from here to there!’, and it will move; nothing will prove impossible to you.”

So, Dear, there you have a method both to test yourself and to test any would-be cleric. Who says Jesus didn’t support the scientific method?!

For example, suppose you wanted to test your own faith (in Jesus, in God, in whatever supernatural junk you want). I don’t necessarily recommend that you start by testing your ability to move mountains. How about something smaller, such as a chair? Go ahead. See what you can do with faith: tell it to “**move from here to there**”. Hmm. Well, maybe try something smaller. How about a pen or pencil? Hmm. Interesting. Consider the lesson for you there – and then, how about having someone else try it? Ask someone else, someone who claims to have more faith than you (such as some cleric) to demonstrate his faith. Have that person tell... whatever to “**move from here to there**”. Hmm. Nice little test, don’t you think?

Then Dear, to top it off, watch how much faith I have in you. Let’s see you move that pen or that chair. Good job! And as for moving the mountain – nah, you’ve got better things to do than dig up a stupid mountain. And those “better things” wouldn’t include reading this stupid Bible – were it not for the pollution that has been dumped on you ever since you were a baby.

And by the way, Dear, before I continue with thoughts about your childhood, don’t bother (at least for now) with the stupid little story at *Matthew 17*, 24. Not only was it written for a time when “**earthly monarchs**” collected taxes and tolls only from “**aliens**”, but it’s a story about something that never happened on Earth, i.e., it’s another “astrological tale”, similar to those I describe in **Ix**. Thus, as you can find on the internet, the “silver coin”

collected by Simon Peter is a group of stars near the “mouth” of one of the “two fishes”, i.e., the sign of the Zodiac called Pisces.

So now, ignoring such astrological nonsense (which as I tried to show you in **Ix**, permeates the entire NT), let me get back to children. To start, I’ll say: maybe I could forgive the clerics for the harm they do humanity, if it weren’t for how they attack and warp the minds of children. That is, if adults are incapable of seeing through the clerics’ con game, then one can argue that there’s justice in adults getting what they deserve.

But the clerical parasites have focused their attack on one of Nature’s vulnerabilities: in part to “scramble” DNA codes (so that the species will be less vulnerable to viruses and similar natural parasites), Nature produces new life, i.e., slightly modified DNA codes, which during childhood must depend on parents (and other adults in their community) for protection against the elements and against full-grown predators, such as drug pushers, pedophiles, and priests (many times, one and the same). Thereby, Nature has left children vulnerable to the clerics: children must trust adults, and clerics capitalize on this trust to perpetuate their con games.

An indication of the clerics’ attack is seen at *Matthew 18, 2*:

He [Jesus] called a child, set him in front of them [his disciples], and said, “I tell you this: unless you turn round and become like children, you will never enter the kingdom of Heaven. Let a man humble himself till he is like this child, and he will be the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven. Whoever receives one such child in my name receives me. But if a man is a cause of stumbling to one of these little ones who have faith in me, it would be better for him to have a millstone hung round his neck and be drowned in the depths of the sea. Alas for the world that such causes of stumbling arise!”

Now, Dear, I suspect you have a good idea of my response to the terror inflicted on children by the clerics, but I’ll try to constrain myself: I’ll try not to describe priests as the drug pushers and pedophiles that they are. Instead, first I’ll just quote, with little comment, the rest of the junk in *Matthew 18* dealing with children:

“If your hand or your foot is your undoing [for example, by protecting children from the clerics], cut it off and fling it away; it is better for you to enter into life maimed or lame than to keep two hands or two feet and be thrown into the eternal fire [i.e., you’re headed for hell if you protect the children from exploitation by clerics].

If it is your eye that is your undoing, tear it out and fling it away; it is better to enter into life with one eye than to keep both eyes and be thrown into the fires of hell. Never despise one of these little ones [leave the despising of children to the clerics]; I tell you, they have their guardian angels in heaven... it is not your heavenly Father's will that one of these little ones should be lost."

Please, Dear, think about what's going on here. Of course it's clear why the clerics want people to be like children – but it's not because children are "humble". In fact, Dear, in your entire life, have you ever met a "humble" child? It's rare to meet any child who wouldn't claim (with a little prodding) that he or she could jump over the moon, fly, travel to the stars, whatever! I've been around kids all my life (including when I was one, when I had my own, when I coached baseball, and now with grandchildren), and my conclusion is that the most inappropriate adjective imaginable for children is "humble"!

Much more appropriate than the word 'humble' is the word 'gullible'. Children will "believe" almost anything you tell them – and of course, what all clerics want is gullible people, not humble ones! Then, Dear, see the horrible policy that the clerics promote through the words of their concocted Jesus: with great solemnity and seriousness, they teach gullible children that there's some great Jabberwock in the sky who will burn them forever in hell if they don't believe that their idiot Christ is the son of God! They teach the children that the world is full of ghosts and goblins, which will blind them and cripple them and drive them insane – unless they accept the lunacy of the existence of some special "Holy Ghost". The response of the poor little kids:

Okay, I'll believe. I promise I'll believe. Don't let the bad ghosts hurt me. Have the good ghost protect me. I'll be good. I want my mommy!

Damn all clerics to hell who have cursed children with this crap.

Consistently, they have their Jesus say (*Matthew 18, 5*):

"If a man is a cause of stumbling to one of these little ones who have faith in me, it would be better for him to have a millstone hung round his neck and be drowned in the depths of the sea."

And you can see why, earlier, they had their Jesus protect their fictitious "Holy Ghost" (*Matthew 12, 32*):

“And so I tell you this: no sin, no slander, is beyond forgiveness for men, except slander spoken against the Spirit, and that will not be forgiven. Any man who speaks a word against the Son of Man [aka Jesus] will be forgiven; but if anyone speaks against the Holy Spirit, for him these is no forgiveness, either in this age or in the age to come.”

The damnable clerics: they know that children are prime targets for their con game; brainwashing them perpetuates the clerics' parasitic existence; therefore, they threaten those of us who would block them from their most innocent prey. But those of us who can still think will fight the damnable predators of children, until the clerics go whimpering off to the fires of hell where they belong.

And if you think I'm "losing my cool", Dear, then let me try to show you that I'm not alone. First, let me quote something written more than 100 years ago by Gerald Massey (an historian about whom I'll write more in **Yx**, where I'll steer you to some of his writings available on the internet):

There are two things which I have come to look upon as constituting the unpardonable sin of the father and mother against the helpless innocence of infancy. The one is in allowing their little children to run the risk of blood poisoning – such as was once suffered by a child of mine... The other is in permitting the mind and soul of their children to be inoculated with the still more fatal virus of the old, false, orthodox dogmas and delusions, by allowing them to believe that the fables of ancient mythology are the sacred and solely true "Word of God"...

Generation after generation we learn, unlearn, and relearn the same lying, legendary lore, and it takes the latter half of all one's lifetime to throw off the mass of corrupting error instilled into us during the earlier half, even when we do break out and slough it off in a mental eruption, and have to find ourselves in utter rebellion against things as they are. Unfortunately, the mass of people never do get rid of this infection, nor of the desire to give their disease to others.

Next, let me begin to introduce you to the author of the above quotation, Gerald Massey, by quoting someone who knew him. In his book *The World's Sages, Thinkers, and Reformers*, D.M. Bennett wrote:

Gerald Massey is a warm-hearted, genial man, and as a companion and friend he has few superiors. His interests and incentives are decidedly in the direction of Science and Rationalism. He has many years been freed from the binding and blinding theological creeds and obligations. He regards priestcraft as one of the great evils which mankind for thousands of years have been compelled to endure and support; and regards it as one of the most important works that men of the present time can engage in to demolish the idols of the past dark ages; to liberate the mind from the

dwarfing and blighting effect of pagan and Christian mythology; and to dispense with the officious and expensive services of a designing, useless, aristocratic, and wily priesthood. He most desires to see the human race advance in knowledge and truth and mental freedom, which science and philosophy imparts to the diligent investigator. He believes ignorance to be the Devil, Science the Savior of the world.

And finally in this introduction to Massey, let me illustrate that in the midst of writing his books, he also toyed with poetry, I assume to try to relieve his tension. For example:

*Begone, you foolish preachers!
Howlers, snufflers, screechers!
You miserable teachers!
You God-of-blood beseechers
You forgers of God's features!
Who make us the devil's creatures;
Shut up, you foolish preachers!
Get out, you hell-fire screechers,
Go home, you played-out preachers!*

So similarly, Dear, let me try to calm myself with a few more limericks:

*Although Jesus did clearly insist
That the slander of him could persist,
Yet never defame
The Ghost of great fame:
Don't insult what doesn't exist!*

*Though Jesus baptized with the Spirit
And claimed no believer should fear it,
Yet talk of such ghosts
Infecting their hosts
Means he was insane – or quite near it!*

*Although Jesus demanded us most
Not to slander the great Holy Ghost,
It's perfectly clear
There's no need to fear:
Such ghosts are from drugs overdosed!*

*Though Christ did coerce in a grumble
To never cause children to stumble –
An innocent child?
Who's meek and so mild?
Have YOU met a child who is humble?!*

*Though Jesus warned us to obey
 (Choose drowning to torture his way!);
 Let's warn every kid
 (And clerics forbid)
 So clerics on children won't prey!*

*Though Christ promised followers feasts,
 Let's give a clear message to priests:
 Pollute dumb adults
 With drugs of your cults,
 But leave kids alone, you damn beasts!*

*Although Christ wanted you in his yoke
 And he sold his own version of coke,
 Forget all his yearnings
 For tortures and burnings:
 All his talk about hell is a joke!*

*Although Jesus said: "Choose to be thrown,
 In a lake tied with rope to a stone."
 To children I say
 Go out and just play
 It's a story that's way overblown!*

*Although Jesus preached laws, as he said,
 There's a law that I recently read:
 No more heaven or hell;
 When you're here, just do well;
 No more judgments when you are just dead!*

*Although Christ said that hell you should fear,
 As you'll find when your own time is near:
 Just develop your mind
 So that someday you'll find
 A new thought that'll always stay here!*

*Although Jesus would have you believe
 That from hell he could give a reprieve,
 Don't scrape to some god,
 They're all drowned off Cape Cod,
 Just have faith in yourself and achieve!*

I know, Dear... But, they're not meant to be "good"; they're meant to calm me down. And I prefer languishing in limericks rather than puttering with poetry, because a limerick has greater potential – if not to make me laugh, then at least to let me smile.

So now, refreshed a little, I'll continue with my struggle though the NT, where at *Matthew 18, 17*, we learn that if a “brother commits a sin” and “will not listen even to the congregation, you must then treat him as you would a pagan or a tax-gatherer”. You see, Dear, there are people as bad as even tax collectors – who work hard to enforce the laws established by our legislators, laws to fund what the majority of people consider to be important, such as protection provided by the police, fire fighters, and the military, as well as a host of other “services” such as water and sewer, mail delivery, upkeep of national parks, scientific research, etc.

So you wonder: who's worse than tax collectors? Why, the horrible “pagans”, of course – such as certain old grandfather of yours, who's certain that all gods are just figments of primitive imaginations, whose religion (i.e., “a binding together”) is the scientific method, who has faith that all people will eventually abandon supernaturalism for Humanism, and who has enduring hope for an educated humanity. And in response to Jesus I'd say that the only serious “sin” that my brother might make is not to use his brain as best he can and thereby, for example, buy into some damnable clerical con game.

Then there's the tidbit at *Matthew 18, 7*, dealing with changing the laws. The specific case is not very important, Dear; instead, it's the principle that's important in this “divine revelation”.

The specific case, apparently, was that some fellow wanted to divorce his wife, and the law (claimed to be written by Moses) required him to give her just a “note of dismissal”. Someone asked Jesus, basically, how come such a “note of dismissal” was sufficient, and the enlightened Jesus explained it all: “It was because your minds were closed that Moses gave you permission...” And thus the principle promoted by the clerics' Jesus: if a new dictator dislikes some law dictated by an earlier dictator, then blame the disliked law not on an error of the earlier dictator but on the inadequacies of the earlier people, cause doncha know, dictators (those with the might) are always right. Riiiiiiiiight.

Just imagine what could have happened if the clerics had written that their Jesus had said something more sensible:

Well, ya see, it's this way. Moses (or, better, Ezra) was a lying, murdering, racist. Similar to dictators yet to come (Muhammad, Joseph Smith, Hitler, Stalin, or any Mafia god-father), Moses (according to Ezra) assembled about him a bunch of murdering storm troopers (the Levites), and his resulting power drove him mad. Most of his laws are so dumb and so horrible that humanity should purge them from memory, except maybe in some historical studies that investigate how evil some people can be. Therefore, forget about all the laws dictated by the damnable Moses (or Ezra). Never mind what he said about how to divorce your wife, beat your slaves to death, sell your daughter into slavery, and so on, and especially forget about all his idiotic ideas about his silly god.

Instead, set your minds to the task of establishing laws that are just, with the fundamental principles being that all people are equal before the law, that everyone has an equal right to claim one's own existence, and that everyone should get pretty much what they deserve. For example, suppose we were to elect representatives from among us, to serve us for a limited time, and assign them the responsibility and appropriate authority to define the laws under which our society will function. Then...

Sorry, Dear, I know it's easy to get carried away imagining what wonderful things could have happened if no priests had polluted humanity.

The clerics' Jesus then turned to his disciples and reportedly said (*Matthew 18, 23*):

“I tell you this: a rich man will find it hard to enter the kingdom of Heaven. I repeat, it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.”

What hideousness! Dear, if people earn money honestly, then their wealth reflects their society's judgment of the contribution they make to the society's welfare.

And of course there are cases in which people gain substantial wealth by behaving similar to clerics, selling something worthless (or, in the case of the clerics, worse than worthless), but those are evils for our legal system to bring to justice. But for Christian clerics to be preaching that money is bad, and that people with wealth are evil, is so dumb (similar to the ignorance that producers are evil) that it reflects a morality too gross even to flush down a toilet.

It drives me to more limericks:

*Though Jesus passed out opium,
And he raised, to new heights, martyrdom,
When I read what he taught
I'm hung up on the thought:
How could anyone be quite so dumb?!*

*Though Jesus said nothing was worse
Than silver and gold in your purse;
If you follow his way,
And give money away,
Then you're spreading a horrible curse!*

*Though Christ, without jest, clearly told
All the rich no more money to hold;
He said: "Just buy friends,
"Thereby, make amends" –
But what "friends" can you buy with mere gold?!*

*Though Jesus suggested you choose:
To serve God (to serve money, you loose);
But never behave
As if you're a slave:
Your money's just something to use!*

*Though Christ said that gold makes you sad,
And the perfect should yield all they had,
It's not clear to me
That he ever did see:
Spreading evil to others is bad!*

And by the way, Dear, if anyone should ever ask you how to get into the utopia that the clerics promote (i.e., their heaven), then maybe you should remind them of the three points that Jesus made at *Matthew 19, 16*:

- 1) There's only "one" who's sufficiently "good" to get into heaven (and that "one", of course, is no one but Jesus, himself),
- 2) If you obey all Moses' commandments (e.g., if you beat your slaves to death and sell your daughters into slavery in the "approved" manner), then you get to "enter into life" (the fact that everyone born has already managed to "enter into life" apparently escaped Jesus' notice), and
- 3) If you "**wish to go the whole way** [into life; sorry, Dear, but clerics' words don't necessarily need to have any meaning], **go, sell your possessions, and give to the poor** [i.e., to those poorer than you]..."

This procedure is especially recommended for anyone who is rich – at least it's highly recommended by anyone who is poorer – but for some strange reason, all Christians and Mormons in rich western societies seem to ignore this injunction from Jesus, ignoring the billions of poor people who live elsewhere in the world. I guess that all these Christians and Mormons just aren't that keen on going “the whole way” into life. But one might have thought that they'd want to go at least part way, and give at least part of their wealth to those people who don't want to work, who prefer to live a parasitic existence, similar to clerics who... Hmmm. Maybe the clerics are trying to tell us something here.

But then, apparently the clerics' Jesus couldn't keep his story straight – or more accurately, the clerics kept changing theirs (because, as I'll show you in Yx, what they tried to do, but failed, was seamlessly meld multi-myths into one story with only one fictitious character, i.e., Jesus). Thus, in *Matthew 19, 29*, the clerics' Jesus informs us of a way not just to “enter into life” (i.e., the Gnostics' idea) but also to get into heaven (i.e., the Persian-Zoroastrian idea):

“And anyone who has left brothers or sisters, father, mother, or children, land or houses for the sake of my name will be repaid many times over, and gain eternal life.”

On the other hand, there's a bit of a Catch-22 in all this: once you get to heaven this way, Moses would boot you down to hell. I can hear him now:

I told you to love your brothers and your sisters. What love do you show them by abandoning them? I told you to honor your father and mother. Do you think you honor them by abandoning their faith? And you even abandoned your children? How low can you get? And why? Because you wanted eternal life in heaven? Is this what you coveted? Didn't I tell you not to covet? To hell with the lot of you.

No wonder the clerics wanted to preach their stuff to children and those who became like children, i.e., gullible. Any adult would have told them to take their con game and blow it out their ears.

And based on the available reports in the NT, not only should Jesus be impeached for his inhumanity (advocating torture – for eternity!), he should be thrown out of office for his lack of comprehension of even the simplest idea of fairness.

You can see what I mean in the long parable at *Matthew 20*, 1-16, about a landowner (Jesus or God) who went out to hire some workers. At the start of the day, he hired some workers and promised to pay them a day's wages for working the day; at midday, he hired more; and then one hour before sunset, he hired still more. The story continues:

Those had started work an hour before sunset came forward and were paid the full day's wage. When it was the turn of the men who had come first, they expected something extra, but were paid the same amount as the others. As they took it, they grumbled at their employer: "These late-comers have done only one hour's work, yet you have put them on a level with us, who have sweated the whole day long in the blazing sun!" The owner turned to one of them and said, "My friend, I am not being unfair to you. You agreed on the usual wage for the day, did you not? Take your pay and go home. I choose to pay the last man the same as you. Surely I am free to do what I like with my own money. Why be jealous because I am kind?"

This is a competent judge? He can't see the unfairness in this case? I agree that the landowner should be able to do what he pleases with his own money. And I agree that the landowner is abiding by the "letter of the law". But Jesus missed the "spirit of the law", just as Jesus criticized others (*Matthew 23*, 23):

"Alas for you, lawyers and Pharisees, hypocrites... you have overlooked the weightier demands of the Law: justice, mercy, and good faith."

Thus, the cleric's Jesus has the landowner ask: "Why be jealous because I am kind?" But this is kindness shown to only a select group, who obviously didn't earn this kindness, and thereby, simultaneously, an unkindness to the workers "who... sweated the whole day long in the blazing sun". That is, this case shows a judge (Jesus) who abided by the letter of the law – and preached kindness – but violated the more fundamental judicial principle of fairness (while calling others hypocrites for following the letter and not the spirit of the law). If such a judge showed such incompetence today, he'd be thrown out of office on his ear.

Please think about it, Dear. In this parable (which as I'll show you in **Yx**, is actually an adaptation of a fairly reasonable Jewish parable, which the Christian clerics twisted into nonsense), the landowner (Jesus or God) reportedly said: "I am not being unfair to you [who worked the full day in the blazing sun]." Do you think he was unfair?

I do, the workers did, and so does justice, as defined by Mother Nature. That is, justice demands, not that the letter of the law be upheld, but that people get what they deserve. In this case, Jesus is preaching like the Pharisees (whom he called “**a viper’s brood**”, for trying to follow the letter of the law); and actually (as I’ll show you in **Yx**) in the Jewish parable (which the clerics’ Jesus is mangling), the latecomers were paid the same as the first workers – because the latecomers worked harder!

Then, Dear, notice the crazy question from the clerics’ Jesus at the end of the parable: “**Why be jealous because I am kind?**” Here we have the clerics’ Jesus (claimed to be the author of the kindness principle “**Do unto others...**”) demonstrating that he doesn’t have the faintest idea about either justice or kindness. He would apparently “think” that it’s kind to identify a single kid to whom he’d, say, give some candy (or praise or whatever) for accomplishments, and to identify this single kid not only in the presence of other kids but even in the presence of kids who deserve more candy (or praise or whatever) than the kid he singled out! Even most little kids singled out in this manner would object, realizing that it’s neither fair nor kind to the other kids. Thus, with this parable, the clerics’ Jesus demonstrates less understanding of justice and kindness than little kids!

Meanwhile, of course what the crazy clerics who wrote this crap are trying to convey is more Christian bigotry. They’re trying to say that the “good” Christians will get into heaven, even though they’re late comers, who (unlike the Israelites) didn’t “**sweat the full day long in the blazing sun**”, trying to placate the giant Jabberwock in the sky. And why? Just because, that’s why. Any other questions for the crazy Christian clerics?

And let me tell you, they’ve got lots of answers – just as dumb as that one. For example, next consider the two parables at *Matthew 21, 33* and *22, 1*. In these, the Christian clerics give us more examples of their religious intolerance and anti-Judaism, which as I’ll show you in **Yx**, led to as much evil as (or even more evil than) the Jewish racism that Moses (or Ezra) promoted and that Hitler practiced. But for a change, how about if I not attack the idiotic social policies of the clerical authors, but their incompetence as authors?!

For comparison, Dear, please have in the back of your mind some parables, fables, or fictitious stories – such as those by Homer, Aesop, Lewis Carroll, Hans Christian Anderson, or even some animated movie produced by Walt

Disney, such as *The Lion King*. In such cases, competent authors use fictitious stories to convey some personal or social message. Similarly (and actually, as I'll try to show you in **Yx**, not just for the two parables under consideration, but for essentially the entire Bible, both Old and New Testament, as well as the Book of Mormon), the authors are presenting fictitious stories to convey some messages (in the case of the two parables under consideration, the social message is anti-Judaism).

What I want you to focus on now (partly just for the fun of it) is not the evil social policies being promoted, but the incompetence of the clerics as storytellers. Thus, Dear, to convey their social message, competent authors such as Aesop, Homer, and so on (including the unknown authors of the original Jewish parables) present fictitious stories that are sufficiently coherent that they're somehow "believable", even though we know that they're untrue.

For example, you know that, in reality, Ulysses didn't battle some one-eyed Cyclops, the hare didn't tell the fox not to throw him in the briar patch, Alice didn't step through a mirror into Wonderland, Dorothy didn't click her heels to get back to Kansas, and so on, but yet, the stories that evolve are sufficiently consistent with the way our imagination links thoughts that we have no difficulty in following (and enjoying!) the evolving stories.

With such examples in mind, Dear, now please consider the first of the two parables, starting at *Matthew 21*, 33. The landowner (God) leases out his land (Earth) to some tenant farmers (the Israelites), goes away, and later sends out multi-waves of servants (prophets) to collect "produce due". The tenants (the Israelites) treated the servants (the prophets) terribly (thrashed, stoned, or killed them). So (so the story goes) the landowner (God) then sent his son (Jesus) to collect, and the tenant farmers killed the son. The "moral" is then contained in the response to Jesus' question, "**When the owner of the vineyard comes, how do you think he will deal with those tenants?**", namely,

He [God] will bring those bad men [the bad Israelites] to a bad end... and hand the vineyard over to other tenants [the good Christians], who will let him [God] have his share of the crop when the season comes.

Now again, Dear, and for a change, my goal (this time) is not to criticize the horrible social policy being advocated (viz., that Jewish people were bad,

because they refused to buy into the Christian clerics' con game), but to ask you to consider the incompetence of the clerical authors.

To be effective, a parable (even about a one-eyed Cyclops, a rabbit in a briar patch, a little girl in a mirror, or whatever) must be coherent. That is, once the reader (or listener) accepts the original fanciful concept, then the author must present a consistent story: Ulysses can't defeat the Cyclops using an AK-47, the rabbit can't outrun the fox in a Cadillac, and even Alice isn't allowed to... I don't know what, because Lewis Carroll cut himself a tremendous amount of slack, permitting Alice to do almost anything in her "Wonderland"!

In contrast, this parable about God as a landowner falls flat on its face. Even the little kid in the back row wants to know:

After the tenants (the Israelites) had killed the landowner's servants (the prophets), why would the landowner (especially an all-knowing God, who is able to see the future) send his son? It doesn't make sense. Also, if the landowner knew that the tenants were going to kill his son, then wouldn't the landowner (God) be an accomplice in the murder? And if he's all-powerful, then couldn't he have stopped the murder? He should have! Are we supposed to conclude that God doesn't know, can't see the future, has no control, and doesn't give a damn about anybody, even his son? I don't like your story – and I don't like your God!

As a clerical construction, Dear, not only does this story reveal horrible social policies but astoundingly incompetent authors. It's crazy! What are the clerics trying to do – promote, atheism?!

And similarly for the parable at *Matthew 22*, 1, which again is a horribly mangled Jewish parable. In this version constructed by Christian clerics, a King [God] prepared a feast to celebrate the wedding of his son [Jesus]. The King sent out servants [prophets] to invite guests [the Israelites] to come to the wedding feast, but not only did they all refuse, they killed the messengers. So, the King [God] sent out his troops to kill the unappreciative guests [the Israelites], and then sent invitations to anyone who wanted a free meal. Among those who came, was a man "not dressed for wedding". Whereupon the King [God] said:

"My friend," [and, Dear, watch what happens to people whom God calls his friends – and beware!] "how do you come to be here without your wedding clothes?" He [the poorly dressed guest] had nothing to say [or maybe better, he was too embarrassed to say that, not only was he starving, he was wearing his best clothes!]. The king then

said to his attendants, “Bind him [a guest?!] hand and foot [because he wasn’t dressed for the occasion?!]; turn him out into the dark, the place of wailing and grinding of teeth” [i.e., hell!]. For though many are invited, few are chosen.”

Now, Dear, of course the important points here are the horrible social policies being advocated by the damnable clerics (promoting the idea that people who don’t buy into the clerics’ con game are to be killed and that, unless a Christian does exactly as the clerics want, God will “turn him out into the dark, the place of wailing and grinding of teeth”).

But I’m so sickened by the damnable clerics who wrote this hellish Bible with its horrible policies that I’m now trying to keep my sanity (I don’t know if it’s working!) by focusing just on their incompetence as story tellers. Thus, Dear, can’t you, also, again hear the little kid in the back row, who was just there to hear a story, saying:

Hey, wait a minute. First, why would the invited guests kill people who delivered the invitation? If somebody invited me to a birthday party, I sure wouldn’t hurt them. And I sure wouldn’t hurt the King’s messengers! And how come the King threw out the guy who wasn’t dressed properly? Even if it was a ‘dress-up’ party, that’s no way to treat a guest. My mommy would never let me behave that way. I don’t like this King – and I don’t like your story!

But on the other hand, Dear, maybe there’s a deeper meaning to these two parables: maybe what the authors are trying to do is to convince people to abandon the stupid concept of gods! Let me put it this way: it may be that there’s no better way to cure people of their primitive ideas about God than to have them read the Bible! I don’t know how anyone can read this stuff without concluding that it’s all rotten, stinking garbage.

In the rest of *Matthew 22* and then the whole of *Matthew 23*, the clerics reveal that their Jesus is a hypocrite and a fool. You can start to see that their Jesus is a hypocrite, Dear, when at *Matthew 22*, 18 the clerics have their Jesus (with a huge plank in his own eye) judge his brothers (the Pharisees, that is, the ones with small specks in their eyes) with his famous: “**You hypocrites!**” You can also start to see that their Jesus is a fool when at *Matthew 22*, 20 they have him utter his famous: “**...pay Caesar what is due to Caesar, and pay God what is due to God**”.

But showing you why this second statement is so foolish (demonstrating that the clerics are unable to distinguish symbols from the reality they represent,

and therefore demonstrating that the clerical authors knew essentially nothing about governments, economics, or God) will take me a while, and I want to delay my explanation until later chapters in this group, where I'll first give you more examples of their errors before showing you the root cause. In this chapter, therefore, because so many additional examples are available, let me restrict my comments to the hypocrisy of the clerics' Jesus.

A hypocrite, Dear, is someone who preaches one thing and practices the opposite. I'll list some examples.

- As I already mentioned, at *Matthew 22, 18* the clerics' Jesus says to a group of Pharisees (i.e., Israelites who followed a stricter version of the Persian religion than did the clerics' Jesus) “**You hypocrites!**”; yet back at *Matthew 7, 1*, he said “**Pass no judgment... First take the plank out of your own eye, and they you will see clearly to take the speck out of your brother's.**” That, Dear, is hypocrisy.
- At *Matthew 23, 9*, the clerics' Jesus says “**Do not call any man on earth 'father'; for you have one Father and he is in heaven**”; yet back at *Matthew 19, 18*, this same Jesus repeated the commandment “**honor your father and mother**”. That, Dear, is more hypocrisy.
- Through the rest of *Matthew 23*, the clerics' Jesus repeats, five times, “**Alas, alas for you, lawyers and Pharisees, hypocrites...**”, and then slaps them with additional insults, calling them “**blind guides**”, “**snakes**”, and “**vipers' brood**”; yet back at *Matthew 5, 39*, this same Jesus said “**If a man slaps you on the right cheek, turn and offer him your left.**” More hypocrisy.
- At *Matthew 23, 22*, the clerics' Jesus defends swearing oaths to heaven with the words “**to swear by heaven is to swear both by the throne of God and by him who sits upon it**”; yet back at *Matthew 5, 34* this same Jesus says “**You are not to swear at all – not by heaven, for it is God's throne, nor by earth, etc.**” Still more hypocrisy (or at least stupidity).
- At *Matthew 23, 23*, the clerics' Jesus states “**Alas for you, lawyers and Pharisees, hypocrites! You pay tithes... but you have overlooked the weightier demands of the Law: justice, mercy, and good faith... You strain off a midge, yet gulp down a camel!**”; yet at *Matthew 7, 23*, this same Jesus says that when the people beg him for mercy he will say to them: “**I never knew you; out of my sight...**” Talk about hypocrisy!
- At *Matthew 23, 33*, the clerics' Jesus states “**You snakes, you viper's brood, how can you escape being condemned to hell?**”; yet back at *Matthew 5, 44*, this same Jesus states “**Love your enemies and pray for your persecutors; only so [i.e., only thus] can you be children of your heavenly Fathers... There must be no limit to your goodness.**” Just as there seems to be no limits to his hypocrisy.

And although I'll show you more examples later, Dear, perhaps the above are enough to support my assessment that the clerics' Jesus is a hypocrite.

Moving on, at *Matthew 24, 34*, speaking to his apostles, the clerics' Jesus states: “**the present generation will live to see it all. Heaven and earth will pass away; my words will never pass away.**” Obviously he was wrong on his first prediction. Would that soon his second prediction will also be shown to be false, for such false teachings as those at *Matthew 24, 52* (where the clerics' Jesus promises hypocrites an eternal hell “**where there is wailing and grinding of teeth**”) deserve to disappear. Yet, at the end of *Matthew 25* the clerics had their Jesus advocate something right – but gave the wrong reason: he advocated the people should help one another, but he gave for the reason so that they could go to heaven (a place of “**eternal life**”) and avoid hell (a place of “**eternal punishment**”).

Dear: we help one another instinctively because these DNA molecules that we temporarily host learned eons ago that kindness was a principle that would help these genes go on. Just as a healthy dolphin will swim beneath a wounded dolphin, periodically lifting it to the surface so that it can breathe, do what you can to help your fellow humans. And to determine how you can best help, use your head! Some humans can best help humanity by filling soup bowls for the hungry (an activity especially recommended for people as ignorant as the clerics of the world); other humans can help by defeating the AIDS virus, stopping an asteroid from hitting the Earth, and in millions of other ways (depending on talents), from dancing and singing (to bring a little beauty into the world) to maybe even writing a book (to help their grandchildren) – even if the author has no talent for it!

Stated differently, Dear, don't help humanity because the clerics promise you eternal life in their fictitious heaven and don't avoid helping humanity because the clerics threaten you with eternal punishment in their fictitious hell. Forget about what happens when you die; all available data strongly suggest that no one is aware of anything after their death, including death. Further, Dear, realize that the major accomplishments of the majority of humans has been, first, to produce offspring (whose DNA molecules temporarily confuse parasites) and then, second, to die. But, Dear, with the advantages that your ancestors have given you (so that you have opportunities to accomplish all that you are capable of accomplishing) and with there now being far too many people in the world, then you can help

humanity most by producing and accomplishing to the limits of your capabilities, in arts, sciences, medicine, politics, or where ever your talents and interests lead you.

And when you follow this natural road that leads to helping humanity, up the endless hill of striving toward your full potential, don't pay the damnable clerics the toll they demand. The toll they demand is the essence of the con game that permits them to live their parasitic existence, producing and accomplishing nothing. Even in those cases where the clerics desire "to do good", their ignorance and the idiocy of their "holy books" leads them to cause humans enormous harm, especially to children, who are taught by the clerics to substitute faith for inquiry, ritual for reason, dogma for data, and mysticism for the scientific method.

But now I'd better try to get off my soapbox and try to finish this damnable "Gospel According to Matthew". The trouble is, every time I get down from my soapbox, more stupidity in the Bible forces me back up! For example, there's the one-paragraph story that starts at *Matthew 26, 6*. We're told that a woman poured a small bottle of fragrant (and expensive) oil on Jesus, his disciples were "indignant" at the waste ("it could have been sold for a good sum and the money given to the poor"), and the clerics have their Jesus say:

"Why must you [disciples] make trouble for the woman? It is a fine thing she has done for me. You have the poor among you always... I tell you this: wherever in all the world this gospel is proclaimed, what she has done will be told as her memorial."

Pity that the dumb clerics who wrote this didn't see their own stupidity. The woman was right: she had the right to do what she wanted with her own property, to help as she best saw fit. Jesus was right to reprimand his disciples with "why must you make trouble for the woman?", but he missed the main point (as did his disciples, and as have all subsequent clerics): the ignorant clerics concocted a Jesus who made trouble for his disciples (teaching them to help humanity for the wrong reason and teaching them just the cheapest way to help humanity, not teaching them, for example, how to build rockets to stop an asteroid from hitting Earth). His busy-body disciples and their subsequent followers, the Christian clerics, then caused humanity more trouble, teaching humanity the wrong way to help and for the wrong reason.

And thus the words (which the clerics put in their Jesus' mouth) come back to bite them: “**Why must you make trouble?**” But the clerics don't have the brains to see the damage they do – or they know, but are living so well off the fat of the land that they don't want to give up the perks of their con games.

At *Matthew 26*, 28 is a trivial little line, which should be so inconsequential as to be not worth calling to your attention – except for the fact that (as I'll show you in **Yx** and will be showing you in a different manner latter in this **Qx**), this line is almost certainly from the insane “Saint” Paul, who erected a monstrous monument on this little line, a monument that led to the Catholic Church and then eventually led to other monstrosities, including all the Protestant Churches as well as Mormonism. The line is associated with the clerics' Jesus passing a cup of wine to his disciples, saying

“**Drink from it, all of you. For this is my blood, the blood of the covenant, shed for many for the forgiveness of sins.**”

I will come back to this idiocy in later chapters, Dear. Here I'll just say that it's a fiction based on a fable designed to deceive the gullible out of their money: the only sin is ignorance; no one can forgive the consequences of ignorance (people will get what they deserve). In reality, the clerics' Jesus didn't shed a drop of blood of any covenant for anybody. If there were a historical Jesus (which, as I'll be showing you in **Yx**, is not at all certain), he may have been stoned to death (and then his body would have been hung out for the day), because (it's suggested) he preached to the Israelites that their god, Jehovah, was the bad god who made matter (or mass) whereas the god good made light. And as silly as that might sound to you, Dear, don't forget that no historical Jesus knew that matter could be turned into energy, and *vice versa*, via Einstein's $E = mc^2$.

And if you want more silly stuff, Dear, then read the nonsense in the rest of *Matthew 26*, starting at *Matthew 26*, 26. The silly story-telling clerics have their Jesus separate himself from the others except for three of them, then he separated himself from these three (who fell asleep three times), and yet somehow-or-other his prayer (to try to get out of dying) was recorded! Riiiiight. Next, a “great crowd” appears, and not one of the crowd (save for the “traitor” Judas) knows who Jesus is. Riiiiight.

* Go to other chapters *via*

Oh, and then the clerics have their Jesus say “**All who take the sword die by the sword**”, which not only is obviously wrong but also it’s a horrible insult to all the brave men who have taken the sword to defend our freedoms. Next, the ignorant clerics have their Jesus say “**Do you suppose that I cannot appeal to my Father, who would at once send to my aid more than twelve legions of angles?**” – whereas at the start of this nonsense, he prayed three times for help to avoid his predicament, obviously to no avail! And what did his cowardly disciples do about all this? These cowards, whom all Christian clerics follow, “**deserted him and ran away.**”

Finally, Dear, the rest of Matthew is such a crazy fabrication that I’m ready to start screaming bloody murder! It’s a total lie; it’s part of the horrible “God Lie.” Instead of this total fabrication by Matthew, the historical investigations that I’ll outline in **Yx** suggest the following:

- The injustices described would not have occurred under Roman law, a law that (as I’ll show in a later **Qx**-chapter) even “Saint” Paul revered and relied upon,
- The Israelites were not guilty of the “sin” of killing the historical Jesus; Matthew and associated Christian clerics used this accusation solely to bolster their con game,
- Of course Jesus didn’t rise from the dead, for that would be a violation of the laws of nature, and
- The clerics didn’t get “**full authority**” from Jesus to preach their evil throughout the world; they gained authority (from the butcher-emperor Constantine) to practice their con game by killing off the competition, thereby establishing the worst organized crime syndicate (with its many branches, such as Islam and Mormonism) that the world has ever had the misfortune of experiencing.

And, Dear, once you see the reason, the pattern, the skullduggery, the consequences, the bestiality behind Matthew’s single line that he fabricated about the Jewish crowd, namely, having them say “**His blood be upon us and upon our children**”, then I think you’ll join me on figuratively spitting on every cleric in the world. That single, fabricated line resulted in almost 2,000 years of tormenting Jewish people and the murder of at least ten million of them (men, women, and children), culminating in Hitler’s massacres. But here, I can’t show you the details; in fact, I won’t be able to show you the full extent of the details in the “excursion” **Yx**, dealing with “Your Indoctrination in the Mountainous God Lie”, because they’re so complicated.

Instead, here I'll provide just a "broad-brush" summary. Thus, what the cleric who wrote *Matthew* is doing, here, is the same as what Ezra and co-conspirators did by writing their fabricated stories (in the OT) about Moses, and the same as some unknown cleric did by writing the fabricated story called the *Book of Daniel* (in the OT). That is, their idea of writing "history" was to write stories after the fact (e.g., in the case of *Matthew*, after the destruction of the Jewish Temple in 70 CE), with the stories concocted to "explain" events (e.g., to introduce characters who would provide fabricated "prophecies" of such events) that had already occurred! So, this "**His blood be upon us and upon our children**" was the author's way of "explaining" why the Jewish Temple had been destroyed. Thereby, with their lies, the Jewish clerics who wrote the OT promoted racism, and the Jewish clerics who wrote the NT set the stage for the tragedies that led to Hitler's horrors.

As a result, Dear, and just as when I reached a similar point in the OT, I plan to change my approach. Up 'til now, I've been trying to show you some of the policies proposed in the Bible. You may recall that, in the case of the OT, when I reached a point at which a major policy just didn't make sense (specifically, when Moses basically said: "It ain't gonna do any good, but go ahead and kill all the people anyway"), I reminded you of my own experience, when a colleague said "**What makes you think that they give a damn.**" That is, while going through the policies in the OT, I had assumed that it was the avowed policies that were being promoted – while overlooking what can be shown was the real purpose of the clerics (Ezra and co-conspirators) who wrote the OT. Their real purpose wasn't to tell the Israelites their history, but to say to them, in effect: "**See, if only you had listened to us clerics, you would never have been captives in Babylon.**" They were rewriting history – lying, complete with totally fake "prophecies" – to con the people into accepting the clerics as their new masters.

Well, it's the same, here, in the New Testament, starting with *Matthew*: the policies are fabrications, the stories are lies, history is being rewritten, "prophecies" are being faked (after the fact), so that a new breed of clerics (who wrote *Matthew*) can say (basically): "**See, if you had listened to us, then the Temple would never have been destroyed.**" Consequently, my plan is, again, to give up. There's no point in going through the "Gospels" of the NT as if they were accurately describing history; they're all *ex post facto* ("after the fact") fabrications, concocted to con the people into paying the keep of a new breed of useless clerics (i.e., the Christian clerics).

Moreover, different from the OT, there's an amazingly strange feature of the three NT "Synoptic Gospels" (i.e., *Matthew*, *Mark*, and *Luke*): they all re-tell the same story (about events that allegedly occurred at the same time, and therefore the adjective "synoptic"). And as silly as that might sound, there's something sillier: the stories disagree! Thus, one "reporter" says that Jesus said or did such-and-such, and the next reporter contradicts the first – and the third! As I'll show you, starting in the next chapter, the resulting contradictions are absolutely bizarre, leaving any sane reader with the overwhelming question: What the devil is going on? Can't these crazy clerics keep their stories straight?!

But of more immediate relevance to you, Dear, is that I'm not going to ask you to read ahead of me, Gospel by Gospel, keeping in "lock step" with subsequent chapters in this Qx that deal with the NT. Instead, please plow ahead, at your own pace, to read the rest of the NT. Perhaps you could get through the next three gospels (*Mark*, *Luke*, and *John*) before you tackle the next chapter in this book – but actually, it doesn't really matter if you don't (so long as you eventually do). But it will matter if you don't get some more exercise!