

Qx13 – Plotting a Different Path through the NT’s Policy Quagmire, starting with: Natural & Personal Injustices

Dear: Actually, there are two additional reasons why I plan to start, now, on a different path through the quagmire of policies advocated in the New Testament (NT), rather than continue on the path that I started on (and have asked you to continue on), i.e., plowing straight ahead. At the end of the previous chapter, I emphasized one reason for taking a different path, namely, sometimes the policies advocated in the NT are not as they appear to be. That is, similar to what I tried to show you occurred in the case of the Old Testament (OT), the primary purpose of both sets of clerical authors (of the OT and of the NT) was not to report history accurately (as historians would do) or even to present stories with important moral messages (as competent story tellers would do) but instead to establish new priesthods.

Stated differently, both the OT and the NT are priestly propaganda polemics (where the word ‘polemic’ means “a strong verbal or written attack on someone or something” or “the art or practice of engaging in dispute” and is derived from the Greek word *polemos* meaning ‘war’). Consequently, the policies advocated in the NT can’t be taken at “face value”; rather, the reader must weigh how the advocated policies were designed to promote the parasitic plans of the new group of clerics.

THE FALLACY OF THE EQUIVALENCE OF INFORMATION

One of the additional reasons why I plan to take a different path through the quagmire is related to another important principle (besides application of the principle, illustrated above, of asking “What’s the objective?”) – and I’m sorry, but because writing these letters to you has taken so long, I’ve forgotten if I’ve already mentioned this principle! And because all what I’ve typed isn’t in a single file, then to find a specific idea, I can’t easily do a single “global search.” But besides, even if I’ve already mentioned this principle, it’s sufficiently important to mention it again!

The principle is commonly expressed as: “Beware the fallacy of the equivalence of information.” It’s related to the common need to assess the value of information (judging “value”, of course, relative to some objective). The basic concept is that, in pursuit of some objective, all information isn’t of equal value.

For example, if your goal is to make a carrot cake, then an appropriate recipe would be of substantial value, whereas equally accurate information on, e.g., how to build a sail boat, would be of little value – at least for baking a carrot cake! Thus, the “fallacy of the equivalence of information” is the false assumption that, in the pursuit of some objective, all information is of equal value.

In pursuit of the goal of trying to show you some of the hideous policies advocated in the Bible, then for the option of “just” plowing ahead through the rest of the NT, I was worried about my succumbing to the fallacy of the equivalence of information, i.e., showing you too many details, causing you to be unable to see their relative importance. Stated differently and using a very old analogy, I was worried that you’d be unable to see the forest, because I’d be asking you to look at so many trees – and even at bugs on the needles of the branches of individual trees! Or, returning to my original analogy: as I plodded my way straight through the NT, with its mud and guck oozing over my boots, I was worried about my ability to show you a useful path through the quagmire.

THE QUAGMIRE GETS GOOIER AND GUCKIER!

And the other additional reason why I want to strike out on a new path to try to get through the NT might be best described by extending my original analogy. Thus, the first time a person plods through the NT quagmire, the mud and guck can be tolerable. Therefore, if this is your first time through the NT, I hope you’ll be able to avoid stepping in some quicksand or getting stuck in some guck – and, of course, I’ll try to ensure your safe passage.

But, Dear, there’s something that you should know about struggling through any quagmire: every subsequent trek through it exposes more and more mud, which then gets gooier and guckier. For me, I’ve gone through the NT guck, now, at least a half-a-dozen times, and I’m sorry, but I just can’t make it through on the same path again! I’ll be nearby– but (recalling what Camus said): [walk beside me; don’t follow](#). And although there’s not much point in my doing so, I’d be inclined to argue that it’s not my fault to ask you to take a nearby path: it’s not this book for you (which I’ve been working on for these many years) that’s created all this guck and goo, but thousands of years of clerical ignorance that have created the swamp of stupidities called the Bible.

* Go to other chapters *via*

In fact (as I'll try to show you in **Yx**), data strongly support the indictment that the clerical authors have taken the next two steps even past the fallacy of equivalence of information, namely, supplying the reader not only with misinformation but also with disinformation, i.e., deliberate lies. That is, many stories in the Bible are nothing but “priestly fabrications”, not only giving distorted reports of events that occurred but also describing events that never even occurred.

And I admit that, many time during this trek, I've almost succumbed to the idea that the best way to get through this swamp is first to drain it: there are no gods; therefore, all “holy books” are fabrications; QED! But I'm concerned that you'd be unconvinced by such a “demonstration” (as in QED = *quod erai demonstrandum*), because ever since you were a baby, you've been taught that the “information” in the Bible (and in the Book of Mormon) is “God's holy truth.” Therefore, I concluded that it would be necessary for me to continue to slog through the swamp of almost useless information, much misinformation, and substantial disinformation contained in these “holy books”.

MY PLANNED PATH FORWARD

More to the point, after much worry and after trying several different methods, I finally developed a plan and found a different path for me to take, while trying to guide you through the rest of the quagmire of NT policies. My plan has the following parts:

- Not to go through the rest of the NT line-by-line (as I did in the previous two chapters, reviewing *the Gospel According to Matthew*), but instead, gather material from the entire NT into similar subject categories,
- Next, organize these subject categories into a framework similar to the one I used earlier in this book to organize “policies” (i.e., in **J** through **M**, which dealt with Justice & Judges, Kindness, Love, Laws, and Morality), and then
- As best I'm able to discern and accomplish in a reasonable amount of time, include in each category sufficient examples to illustrate the policies advocated in the NT.

Thereby, I hope if not to remedy, then at least not to contribute further to the fallacy of the equivalence of information.

* Go to other chapters *via*

But I should add, if not a warning, then at least a caution. As I already wrote, to make further progress through the swamp, I plan to proceed along a path generally parallel to the path that I used in **J** through **M**, dealing with justice, kindness, and so on. I advertise that this path will be “generally parallel” to the path from **J** through **M**, but as you might recall, I had difficulty with “switch backs” even on that earlier path; therefore, in what follows, I’ll again need to intermix these topics.

Stated differently, Dear, don’t expect me to “religiously” stick to my planned path (especially when the mud starts oozing over my boots). In general, my goal is to show you some of the ignorance promoted in the NT – and that goal will be the prime guide for the steps I take along the path, starting with comments on:

RELIGIOUS “MIRACLES” *versus* NATURAL JUSTICE

As I’ve addressed in earlier chapters (e.g., Chapter **J2** entitled “Justice and Morality”), by “natural justice” is meant “just” the scientific principle of causality, i.e., all effects have their causes. In those earlier chapters, I also pointed out that what are called “miracles” (in the religious sense of the word ‘miracle’, i.e., according to the New Oxford American Dictionary, [a surprising and welcome event that is not explicable by natural or scientific laws and is therefore considered to be the work of a divine agency](#)) violate the principle of causality. That is, (religious) “miracles” violate natural justice – and, therefore, they don’t occur.

Nature (i.e., experience) begins to teach us the principle of causality (or “natural justice”) when we’re children. For example, when still eating in high chairs, most modern children learn that a single candy can’t be turned into a thousand candies, when they walk, they learn that they can’t walk on water, and when they fall and hurt themselves, they learn that, to help them, their mother must do more than chase some devil away.

In contrast, the primitive clerics who wrote the NT knew less about natural justice than do modern children! Thus, the clerical authors of the NT would have us “believe” that their Jesus could turn a couple of loaves of bread into thousands of loaves, that he could walk on water, that he was an expert at “scaring the devil” out of sick people, and so on.

Now, Dear, I won't list all the "miracles" claimed in the NT. I suspect that there are at least a hundred of them – and based on all that I've learned about nature (including the total absence of even a shred of data supporting even a single one of what religious people call 'miracles'), I'm certain that every single claim of a (religious) "miracle" in the NT is a deliberate fabrication, i.e., a lie. In fact, as I've addressed in earlier chapters, all (religious) "miracles" are lies (or maybe at best, "misunderstanding"), since they violate natural justice.

And actually (as I'll illustrate in Yx) some of the clerics' Jesus' most famous "miracles" were simply restatements of "miracles" claimed much earlier by Ancient Egyptian priests. For example, of course the Egyptian sun god Ra could walk on water – anyone who has seen the reflection of the Sun on water knows that the Sun god (or the Son of God!) can walk on water! Also, the "miracle" of the "immaculate conception" of the "virgin mother" of the clerics' "Son of God", Jesus, is essentially the same as the Egyptian clerics' much earlier claim about the birth of their "Son of God", Horus, the son of the Egyptian god Osiris. In addition, the "miracle" of the clerics' Jesus bringing the dead Lazarus back to life is almost certainly derived from the Egyptian clerics' story about Horus raising Osiris (aka Asar) from the dead.¹

Even the "miracle" of the "resurrection from the dead" of the clerics' Jesus is the same as all the stories about the "resurrections" of all the Egyptian pharaohs (or "gods") for whom the pyramids were built, approximately 2500 years before the clerics' Jesus allegedly lived.²

"Miracle Births"

Similar silly stories about such "miracles" were well known throughout the ancient world. For example, for the case of the "miracle" of "immaculate conception" and "virgin birth", in his book *god is not Great – How Religion Poisons Everything*, Christopher Hitchens writes (about Mary finding herself pregnant courtesy the Holy Ghost):³

¹ See, for example, http://www.religioustolerance.org/chr_jcpa5.htm.

² Dear: For a huge list of comparisons between Christian and pre-existing Egyptian stories (including stories about alleged "miracles"), see the Appendix to Gerald Massey's *Ancient Egypt – The Light of the World*. This appendix is available at <http://www.theosophical.ca/AncientEgyptAppendix.htm>.

³ Twelve Hachette Book Group USA, New York.

Yes... and the Greek demigod Perseus was born when the god Jupiter visited the virgin Danaë as a shower of gold and got her with child. The god Buddha was born through an opening in his mother's flank. Catlicus the serpent-skirted caught a little ball of feathers from the sky and hid it in her bosom, and the Aztec god Huitzilopochtli was thus conceived. The virgin Nana took a pomegranate from the tree watered by the blood of the slain Agdestris, and laid it in her bosom, and gave birth to the god Attis. The virgin daughter of a Mongol king awoke one night and found herself bathed in a great light, which caused her to give birth to Genghis Khan. Krishna was born of the virgin Devaka. Horus was born of the virgin Isis. Mercury was born of the virgin Maia. Romulus was born of the virgin Rhea Sylvia.

In fact, similarities between the clerics' Jesus and the Buddha extend far beyond their both being born from virgins. As an illustration, consider the following quotation, taken from Chapter 18 of the book by Alvin Boyd Kuhn entitled *A Rebirth for Christianity*.⁴

First, let us offer a paragraph from Oliver Wendell Holmes' *Introduction* to the first edition of Sir Edwin Arnold's famous poetic account of the life of the Lord Buddha, *The Light of Asia*. Here is the paragraph.

If one were told that many centuries ago a celestial ray shone into the body of a sleeping woman, as it seemed to her in her dream; that thereupon the advent of a wondrous child was predicted by the soothsayers; that angels appeared at this child's birth; that merchants came from afar bearing gifts to him; that an ancient saint recognized the babe as divine and fell at his feet to worship him; that in his eighth year the child confounded his teachers with the amount of his knowledge, still showing them due reverence; that he grew up full of compassionate tenderness to all that lived and suffered; that to help his fellow-creatures he sacrificed every worldly prospect and enjoyment; that he went through the ordeal of a terrible temptation in which all the power of evil were let loose upon him, and came out conqueror of them all; that he preached holiness and practiced charity; that he gathered disciples and sent out apostles to spread his doctrine over many lands and peoples; that this "Helper of the World" could claim a more than earthly lineage and a life that dated long before Abraham was – of whom would he think the wonderful tale was told? Would he not say that this must be another version of the story of the One who came upon our earth in a Syrian village during the reign of Augustus Caesar and died by violence during the reign of Tiberius? What would he say if he were told that the narrative was between five and six centuries older than that of the Founder of Christianity? Such [i.e., the book being referenced] is the story of this person. Such is the date assigned to the personage of whom it is told. The religion he taught is reckoned by many to be the most widely prevalent of all beliefs.

⁴ Dear: I copied the quotation from the internet. It was from the first edition of Kuhn's book (published in about 1970). Now, I see that a second, paperback edition has been published by Quest Books, Wheaton, in 2005 – and the website from which I obtained the quotation seems to have disappeared.

It is startling enough that Holmes living in New England about the 1830s could draw this close parallel [between “the Buddha” and “the Christ” – and notice, Dear, that Holmes did it near the time and place that all the stories about all the “miracles” associated with the Book of Mormon were being fabricated by Sidney Rigdon and his accomplices, especially Joseph Smith, Jr.]. What seems more startling is that [Holmes’] words had little or no effect upon the prevailing climate of thought among Christians at that time.

What is perhaps even more “startling” is what was recently described by *New York Times* columnist Nicholas Kristof as follows:

Despite the lack of scientific or historical evidence, and despite the doubts of Biblical scholars, America is so pious that not only do 91 percent of Christians say they believe in the Virgin Birth, but so do an astonishing 47 percent of U.S. non-Christians.

The only way that I can begin to come to grips with such depressing statistics is to note how brainwashing can be so effective on so many children (e.g., such a large fraction of the children in Nazi Germany) and to remember that 50 percent of the people have below-average intelligence

Further, Dear, if you wonder how it could be that so much of the story about “the Buddha” is so similar to the story about “the Christ”, then consider some comments by Gerald Massey about the Essenes (who probably wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls, who probably trained John the Baptist, and who may have trained the “healer” known as Jesus the Nazarene). The following quotation is from Massey’s lecture Gnostic AND HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY, which was originally published in about 1900.⁵

Essenism was no new birth of Hindu Buddhism, brought to Alexandria about two centuries before our era; and Christianity, whether considered to be mystical or historical, was not derived from Buddhism at any time. They have some things in common, because there is a Beyond to both.

In his lecture THE “LOGIA OF THE LORD”,⁶ Massey goes on to describe other similarities and proposes that their common origin (the “Beyond to both”) was ancient Egypt; the following quotation is illustrative.

⁵ Available, e.g., at <http://www.theosophical.ca/GnosticChristianity.htm>.

⁶ Available at http://www.africawithin.com/massey/gml1_logia.htm.

And the third commandment according to Buddha is – “Commit no adultery, the law is broken by even looking at the wife of another man with lust in the mind.” Some of Buddha’s sayings are uttered in the same character as that of the canonical Christ. For example, when speaking of his departure, Buddha, like the Christ, promises to send the Paraclete, even the spirit of truth, who shall bear witness of him and lead his followers to the truth.

The Gnostic Horus [of Egypt, from more than 2,000 years earlier] says the same things in the same character, and these sayings, by whomsoever uttered, carry the mythical character with them. The sayings of Krishna [of India] as well as those of the Buddha are frequently identical with those of the Christ. “I am the letter A,” cries the one. “I am the Alpha and Omega...” exclaims the other. “I am the beginning, the middle, and the end,” says Krishna – “I am the Light, I am the Life, I am the Sacrifice.” Speaking of his disciples, he affirms that they dwell in him and he dwells in them... The attitude of the Sayer as the personal revealer, the veritable and visible image of the hidden God in the Gospels, is that of the mythical Horus...

But I’ll set-aside until Yx more illustrations of such similarities and their likely origin in ancient Egypt, thousands of years before Jesus allegedly lived, and move on to other topics related to the crazy concept of “miracles”.

One of these topics is that “The Gospel According to Mark”, which I’ll abbreviate to *Mark*, seems to include descriptions of more “miracles” (especially “miracle cures”) than do the other gospels (i.e., *Matthew*, *Luke*, and *John*). A possible explanation for this difference may be (for reasons I’ll suggest in Yx) that *Mark* may be making more reference to a historical Jesus (possibly Jesus ben Pandera) who may have been trained in the “magical arts” of the Egyptian priesthood, which included “miracle cures”. Thus, according to the Roman writer Celsus (writing in 178 CE), earlier writers claimed that Jesus was “born in adultery [i.e., not a ‘virgin’ birth] and nurtured in the wisdom of Egypt.”

“Miracle Cures”

Relative to the general concept of “miracle cures”, I should add that I have insufficient data to reach a conclusion about the efficacy of “faith healing” – but I wouldn’t be surprised if some medical problems caused or exacerbated by mental stress could be diminished or even eliminated by stress removal *via* “faith healing”. That is, if data support the concept that “faith” can heal, then I’d suspect that the real value would come from reducing the patient’s stress (or “anxiety level”).

Thus, if stress reduction is important, a relevant scientific investigation would be to determine the best way to reduce stress: to have the patient relax in the “knowledge” that there’s a giant Jabberwock in the sky who cares, or to proceed with more rational methods of reducing stress (such as hypnosis, meditation, medication, or similar). Besides, there’s the “placebo effect”: for some illnesses, ~1/3 of the people in a control group may report health improvements when they’re given only a sugar pill (a “placebo”), because for this illness, ~1/3 of the people would become sicker, ~1/3 would be stable, and ~1/3 were already on the road to recovery, with or without the “aid” of a placebo!

“Miraculous Speech”

Another topic, more relevant to the indoctrination of certain grandchildren, is the silliness about the “miracle” of “the power of utterance” (or the claimed ability to “speak in tongues”) – a “power” or “ability” that, as you’ve been taught, the Mormon “prophet” Brigham Young claimed to possess. As you unfortunately know, all Mormons are required to “believe” in such “miracles”, because #7 of the Mormon’s “Articles of Faith is (with italics added):

We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, [faith] healing, interpretation of tongues, and so forth.

And I wrote “unfortunately”, because certain poor grandchildren I happen to know were faced with the choice of either proclaiming “belief” in such nonsense or losing parental love. Pity the children – of all religious parents! Yet, I hope you realize, Dear, that such indoctrination is done “only” out of ignorance, and I hope that you, too, will do what you consider appropriate to try to diminish future molestations of children’s minds with such ignorance.

Meanwhile, though, in case you’ve ever wondered what’s meant by the above “Article of Faith”, then you may be pleased to learn that it’s described quite thoroughly in the NT, starting at *Acts 2, 2*:

... suddenly there came from the sky a noise like that of a strong driving wind, which filled the whole house where they [the now-twelve Apostles] were sitting. And there appeared to them tongues like flames of fire, dispersed among them and resting on each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to talk in other tongues, as the Spirit gave them power of utterance.

By the way, Dear, notice in the above quotation that the “Holy Spirit” descends on people in “**tongues like flames of fire**”, although *Matthew* 3, 17, *Mark* 1, 10, *Luke* 2, 22, and *John* 1, 32 claim that it descended on Jesus “**like a dove**”. In either case, for all those Christians (and Mormons) in this world who think that they’re “filled with the Holy Spirit”, unless they either had a dove descend on them [dove-droppings, alone, don’t count!] or had tongues of fire come rushing down on them with “**a noise like that of a strong driving wind**” [being burned by fire doesn’t count, because there’s no record that the tongues of fire from the Holy Spirit cause pain – at least initially], then such people apparently are filled with something else besides the Holy Spirit. But that aside for now, I’ll continue the quote from *Acts* 2.

Now there were living in Jerusalem devout Jews drawn from every nation under heaven [even Jews from the nations of the Aztecs and Incas?!] **and at this sound** [i.e., the Apostles “talking in tongues”] **the crowd gathered** [in the house?! It must have been a very big house! – or a very small “crowd”], **all bewildered because each one heard his own language spoken. They were amazed and in their astonishment exclaimed, “Why, they are all Galileans, are they not, these men who are speaking? How is it then that we hear them, each of us in his own native language?”** [So, Dear, “speaking in tongues” or “the power of utterance” is the ability to speak in another language, e.g., when “the spirit” moved him, Brigham Young claimed to be able to speak in the languages of various Native American tribes. As for why Galileans couldn’t speak in other languages, the author doesn’t mention.] **And they** [the foreigners] **were all amazed and perplexed, saying to one another, “What can this mean?” Others said contemptuously, “They have been drinking!”** [Although I didn’t know that a person could learn a foreign language by getting drunk! To think of all the time I wasted studying French and German, when all I needed was to...!]

But Peter [allegedly the first pope] **stood up with the Eleven** [was he still in the house with the “crowd”?] **raised his voice, and addressed them: “Fellow Jews, and all you who live in Jerusalem, mark this and give me a hearing** [he must have had a very good public address system to address “all you who live in Jerusalem”! Or were they all in the house?!]. **These men are not drunk, as you imagine; for it is only nine in the morning** [from which it seems to follow logically that, normally, it wasn’t until around noon that all the Apostles would be drunk!]. **No, this is what the prophet spoke of: ‘God says, “this will happen in the last days** [So, Dear, in case you ever wondered, it was ~2,000 years ago that the “last days” occurred]: **I will pour out upon everyone a portion of my spirit; and your sons and daughters shall prophesy, your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams” ...’** [From which I conclude either that Peter misjudged “the last days” or that sons and daughters still guess what will happen, young men still see visions (of young women!), and old men still dream dreams – as if we could dream anything else!] **“Men of Israel, listen to me: I speak of Jesus of Nazareth** [which actually should be “Jesus the Nazarene”, not “Jesus of Nazareth”] **a man singled out by God and made known to you through miracles, portents, and signs...”**

From which I conclude: since science has debunked all such “**miracles, portents, and signs**”, then obviously God didn’t reveal anything – not even his own existence!

But let me add, Dear, that beneath this silliness, there’s something going on, here, that’s actually quite serious – and sinister, and even seriously sinister. To show you details of what’s “going on”, however, would require that I take quite a detour from this “policy path” that I’m trying to stay on. Therefore, let me delay my showing you details until **Yx**, and here, try to give you just a glimpse of what’s “going on”.

A Glimpse at the Clerics’ Con Game

Promoting the “magical abilities” of their Jesus is part of the clerics’ con game, designed to gain the people’s “confidence” that their Jesus has “authority” (from God). Stated differently, all this silly magic stuff is part of the clerics “proof” that their Jesus is God’s son. Later, I’ll show you some details of their “proof” – and rest assured, Dear, that other parts of their “proof” (e.g., the alleged fulfillment of OT prophecies by the clerics’ Jesus) are equally fallacious as this part that relies on “magic”. For example, the claim that the clerics’ Jesus “fulfils” the OT prophecy that a prophet would be born from a virgin rests entirely on a translation error: in the original of the OT, the word is not “virgin” but “young girl”!

Anyway, you can see the essence of the clerics’ con game in the statement by Peter, quoted above:

I speak of Jesus of Nazareth, a man singled out by God and made known to you through miracles, portents, and signs...

Left unstated here (but as I’ll show you soon, it’s stated clearly elsewhere in the NT) is that, since Jesus has his “authority” from God (as “evidenced” by the “miracles, portents, and signs”) and since the clerics are the “official” spokesmen of their Jesus, therefore (claim the clerics), they have “authority” to proceed with their con game, gaining power over the people.

The task of “proving” that their Jesus had transferred to the new breed of clerics his authority (to forgive sins) was relatively easy for the clerics to accomplish. They dispensed with it (e.g., at *Matthew 16, 17*) by claiming that their Jesus created a church, of course to be administered by the clerics:

Then Jesus said: “Simon son of Jonah, you are favored indeed!... I say this to you: You are Peter, the Rock [which is actually a play on words, as in “petroglyph”!]; and on this rock I will build my church, and the powers of death shall never conquer it [i.e., the church will last forever]. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of Heaven [and the keys to enslave humanity]; what you forbid on earth [i.e., what you define to be ‘sins’] shall be [not only sins for your sheepish followers but also will be] forbidden in heaven; and what you allow on earth shall be allowed in heaven.”

How’s that for a power grab! The clerics assigned themselves not only the right to define what was good vs. evil on Earth but also in Heaven!

Perhaps later clerics saw that the claim to define the rules in Heaven was excessive. Thus, at *John 20, 22* (right near the end of the gospel that was written last, as if the clerics were adding an afterthought), they backed off a little. They have their Jesus state:

“If you forgive any man’s sins, they stand forgiven; if you pronounce them unforgiven, unforgiven they remain.”

That is, here the clerics claim “only” that their Jesus gave them authority to define and forgive sins on Earth.

On the other hand, the clerics’ task of showing the people that their Jesus had authority to forgive sins required more effort; i.e., more fabrications. A part of their method was to tell story after story about how their Jesus went about demonstrating his powers to cure illnesses and infirmities – even the infirmity of being dead! In turn, this ridiculousness rested on the crazy idea that illnesses and infirmities were caused by “sin”, even though “the father of modern medicine”, Hippocrates, had made a mockery of this idea ~500 years earlier. But such was (and, in many cases, still is) the ignorance of the people who were (and still are!) the clerics’ marks.

Now, Dear, I’m not going to review all such silly stories, but let me show you at least a few, so you’ll get at least a first impression of their silliness. For example, consider the following silliness that appears at *Mark 2*.

When after some days he [Jesus] returned to Capernaum, the news went round that he was at home; and such a crowd collected that the space in front of the door was not big enough to hold them. [Which suggests that the house must have been constructed rather strangely: shucks, the space in front of our front door is big enough to hold

everyone in the world!] And while he [Jesus] was proclaiming the message to them,⁷ a man was brought who was paralyzed. Four men were carrying him, but because of the crowd they could not get him near. So they opened up the roof over the place where Jesus was, and when they had broken through, they lowered the stretcher on which the paralyzed man was lying. When Jesus saw their faith, he said to the paralyzed man, “My son, your sins are forgiven.”

Now there were some lawyers [i.e., Jewish priests] sitting there [it isn't explained why they were permitted to sit in the house, while “true believers” couldn't even get in the door!], and they thought to themselves, “Why does the fellow [Jesus] talk like that? This is blasphemy! Who but God alone can forgive sins?” [It isn't revealed how the author of Mark knew what the Jewish priests were thinking, or if all of the priests had exactly the same thoughts!] Jesus knew in his own mind that this was what they were thinking [and the author even knew what Jesus was thinking!], and said to them: “Why do you harbor thoughts like that? Is it easier to say to this paralyzed man, ‘Your sins are forgiven’, or to say, ‘Stand up, take your bed, and walk’? [Well, actually, they're both easy to say! But, if you want my assessment, based on word-count and those tricky commas, it's actually easier to say ‘Your sins are forgiven’.] But to convince you that the Son of Man [and notice, Dear, that in this story, contained in what's generally accepted to be the first of the Gospels written, i.e., *Mark*, the clerics' Jesus allegedly said not “Son of God” (as later writers claim) but “Son of Man”, which seems to have been a fairly common expression at the time (similar to the claim of a modern teenager to be “the main man”) and seems to have literally meant “Son of Adam”] has the right on earth to forgive sins” – he turned to the paralyzed man – “I say to you, stand up, take your bed, and go home.” And he [the previously paralyzed fellow] got up, and at once took his stretcher and went out in full view of them all...

Dear, please temporarily suppress your understandable concern about the veracity of the story; instead, please think about the policy being advocated. How could any modern human accept (as “the word of God” or the word of anybody!) the crazy concept that paralysis is caused by somebody's “sins”? More likely the invalid broke his back, e.g., by falling after climbing up on somebody's roof! To say that people who are paralyzed (or blind or deaf or with other disabilities or infirmities) are “sinners” or “possessed by evil spirits” is so sick that it should be a punishable crime. Anyone who propagates such an idiotic policy should be punished; any judge who makes such a judgment should be impeached.

⁷ Dear: If you wonder what this “proclaiming the message” means, then notice the following, which appears at *Mark 1*, 14: “Jesus came into Galilee proclaiming the Gospel of God: ‘The time has come; the kingdom of God is upon you; repent, and believe the Gospel’.” And whereas no “Gospel” had yet been written, a little boy in the back asked “Whadya mean ‘the Gospel’?” Whereupon Jesus repeated the Gospel of God: “The time has come; the kingdom of God is upon you; repent, and believe the Gospel.” To which of course the little boy responded... Sorry, Dear, sometimes stupidity makes me even more sarcastic.

I didn't count the total number of claims in the NT that illnesses are caused by "sinning", but I expect there are at least a hundred of them. Another is at *Matthew 8, 16*, where we're told:

When evening fell, they brought to him [Jesus] many who were possessed by devils; and he drove the spirits out with a word and healed all who were sick, to fulfill the prophecy of [the raving idiot] Isaiah: "He took away our illnesses and lifted our diseases from us."

In fact, Dear, if you examine the string of reported "miracle cures" by the clerics' Jesus, you'll see that essentially all of them are by "casting out devils" from the afflicted people.

Surely you agree, Dear, that it's a horrible policy. It's horrible to suggest the policy (and then for priests to perpetuate it) that people are paralyzed (or deaf, or blind, or all the other ailments that the clerics' Jesus reportedly cured) because of their sins! As if being paralyzed or blind isn't bad enough, some fool states it was caused by the person being bad?! Blow it out your ear!

Maybe when this junk was written, more than 500 years after Hippocrates, some of the most uneducated people might have thought that this was so, but today, only a blithering idiot would add such a horrible insult to such terrible infirmities and disabilities. And to this day, children are required to profess (for fear of losing parental love!) such nonsense as: "We believe in the gift of tongues, prophecy, revelation, visions, [faith] healing..."?! Again: pity the poor children.

The clerics even went so far as to claim a similar capability for the person who (as I'll show you later) gave them the key to their new-version of the multi-thousand-year-old con game of defining and then forgiving sins, i.e., "Saint" Paul. For example at *Acts 19, 11* there is:

And through Paul, God worked singular miracles: when handkerchiefs and scarves which had been in contact with his [Paul's] skin were carried to the sick, they were rid of their diseases and the evil spirits came out of them.

Sometimes, the evil spirits even answered back (*Acts 19, 15*) – at least to "the wrong people" who tried to match Paul's stunts:

"Jesus I acknowledge, and I know about Paul, but who are you?"

All of which leads me to moan: save the world from the ignorance of the clerics! If you sin (if you disobey the clerics) than an evil spirit will paralyze you or give you leprosy or...? Surely no sane human could believe such idiocy!

But enough, for now, about alleged violation of “natural justice” (i.e., causality) *via* miracles. As near as I can guarantee you anything, Dear, I guarantee that they’re all lies. Just as God never killed all the Egyptian first-born, Jesus never performed any miracle cures; just as God never parted the Red Sea (or the Reed Sea either!), Jesus never walked on water, and just as God never dropped manna from heaven, Jesus never fed thousands with a few loaves of bread and a couple of fish (the constellation Pisces!). All are just silly stories, concocted by the clerics to con people into “believing” that they, the clerics, were representatives of powerful, supernatural forces – and, therefore, that the people would be well advised to compensate the con artists with whatever booty they demanded – or else! It’s stupid enough to drive me to more limericks:

*As for miracles done (so it’s said!)
Like feed thousands from two loaves of bread...
Well – such stuff they relate
Lead sane people to state:
“Nature’s justice got dumped on its head!”*

*Although Jesus cured some (if it’s true!)
Walked on water, stopped wind when it blew...
Well – I hate to be blunt,
But the occasional stunt...
Is that ALL he was able to do?*

*As for healings it’s claimed that he did
Cure the sick and the odd invalid,
But to say that the blame
Fell on sins of the lame
Is a crime that a god should forbid!*

*If he asked me I’d tell him instead
Of confusing the simpleton’s head:
Enough rhetoric!
Restrict all your tricks –
To help people before they are dead!*

*Do well – and in Heaven you'll thrive;
 If not – then in Hell you'll arrive;
 But as Ingersoll said
 Don't just do for the dead:
 Why not do stuff for those still alive?!*

*If he really could break all the rules,
 Why not leave us some practical tools?
 Like a virus that spread
 Only wellness not dread –
 And can smarten up born-again fools!*

*If he really possessed what it takes,
 If his magic surpassed that of snakes,
 Then to start: fix the Earth –
 Since tectonics give birth
 To volcanoes, tsunamis, and quakes!*

*And instead of promoting his way,
 There was certainly something to say:
 Not repeat some old rules
 Known to all (even fools) –
 Show us how to decode DNA!*

Sorry, Dear. But anyway, with my temper now toned down a bit, I'll try to move on. Thus, instead of my spending more time on the clerics' ridiculous claims that their gods can violate causality (i.e., natural justice), let me now turn to the stupidity in the NT dealing with:

PERSONAL JUSTICE

As I've described in the "J-chapters", Mother Nature also begins teaching each of us the essence of personal justice when we're infants – and continues teaching us throughout our lives. A baby in a crib who reaches for a toy, an infant who crawls toward a teddy bear, a toddler who staggers toward some object, a child who strives to accomplish some objective, a student who attempts to improve his or her grades, an adult who seeks a mate or a better job, and even old grandparents who try to help their grandchildren – all get pretty much what they deserve (and, we all hope, generally don't get what we don't deserve). That's the brilliance of personal justice as taught by Mother Nature, Dear, and in stark contrast, the concepts of personal justice advocated by the clerics' Jesus (i.e., by the clerics who wrote the NT) are mind boggling in their idiocy.

* Go to other chapters *via*

Unfortunately, though, I won't be able to "justify" that last statement quickly. Let me put it this way: it's extremely difficult to move forward rapidly when you're up to your knees in the mud and guck of "divine revelations" from some damnable "holy book". In what follows, I'll try to make a little progress, by getting at least one of my boots unstuck, but I won't be able to reach firm ground (justifying my claim that the concepts of personal justice advocated by the clerics' Jesus are mind boggling in their idiocy) until I've finished several more chapters.

In my plan to try to move forward, notice that I restricted my criticism to the Jesus promoted by the clerics (viz., "the clerics' Jesus"), because to determine the view of a historical Jesus (if one existed!) on personal justice (or, for that matter, his view on anything at all!) is extremely difficult – if not impossible. Now, however, at least we have the Gnostic gospels found in the desert at Nag Hammadi in 1945, and by comparing the two set of reports of what Jesus said (i.e., as reported in the NT by the Christian clerics *versus* as reported in the Gnostic gospels), maybe we can at least get a better idea of what a historical Jesus might have said – assuming there was such a person. In any event, what I plan to do in what follows is try to show you two examples of horribly corrupt policies in personal justice reportedly advocated by clerics' Jesus, and then for contrast, show you what the Gnostics say that their Jesus said about the same policies.

The "Sermon on the Mount" Given by the Clerics' Jesus

As an illustration of the horrible corruption of personal justice promoted by the clerics who wrote the NT, I'll start with what the clerics call the "Sermon on the Mount", which they allege was delivered by their Jesus. I focus on this Sermon, because many Christians (and Mormons – and even Muslims and atheists!) consider it to be the pinnacle of Jesus' teachings. Therefore, trying to understand Jesus by first focusing on the Sermon of the Mount is similar to trying to understand President Lincoln by first focusing on his Gettysburg Address.

Immediately, however, some problems appear, some of which are more annoying than serious. One of these annoying problems is that neither *Mark* (considered to be the first of the three synoptic gospels written) nor *John* (considered to be the last of the gospels written – and included in the NT) mentions the Sermon on the Mount!

* Go to other chapters *via*

Also, the first person to have “contributed” to the NT (viz., “Saint” Paul, in his letters or “epistles”) mentions neither the Sermon on the Mount nor any of its “messages”.

Further, there’s a suggestion in *Mark* that there should be no Sermon on the Mount, because at *Mark 4, 34* is the statement: “He [Jesus] never spoke to them [the people] except in parables.” If this were so, then Jesus couldn’t have delivered the Sermon on the Mount to the people, because as given in *Matthew* and *Luke*, it’s not a parable but a sermon. It’s as if one of Lincoln’s biographers wrote that all of Lincoln’s addresses were in the form of parables (or limericks or whatever); accepting that to be true, we would then be forced to conclude Lincoln couldn’t have delivered the Gettysburg address!

Anyway, as a minimum, one begins to wonder – and I, for one, become annoyed. I become more annoyed, because the two synoptic gospels that report on the Sermon on the Mount (i.e., in *Matthew* and *Luke*) give different descriptions of the manner of its delivery and its audience. Thus, *Matthew 5, 1* starts with

When he [Jesus] saw the crowds he went up the hill. There he took his seat, and when his disciples had gathered round him he began to address them...

In contrast, *Luke 6, 17* states:

He [Jesus] came down the hill [underlining added] with them [his twelve disciples] and took his stand on level ground. Then, turning to his disciples, he began to speak...

Hello? What’s it to be: the top or the bottom of the hill, and standing or sitting?!

More annoyance arises from something else in *Mark*. As I already wrote, *Mark* doesn’t include a Sermon on the Mount, but some of the parables contained in this Sermon (as given in *Matthew* and *Luke*) are contained in a set of parables in *Mark*, where one might have expected to find the Sermon on the Mount. For example, at *Mark 4, 21* there is: “Do you bring in the lamp to put it under the meal-tub or under the bed? Surely it is brought to be set on the lamp-stand.” Meanwhile at *Matthew 5, 14*, within the Sermon on the Mount, there is: “When a lamp is lit, it is not put under the meal-tub, but on the lamp-stand.”

Further, if one wonders about the delivery of this set of parables, one finds at *Mark 4*, 1:

On another occasion he [Jesus] began to teach by the lakeside. The crowd that gathered round him was so large that he had to get into a boat on the lake, and there he sat, with the whole crowd on the beach right down to the water's edge.

So, exactly where, how, and to whom did the clerics' Jesus deliver his "Gettysburg Address" (or "Sermon on the Mount" or "Lecture on the Level" or "Parables at the Beach"): sitting at the top of the hill and just to his disciples, standing at the bottom of the hill "on level ground" and to everyone present, or sitting in a boat in the lake and to "the whole crowd on the beach"? If authors of biographies of Lincoln who mentioned his Gettysburg address didn't agree on whether he delivered the speech to his cabinet or to a crowd, or whether he was sitting or standing, on level ground or on a platform (on in a boat!), then surely readers would be justifiably annoyed with the authors.

In the case of the Sermon on the Mount, I would partially agree with anyone who cynically asks: "Who cares?" Yet, although I'd agree that it doesn't really matter how and to whom the Sermon on the Mount was delivered, I would disagree with anyone who says "Who cares?" about accurate reporting, because (as I'll be showing you), as reported in *Matthew* and *Luke*, it's a thoroughly stupid sermon! In contrast, I would hope that those people who consider this sermon to be significant should start by demanding that they get a reliable copy of the text – whereas they can't get a reliable report even of where and how and to whom it was delivered!

More significant than those annoyances, however, are the discrepancies in the reports of what Jesus allegedly said. You can see this, Dear, by comparing the two versions of this Sermon, line-by-line, starting at *Matthew* 5, 3 and at *Luke* 6, 20. Here, though, I won't go through all of it in detail, because in this chapter, I want to focus on the personal injustices promoted.

At the outset, I'll admit that many of the sentences seem similar. For example, starting with the first line of the Sermon as given by each reporter, there is *Matthew's* "How blest are those who know their need of God; the kingdom of Heaven is theirs..." vs. *Luke's* "How blest are you who are in need; the kingdom of God is yours..." Nonetheless, Dear, notice that even

* Go to other chapters via

in this case of quite similar statements, they have different meanings: knowing (or thinking) that you're "in need" can be dramatically different from being "in need"!

Then, Dear, if you'll look into more details, you'll see whole sentences and even whole sections of the Sermon have either been added to one version or have been omitted from the other. Riiiiiiiiight.

In addition, notice that both versions of the Sermon on the Mount claim to give exact quotations (complete with quotation marks); that is, neither version is proposed to just suggest what Jesus said. Therefore, at least one of the reports is obviously wrong. Also, whereas many of the alleged statements by Jesus as given in *Matthew* are entirely omitted from *Luke*, therefore, at least one of the reports is obviously incomplete – or fabricated. If two biographers similarly garbled their reporting of Lincoln's Gettysburg address, and if getting an accurate report were important to you, surely you would distrust both reports, seek another, and compare.

A Similar Sermon Given by the Gnostics' Jesus

During the past 2,000-or-so years, comparing other versions of what Jesus might have said in some alleged "Sermon on the Mount" was impossible – at least, it was impossible for essentially everyone (for who knows what's available to "church scholars" with "special privileges" to examine otherwise "secret documents", normally "hidden away" within the Vatican or some other place). During 1945, however, two other versions (of what appear to be related to what's called "The Sermon on the Mount") were discovered. They were found buried in large earthenware jar in the upper-Egyptian desert near the town of Nag Hammadi. Now, courtesy the internet and the hard work by a lot of people (e.g., the translators!), these two versions been made available to essentially everyone.

Later, I'll comment more on this "Nag Hammadi Library"; if you want, you can explore the subject, now, on the internet; here, I'll focus on the information related to the "Sermon on the Mount", claimed by the Christian clerics to have been delivered by Jesus (while sitting at the top of a hill, or standing on a level area at the bottom of a hill, or while sitting in a boat on the lake). As I'll show you, the Gnostics who wrote the books that were buried at Nag Hammadi describe both a very different origin of this "Sermon" and substantially different content.

First, consider the Gnostics' claim about the origin of this "Sermon". The description appears most completely in *The Book of Thomas the Contender*, which starts as follows (as translated by John D. Turner and which you can find at many places on the internet).

The secret words that the savior [Jesus] spoke to Judas Thomas which I, even I, Mathaias, wrote down, while I was walking, listening to them speak with one another.

That is, Dear, with the above, we have still-another description of when and how "the Sermon" was delivered: this time, the claim is that it's derived from an otherwise private conversation between the Gnostics' Jesus and Judas Thomas, while they were walking.

As for who Judas Thomas was, the author of *The Book of Thomas the Contender* (i.e., Mathaias) states:

The savior [Jesus] said, "Brother Thomas while you have time in the world, listen to me, and I will reveal to you the things you have pondered in your mind... Now, since it has been said that you are my twin and true companion, examine yourself, and learn who you are, in what way you exist, and how you will come to be. Since you will be called my brother, it is not fitting that you be ignorant of yourself. And I know that you have understood, because you had already understood that I am the knowledge of the truth. So while you accompany me, although you are uncomprehending, you have (in fact) already come to know, and you will be called 'the one who knows himself'. For he who has not known himself has known nothing, but he who has known himself has at the same time already achieved knowledge about the depth of the all. So then, you, my brother Thomas, have beheld what is obscure to men, that is, what they ignorantly stumble against."

That alleged statement by Jesus seems to be a long-winded way to restate the first of the famous sayings, from about 600 BCE, of the Seven Sages of Ancient Greece, also known as the "Inscription of the Delphi Oracle", i.e., "Know thyself." Further, Dear, notice that the title of both this book, *The Book of Thomas the Contender*, and the book that I'll soon quote, namely, *The Gospel of Thomas*, both seem to refer to this same "Thomas" (i.e., the one whom Jesus called "Brother" and whom Jesus acknowledged that others described as "my twin and true companion").

Now, to compare the content of at least some of the "Sermon of the Mount", I'll "line up" the different versions as follows. If you will refer to your version of the NT, Dear, notice at *Mark 5* that the Sermon on the Mount starts with a series of nine statements that begin with "How blest are..." At

Luke 6, the Sermon starts with a similar series of “How blest are...” statements – but there are only four of them, not nine. Below, to start, I’ll “line up” these “blest are” statements from the NT with corresponding statements from the *Gospel of Thomas* (abbreviated, below, as *Thomas*) and from *The Book of Thomas the Contender* (identified below with the author’s name, *Mathaias*).

Matthew:

How blest are those who know their need of God; the kingdom of Heaven is theirs.
 How blest are the sorrowful; they shall find consolation.
 How blest are those of a gentle spirit; they shall have the earth for their possession.
 How blest are those who hunger and thirst to see right prevail; they shall be satisfied.
 How blest are those who show mercy; mercy shall be shown to them.
 How blest are those whose hearts are pure; they shall see God.
 How blest are the peacemakers; God shall call them his sons.
 How blest are those who have suffered persecution for the cause of right; the kingdom of Heaven is theirs.
 How blest you are, when you suffer insults and persecution and every kind of calumny for my sake. Accept it with gladness and exultation, for you have a rich reward in heaven; in the same way they persecuted the prophets before you.

Luke:

How blest are you who are in need; the kingdom of God is yours.
 How blest are you who now go hungry; your hunger shall be satisfied.
 How blest are you who weep now; you shall laugh.
 How blest you are when men hate you, when they outlaw you and insult you, and ban your very name as infamous, because of the Son of Man. On that day be glad and dance for joy; for assuredly you have a rich reward in heaven; in just the same way did their fathers treat the prophets.

Thomas:

Congratulations to the one who stands at the beginning: that one will know the end and will not taste death.
 Congratulations to the one who came into being before coming into being.
 Congratulations to those who are alone and chosen, for you will find the kingdom. For you have come from it, and you will return there again.
 Congratulations to the poor, for to you belongs Heaven’s kingdom.
 Congratulations to the person who has toiled and has found life.
 Congratulations to you when you are hated and persecuted; and no place will be found, wherever you have been persecuted.
 Congratulations to those who have been persecuted in their hearts: they are the ones who have truly come to know the Father.
 Congratulations to those who go hungry, so the stomach of the one in want may be filled.

Congratulations to those who know where the rebels are going to attack. [They] can get going, collect their imperial resources, and be prepared before the rebels arrive.

Mathaiias:

Blessed is the wise man who sought after the truth, and when he found it, he rested upon it forever and was unafraid of those who wanted to disturb him.

Blessed are you who have prior knowledge of the stumbling blocks and who flee alien things.

Blessed are you who are reviled and not esteemed on account of the love their lord has for them.

Blessed are you who weep and are oppressed by those without hope, for you will be released from every bondage.

And if, Dear, you are flabbergasted by the differences among these “sermons”, then welcome to the club! Imagine your reaction if you were presented with a similar scramble of statements each of which claimed to be Lincoln’s Gettysburg address!

If some of the statements in *Thomas* seem especially “weird”, Dear, then if you’ll check on the internet, you’ll see that the Gnostics’ Jesus was teaching the primitive (and weird!) ideas:

- “the good” is light, and “the bad” is dark,
- the good is “spirit” = light, and the bad is “body” or “mass” or dark,
- the “good god” is light, and the Jewish god (Yahweh or Jehovah) is the bad god (who delights in darkness and made mass),
- everyone has a portion of the original “light” (or the good god) in one’s “soul”,
- this light has been “glowing” since “the beginning” of time, and
- everyone should strive to suppress one’s bad (body), so that one’s own “light” can shine.

Whatever! And if you should wonder, Dear, which one of the above four sets of “sermons” might be nearest to what a historical Jesus (if there was one) might have actually said, personally I’d put my money (but not much of it!) on *Mathaiias*, for the following reasons.

As I'll try to show you in **Yx**, the clerics who wrote the synoptic gospels (such as *Matthew* and *Luke*) were pushing their own agenda, which especially included the clerics gaining power over the people – and their money! Therefore, I'm suspicious of anything that the clerics claim that their Jesus said. The Gnostics' Jesus, on the other hand, apparently said nothing about establishing a priesthood; therefore, generally I would trust the Gnostics' reports more than any report by any Christian clerics.

Further, I would tend to trust *Mathaias* more than *Thomas*, because Thomas was apparently in line to be the successor to the Gnostics' Jesus (if one can trust the statements in *Mathaias* that Jesus recognized Thomas as his “twin” and “true companion”); therefore, in his Gospel, Thomas might have been promoting his own “successor-ship” and “leadership” role. Mathaias, on the other hand, appears to have recognized himself as nothing but a reporter; therefore, his report may be the least biased. Besides, and revealing my own favorable bias toward a historical Jesus (who seems to have been a real “nut case” but seems to have meant well), I should admit that the above statements reported by Mathaias make the most sense to me!

Personal Injustices Promoted in the NT's “Sermon on the Mount”

But in any case, I'll continue. In case you've forgotten (!), in case you're “underwhelmed” by my appreciation of the fallacy of the equivalence of information (!), my goal was to comment on some of the idiotic notions of personal justice that are promoted in the New Testament (NT).

Some examples are available in the second part of the “Sermon on the Mount”, but in the NT, only as given in *Luke*. That is, there isn't a corresponding set of statement in the “Sermon on the Mount” as given in *Matthew*. Why that's so, I haven't a clue. After commenting on the personal injustices promoted in these statement from *Luke*, I'll show you and comment on “similar” statements allegedly made by the Gnostics' Jesus.

So now, Dear, consider the disconnects between causes and effects as well as the promotion of personal injustices revealed in the following quotations from *Luke 6, 24–26* (quoted here both from the King James Version of the Bible, quoted first, and then also from the New English Bible):

1. “Woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation” or “Alas for you who are rich; you have had your time of happiness.”

Dear: do you agree with that idea? I don't. Thus, although being rich is not a cause of happiness (making progress toward your goals provides survival signals known as happiness), probably even most children would agree neither with the suggestion that being rich is a normal cause of unhappiness nor with the suggestion that personal justice would be served if rich people were sad. On the other hand, probably most children would agree that there is some personal justice if people are sad who have made some stupid mistake, such as buying into an idea such as **“alas for you who are rich; you have had your time of happiness”!**

2. **“Woe unto you that are full! for ye shall hunger”** or **“Alas for you who are well-fed now; you shall go hungry.”**

What sort of silliness is this?! On the one hand, Dear, if you're well-fed, now, and if you enjoy eating when you're hungry (as most people do!), then the only way to regain this enjoyment is to become hungry – so why say “alas”? How about: **“Be of good cheer, for you'll be hungry again!”**? And on the other hand, who in his or her right mind would buy into either the idea that being well-fed is a normal cause of being hungry or the idea that personal justice would be served if people who are now well-fed will soon face starvation? Instead, how about: **“Congratulations to you who are well-fed through your own kind and honest accomplishments”**?

3. **“Woe unto you that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep”** or **“Alas for you who laugh now; you shall mourn and weep.”**

This is another crazy disconnect: granted that one can't know happiness without experiencing unhappiness, but why say **“alas”** to someone who is now happy? It depends on what the person is happy about. If someone is happy that they just discovered a cure for cancer, then to hell with anyone who says **“Alas for you who has discovered a cure for such a terrible disease.”** On the other hand, as a counter example, maybe sometimes it would be appropriate to say **“Alas for you who laugh now”**, e.g., if the person is happy because they “discovered Jesus”, for I would agree that **“you shall mourn and weep”** when you realize you've bought into one of the world's longest running, most deceptive, and most pervasive con games.

4. **“Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you!”** or **“Alas for you when all speak well of you...”**

I'll not even comment on the above statement, except to say that it's sick!

As a summary of this portion of this version of the “Sermon on the Mount”, Dear, I’ll just say: anyone who advocates such corruption of the concept of personal justice is mentally retarded, with mental development less than a modern two-year old – unless there were special circumstances that occasioned this Sermon. That is, Dear, there could be circumstances when the above apparent stupidities would be sensible. For example, if there were a group of rich, well-fed, happy-go-lucky people, of whom similar rich, well-fed, happy-go-lucky people spoke well, and all of them attained their wealth, etc., through dishonesty and abuse of others, then this portion of the “Sermon on the Mount” could have made sense, e.g., if Jesus was talking about any group of clerics! But if this was the case, then the reporter should have provided this “background information”; without it, this part of this version of the Sermon on the Mount exudes idiocy.

And though you’re not gonna like the next few paragraphs, Dear (I suspect that your response will be something similar to “**Nobody could be that sick!**”), let me briefly mention what the author of *Luke* seems to be doing (and similarly for the authors of the other NT gospels). And let me add that later, both in this **Qx** and in **Yx**, I’ll provide evidence to support the assessment that the clerics were, in fact, this “sick”.

To begin, I call your attention to an amazing statement (at least it’s amazing to me!) that appears on the first page of *Acts*, at *Acts 1*, 15:

It was during this time [when the then-eleven apostles had returned to Jerusalem] **that Peter stood up before the assembled brotherhood, about one hundred and twenty in all, and said...**

Disregarding what Peter might have said, Dear, look at what the passage says, perhaps not realizing it (!) – which I put in bold type. Can you imagine it?! After all the miracles that Jesus allegedly pulled off, including turning the sun off for three hours in midday (!), only “**about 120 in all**” had joined “**the brotherhood**”? Although I didn’t count them all, I expect that at least 120 people were claimed to have been cured by Jesus! Wouldn’t at least they have joined “the brotherhood”? Even for fools who “think” that (religious) “miracles” can occur, surely that one little phrase “**about 120 in all**” would make them extremely skeptical that Jesus had managed to pull off even a single, such “miracle”.

In addition (and I think it's significant), the phrase “**about 120 in all**”, if true, reveals that the policies promoted by any historical Jesus just “didn't have what it takes”. Whatever any historical Jesus might have taught, somehow his message didn't move the people. We were told in the synoptic gospels (e.g., in *Luke*) that he gave his sermons to thousands of people (e.g., the thousands who were fed by a few loaves and a couple of fish), that people swarmed around him wherever he stopped, and that crowds followed him, some shouting “**Hosanna!**” [“**an exclamation expressing adoration, praise, or joy**”]. If there were any truth to such claims, then surely more than “**about 120 in all**” would have belonged to “**the brotherhood**” after his death. So again, it suggests that Luke is lying, either in his gospel or in his *Acts*.

But meanwhile, there's something else that was going on. As I'll be showing you, it wasn't the historical Jesus (if he existed!) who created Christianity as we know it; it was “Saint” Paul – who (as I'll be showing you) undoubtedly and unfortunately was insane. He seems to have driven himself crazy by trying to answer the question: Why did Jesus, the “good light” (the Gnostics' Jesus) die? In one of Paul's delirious episodes (he was probably an epileptic), he concluded that God killed Jesus as a sacrifice to himself, to appease himself for bringing death into the world! Paul further concluded that anyone could gain eternal life simply by believing that Paul's speculations were right, i.e., that he (Paul) wasn't insane!

Surprising maybe even Paul, superstitious “losers” throughout the Roman Empire bought into Paul's crazy scheme – and maybe one can look back at the entire episode of human stupidity and say:

Why not? What did the losers have to lose? All the “uneducated masses” had to do was say that they believed in Paul's nonsense and, thereby, they were given “a cause to live for” (which gave meaning to their otherwise almost meaningless existence). In addition, besides being able to join a friendly group of other “believers” (who served good meals, and exuded ‘love’ – in many cases including “free love”, i.e., free sex), the ‘losers’ were promised eternal life in a paradise! That was a much better offer than those from competing religions: in those, one had to earn “eternal life” by being a good, just, honest, honorable person!

As a result, a new group of clerics (later to be called Christian clerics) saw the makings of great new con game. They wouldn't be able to collect much money from individual converts who were so poor, but adding together even a little from a lot could be profitable; in addition (as I'll show you later) a lot of rich widows joined – probably in search of some “love”.

* Go to other chapters *via*

In any case, the resulting breed of would-be clerics assembled various astrological tales, tales of other gods and sons of gods, and so on, together with parables and stories from the Jewish literature, plus maybe some sayings of a historical Jesus, to form what we call the NT gospels, all designed to “bolster” Paul’s crazy ideas. In turn, the resulting “propaganda pamphlets” (known as the NT gospels) were pitched at the crowd of losers (and rich widows) who had bought into Paul’s craziness. And thus all the “blessed are the losers” and “woe unto the winners” that appear in the fabricated “Sermon on the Mount” of the NT “gospels”.

The “Woe-unto-you” Sermon by the Gnostics’ Jesus

Sorry, Dear, but I warned you that the above would be hard to believe. As I already promised, later in this Qx (and in Yx), I’ll provide evidence to support the above assessment. For now and to end this chapter, I want to turn to the statements from the Gnostics’ “gospels” that seem to be similar (at least in format!) to the “**woe unto you**” statements in the “Sermon on the Mount” – and that I expect are closer to what any historical Jesus might have said (but were then corrupted by the Christian clerics). There are no similar statements in the *Gospel of Thomas*, but in *The Book of Thomas the Contender*, reported by Mathaiias, there is the following (as translated by John D. Turner):

Then the savior [the Gnostics’ Jesus] continued, saying, “Woe to you, godless ones, who have no hope, who rely on things that will not happen! Woe to you who hope in the flesh and in the prison that will perish! How long will you be oblivious? And how long will you suppose that the imperishables will perish too? Your hope is set upon the world, and your god is this life! You are corrupting your souls! Woe to you within the fire that burns in you, for it is insatiable! Woe to you because of the wheel that turns in your minds! Woe to you within the grip of the burning that is in you, for it will devour your flesh openly and rend your souls secretly, and prepare you for your companions! Woe to you, captives, for you are bound in caverns! You laugh! In mad laughter you rejoice! You neither realize your perdition, nor do you reflect on your circumstances, nor have you understood that you dwell in darkness and death! On the contrary, you are drunk with the fire and full of bitterness. Your mind is deranged on account of the burning that is in you, and sweet to you are the poison and the blows of your enemies! And the darkness rose for you like the light, for you surrendered your freedom for servitude! You darkened your hearts and surrendered your thoughts to folly, and you filled your thoughts with the smoke of the fire that is in you!...”

That is obviously a very different “woe-unto-you” sermon!

And again, Dear, in case the above “sermon” as reported by Mathaiias makes little sense to you, let me remind you about two points. The first is that in the above sermon, the Gnostics’ Jesus is teaching the essence of the Gnostics’ concepts (that “the good” was “the light” put in each person’s “soul” by the “good god”, and that “the bad” was “the dark” put there by the “evil one”, who drove people to respond to their animal instincts). And the second point that I want to make is that, although this Gnostic idea is crazy, it’s no crazier than ideas advocated in the Bible – and at least the Gnostics’ Jesus, in the above-quoted sermon, didn’t preach concepts conflicting with Nature’s teachings of personal justice!

Besides, Dear, think what could have happened. Imagine some lazy good-for-nothing who decided, 2,000-or-so years ago, that rather than go out and work for a living, he’d much sooner start up a new con game (a new religion). Imagine, further, that he had a copy of the above “sermon” as recorded by Mathaiias. Now, granted that this good-for-nothing would-be cleric would need to suppress all ideas from the Gnostics’ Jesus that clerics were totally irrelevant “middle men” (because if such ideas became general knowledge, the new con-game would be doomed!), but notice that the would-be cleric could have initiated his new religion just by “editing” what Mathaiias reported that Jesus said (similar to how the Christian clerics apparently edited whatever they were working from). For example, consider the following “editing” (done by me!):

Then the savior continued, saying, “Woe to you who rely on things that will not happen – such as life after death. How long will you be oblivious to reality? Set your hopes in the world; god is life; help your fellow humans live theirs. You are corrupting your souls! Woe to you because of the wheel that turns in your minds! Woe to you within the grip of the burning that is in you! Woe to you, captives, for you are bound in caverns! You laugh! In mad laughter you rejoice! You neither realize your perdition, nor do you reflect on your circumstances, nor have you understood that you dwell in darkness and death! On the contrary, you are drunk with the fire and full of bitterness. Your mind is deranged on account of the burning that is in you, and sweet to you are the poison and the blows of your enemies! And the darkness rose for you like the light, for you surrendered your freedom for servitude! You darkened your hearts and surrendered your thoughts to folly, and you filled your thoughts with the smoke of the fire that is in you!”

Shucks, he could have then even invented a “catchy name” for his new religion, such as “Humanism”!

Sorry, Dear: as you probably noticed, one of my reactions to stupidity (besides anger, released in limericks) is sarcasm. Another good “release valve” is getting some exercise. Any chance that you...