

Qx14 – Immoralities Promoted in the New Testament

Dear: Before showing you some of the immoralities promoted in the Bible's New Testament (NT), let me remind you of my opinion about the concept of morality by again quoting my summary from an earlier chapter (J2):

Because 'moral value' (as with any value) can be measured only relative to an objective and because our prime objective is to promote our trio of survival goals, the 'morality' of any act is simply a measure of how the act promotes our goals. And because using our brains as best we can is the best way to promote our trio of survival goals, then the act of highest moral value is: *test ideas with data and then decide and act as the data dictate.*

Thus, in my opinion the act of highest moral value (a +10 on a morality scale that runs from -10 to +10) is to apply the scientific method in our daily lives. More succinctly, Dear, I continue to encourage you to adopt the "personal moral code" that can be stated in the single word: **Evaluate!**

When it comes to interpersonal relations, then using my brain as best I can (i.e., acting morally!), I can deduce an "interpersonal moral code" that can also be stated in many different ways. Examples include the single-word summary by Confucius "**reciprocity**", Ayn Rand's imperative "**Give equal value for value received**", and my own version: "**Everyone has an equal right to claim one's own existence.**" Basically, all such statements recognize that there is value in behaving with other people at least as well as dolphins behave to one another! And the reason is obvious: given the wisdom in the common saying "**What goes around, comes around**", then you should do what you can to make sure that what you "send around" is the same as what you want to "come back around"!

In contrast to the above ideas about personal and interpersonal moralities (which I hope you consider to be trivially obvious), the NT promotes some stunning immoralities. In this chapter, I'll show you some of the NT's immoralities. For this presentation (which basically just lists and comments on examples of immoralities that I encountered in the NT), I first "flagged" the immoralities as I read the NT; so, they're generally listed in that order. Many times, however, I found later examples in the NT that were similar but even more egregious; so, I've used those later examples to illustrate. As a result, you'll probably find that I seem to jump around the NT quite a bit, but I hope you'll pay less attention to the ordering and more to the ideas.

Using Others Without Their Permission

To start, consider some idiotic ideas about interpersonal morality of the Christian god, himself! If you agree with the interpersonal moral code that **everyone has an equal right to claim one's own existence**, then I trust you agree that it's immoral for anyone (including any god!) to use people solely for his or her own benefit. Yet, the NT authors state that their god does.

To see what I mean, recall that, in the previous chapter, I showed you examples of how the clerical authors of the NT proposed that their Jesus could violate natural justice by performing “miracle cures”, thereby maintaining the ignorant and horrible policy that various infirmities and disabilities were caused by the sufferers’ “sins”. Maybe some clerics saw how horrible this idea was (maybe some who were ill!) and tried to modify it. In any event, a new concept appears in *John 9, 12* (which seems to be the last of the NT “gospels” written):

As he went on his way Jesus saw a man blind from his birth. His disciples put the question, “Rabbi [i.e., Jesus], who sinned, this man or his parents? Why was he born blind?” “It is not that this man or his parent sinned,” Jesus answered; “he was born blind so that God’s power might be displayed in curing him...”

But, Dear, is this (revised?) “explanation” (for why people are afflicted with infirmities and disabilities) any better than the original “explanation” (that the affliction was caused by sin)?

Please, Dear, think about the immorality associated with such an “explanation”. What sort of God would blind a person at birth, so his power could be displayed in curing the person?! And yet, that’s what the above junk from *John* is describing: it proposes that their immoral god uses people – even blinds them – so that “**God’s power might be displayed**” in curing them. It’s the same glory-to-god junk that was used to “justify” killing all the Egyptian first-born.

But using people for your own purpose, without their knowledge and approval, is immoral. So, clerics: blow it out your ears! If your damn god is so eager to display his powers, how about his curing blind children at birth, or eliminating starvation in the world, or eliminating all the ignorance and its evil in the world – starting with all clerics!

Promoting the Acceptance of Untested Ideas

Next, Dear, consider an example of personal immorality promoted in the NT. As I reviewed at the start of this chapter and as far as I'm concerned, the act of highest moral value (a +10 on a morality scale that runs from -10 to +10) is "always use your brain as best you can" or equivalently "apply the scientific method in your daily life". That means making sure all your hypotheses succinctly summarize a substantial quantity of data and that you never stop testing the predictions of your hypotheses.

For contrast, consider the absolutely atrocious idea promoted by the clerics' Jesus (at *Matthew 12, 39*, *Matthew 16, 4* and at *Luke 11, 29*):

"It's a wicked generation that seeks a test."

Dear: that's a horrible policy! As I've written before, please, PLEASE, PLEASE never adopt such an idiotic policy. If anybody but anybody ever tells you that it's "wicked" to test their ideas, then get away from that person as fast and as permanently as you can.

You can find similar horridness in the NT at *John 20, 29*. In the New English Bible it's:

Jesus said, "Because you have seen me you have found faith. Happy are they who never saw me and yet have found faith."

In the King James Version of the Bible, the same *John 20, 29* is:

"Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed."

As Gerald Massey wrote (in a reference to be given later):

Why, tyranny could devise no doctrine that could be turned to more fatal account!

Dear: you're not "blessed" if you believe what you haven't tested; much more likely is that you've been duped – or, in the vernacular, you've "been had"! The morality of "believing" what you have neither seen nor tested is definitely not +10; more likely it's in the range from zero to -10, with the exact value depending on how seriously your survival goals are hindered by the immorality of not using your brain as best you can.

Claiming that “Purity” is Subjective

As another example of immoral policies promoted in the NT, consider what (as I’ll try to show you in later chapters, the true founder of what we know as “Christianity”) “Saint” Paul wrote at *Romans 14*, 14:

I am absolutely convinced... that nothing is impure in itself; only, if a man considers a particular thing impure, then to him it is impure.

Really?! Water, air, food... aren’t “impure” unless you think they are? Unless you think so, it’s not “impure” to “believe” an idea without testing it? It’s not “impure” to violate another human’s right to exist? It’s not “impure” for Hitler and Stalin and Pol Pot to murder millions of people?

It’s impure “only if a man considers a particular thing impure”? If, during the past multi-thousands of years, clerics of various persuasion have ordered the torture and murder of millions of people because these “heretics”, “infidels”, or “unbelievers” had the audacity to think for themselves, if clerics of all colors have stimulated wars in which millions of people have died to protect the clerics’ con games, then provided the idiot clerics think it’s okay, it is? Somebody’s gotta be kidding – or is evil to the core.

Paul’s policy advocates both personal and interpersonal immoralities. It rejects the personal morality of relying on objective evaluations of data (e.g., that the median lethal dose of botulinum toxin is ~1 ng/kg), and it rejects the interpersonal morality of recognizing that everyone has an equal right to claim their own existence.

I suppose that, in the history of the world, something as idiotic as “nothing is impure in itself” has been advocated by someone, but by the founder of a religion? It’s even dumber than the idea that gods exist!

Dear: Can you imagine such a horrible statement residing in a “holy book”? Can you imagine that all Christian (and therefore Mormon) churches were founded by an idiot who was “absolutely convinced... that nothing is impure in itself”? Can you imagine that a society would promote a religion founded on such a “moral principle”?!

It’s mind-boggling! How could people buy into such idiocy – or when they were children, were they “just” brainwashed into “believing” such junk by similarly brainwashed adults?

Advocating that You Hate Yourself

As another example of immoral statements that the clerical authors of the NT attribute to their Jesus, consider the statement he allegedly made as given at *John 12, 25*:

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

Mind boggling! As I’ve written a couple of chapters ago (because similar junk was in *Matthew*), it’s one thing to teach a reasonable amount of humility (because braggarts can be a bore), but this is humility gone berserk: not only not to love oneself, but even to hate oneself! It’s crazy!

The famous and in many ways brilliant mathematician Blaise Pascal (1623–1662) used this idiocy to defend Christianity. He wrote:

No other religion has proposed to men to hate themselves. No other religion, then, can please those who hate themselves, and who seek a Being truly lovable.

Maybe so – but what about the assessment that people who hate themselves are bonkers! Dear, the immorality of hating oneself is right up there (or, better, “down there”, with a value close to -10), with the morality of “believing” rather than “evaluating”. In the limit, if you hated yourself enough, you would kill yourself! Anyone who promotes people hating themselves is bananas!

Dear, if you ever start hating yourself, please seek psychiatric help. If you know of people who hate themselves (and if it’s safe for you), then try to help them, for example, by encouraging them to see a psychiatrist – and by encouraging them to stay away from the damnable clerics!

Advocating that You Hate Life

But even the above idiocies only begin to reveal the astoundingly ignorant ideas about morality promoted by the damnable clerics who wrote the NT. Another example is at *1 John 2, 15*:

Do not set your hearts on the godless world or anything in it [such as sunsets, smiles of little children, strawberry milkshakes, and so on]. Anyone who loves the world is a stranger to the Father’s love. Everything the world affords, all that panders to the appetites or entices the eyes, all the glamour of its life, springs not from the Father but from the godless world.

It's almost inconceivable that anyone could promote such idiocy. No sane person could make such a statement! It drives me to another limerick:

*Though Jesus claimed he had the power
To make even wind and trees cower,
Still I kinda wonder,
With that kind of thunder,
Then why turn this sweet life so sour?!*

Rejecting Evaluations!!

As another example of NT stupidity, one that I already reviewed in the chapters on *Matthew*, consider again the following, from *Matthew 7, 1*, where some ignorant cleric put the following in the mouth of their Jesus, in his Sermon on the Mount, either in the more familiar King James Version

“Judge not, that ye be not judged”

or in the New English Bible

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

In either version, my summary assessment of such stupidity is: Gulp! What gigantic stupidity! As I've wrote before, Dear, please, Please, PLEASE never, Never, NEVER, NEVER follow such an idiotic idea – never engage in the immorality of not judging. That's what your brain is for!

Such idiocy is enough to drive me to still another limerick:

*Although Jesus judged others a lot,
Yet he told us, quite clearly, “judge not”;
But behind his cajole
I think was his goal
That we'd not judge his judgments as rot!*

Please, Dear, never engage in the immorality of hating yourself or in the immorality of not judging others: judge one person as a friend and another as a foe; judge one person as wise and another as a fool; and judge one person as generally good and another as generally evil – and act accordingly. Similarly, Dear, for all policies advocated by anyone (including those advocated by me!) – and especially including all policies advocated by any and all clerics – judge them!

* Go to other chapters via

Please, Dear, judge every sentence in this book, in any “holy book”, and in every book. Judge every statement ever made. If some idea seems reasonable to you, and if it’s convenient and seems valuable for you, then use it. But if it seems dumb, dump it! In particular, Dear, I hope you’ll judge the recommendations (by the ignorant clerics who wrote the NT) to hate yourself, to not judge others, and to accept ideas without testing them to be babblings of severely diseased minds.

Surrendering – to the Clerics!

And among all the hideous, immoral policies advocated by the clerics who wrote the NT, I hope you’ll judge, as one of worst, the horrible concept that people are to be “followers”, like sheep. This hideousness permeates not only all Christian sects (including Mormonism) but also all organized religions, including Judaism and Islam (which means “surrender”, to Allah). Their followers are to “have faith” in what the clerics’ say, to “believe” what their “holy books” state, and to “obey” the clerics’ god (for whom they just happen to be the spokesmen – and now take even checks and credit cards).

Now, Dear, I haven’t counted them all, but I expect that there are at least a hundred places in the Bible where this horrible policy is advocated. In later chapters I’ll show you more examples, but for now, I’ll show you just a few. For example, consider again *Matthew 10, 5*, where (when the work of converting people “to the way” became too great for him, “the crop is heavy, but laborers are scarce”) the clerics’ Jesus turns the job over to his disciples with the comment:

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

Later, in *John 10, 14*, the clerics propose to increase their “flock”, proposing to lead not just the “lost sheep” of Israel but to herd all humans as sheep, by having their Jesus say:

“I am the good shepherd; I know my own sheep and my sheep know me... But there are other sheep of mine, not belonging to this fold [of Israelites] whom I must bring in; and they too will listen to my voice. There will then be one flock [all humanity] and one shepherd [and no doubt just one priesthood!].”

Of course this is the same scheme used by all clerics: they don't want to conscript thinking humans; they want more sheep to be sheared, i.e., more paying customers in the pews.

And actually, Dear, it's quite revealing that the clerics chose to draw an analogy between sheep and their “**flock of followers**.” They didn't chose an analogy to goats, I suspect, because whenever you get a chance to learn about the behavior of goats, Dear, I think you'll be amazed: the damn things will not behave!

Stuck in my mind is a picture of one blasted goat that I confronted one summer when I was working as a land surveyor and living for a few weeks at a ranch. That goat seemed to love to stand on top of the doghouse, driving the dog crazy. Given half a chance and at the most undesirable time (e.g., at dawn) that damn goat would leap up on top of the doghouse (as if it was his personal mountain top), prance around on the rooftop, and bleat his head off. [They can be loud!] One Sunday morning I went out to chase him off the doghouse – and he tried to ram me!

In contrast, sheep have gotta be the dumbest, “skittiest” animals I've ever encountered. Always cowering together in a frightened mass and bleating their heads off (with a slightly higher pitch than a goat). When the goat would head towards them, they'd run away in fright. If the dog went out and told them which way to move, they'd do it – probably including running them over a cliff, if the dog so desired.

Anyway, drawing an analogy between people and sheep couldn't be more insulting to people – but I'm sorry to say, it fairly accurately portrays “true believers”. Paul summarizes such horridness well at *2 Corinthians 10, 6*:

...we compel every human thought to surrender in obedience to Christ.

That's absolutely stunning: for an adult, it's as sick a personal policy as has ever been proposed. I'm sorry to say it, Dear, but as far I'm concerned, anyone who advocates such idiocy, such immorality, is inhuman. If you know anyone who advocates such immorality, and if it's safe for you, then try to show him his error, try to get him some psychiatric help, but if he won't respond to your help, then do what you think is reasonable to get him into an asylum, so he won't harm others.

For children, it's different. All young animals (including young children) must “**surrender in obedience**” to their parents, because parents have more experience needed for successfully accomplishing the shared goal of their offspring's survival.

For example, Dear, when your mother yelled at you, “Stop!”, then you needed to stop, for otherwise, a car might have hit you. Similarly, if your father demanded your obedience, surely he did it for your benefit.

In contrast, Dear, see what the clerics are doing: they've put a fictitious “father figure” in their imagined heaven, whom you are to obey – but not for your benefit; for the benefit of the clerics! And not only are you to obey with your body, but with your mind: “**we compel every human thought to surrender to Christ**”!

That's the depth of immorality to which I wish no human would ever succumb. As M.M. Mangasarian wrote in his book *The Truth About Jesus* (which I referenced in an earlier chapter):

Judaism, [Islam], and Christianity have taken away from us the liberty to think for ourselves. Each one of these... religions makes unconditional obedience the price of the salvation it offers, but do you know what other word in the English language unconditional obedience is a synonym of? – Silence! A dumb world, a tongue-tied humanity alone can be saved! The good man is the man on his knees with his mouth in the dust. But silence is sterility! Silence is slavery! Think, then, of the character of a religion which makes free speech, free thought, a crime...

Dear, obedience in action is for children who need protection – or for prisoners – or for slaves. But obedience in thought isn't required even of prisoners; it's beneath even slavery; it's reserved for the most depraved human imaginable: the religious. They aren't just prisoners of the clerics' propaganda and slaves of their rituals, but sheep – either not able or, if able, not permitted to think for themselves.

Killing “Unbelievers”

Actually, Dear, it was only on good days that the clerics' Jesus described people as sheep. To show you what I mean (and to show you something else as well) consider a couple of the parables concocted by the clerics who wrote the NT (and, by the way, Dear, as you can determine by yourself if you'll dig on the internet, the clerical authors of the NT plagiarized – and “balderdized”! – most of their parables from available Jewish literature).

One of the parable that I'd have you consider is the story in *Mark 5* (and at the end of *Matthew 8*) about driving evil spirits either out of a single madman (*Mark 5, 1*) or out of two madmen (*Matthew 8, 28*), in either case into pigs, which then plunge into a lake and drown. As silly as that part of the story is, and as bad as it is (suggesting the people are insane because they possess "evil spirits"), the message of the end of the story is absolutely horrible. According to *Matthew 8, 34*:

Thereupon all the town came out to meet Jesus; and when they saw him they begged him to leave the district and go [how he could leave without going is a separate question, but I'll ignore it!].

Or, according to *Mark 5, 12*:

They came to Jesus and saw the madman who had been possessed by the legion of devils, sitting there clothed and in his right mind; and they were afraid. [Hello? Afraid?] The spectators told them how the madman had been cured and what had happened to the pigs. Then they begged Jesus to leave the district.

Now, Dear, I trust that your first reaction to the ending of that parable is something similar to: "Hello? Why were the people afraid? Why did they beg Jesus to leave?" If so, Dear, then maybe go for a walk to think about it, or sleep on it, and then it'll hit you – in all its horror. But if you don't want to take a break to think about it, then consider this: Of course this parable isn't a story about something that occurred. It's a parable of propaganda, promoting the Christian clerics' view of the Israelites and their priests. As I'll show you in *Yx*, when this parable was written, the Christian clerics were in the middle of a "turf war", trying to grab the field that would define whose con game was going to be played.

What this horrible little parable is saying is: those Israelites who refused to go along with the Christian clerics (i.e., who "begged Jesus to leave the district") were filled with evil spirits. And the Israelites were afraid (according to this propaganda from the Christian clerics), because the Israelites realized that Jesus would send them all over the cliffs to drown in the lake, just like he did to the pigs. Sick? Yes, Dear, extremely sick: those who followed the Christian clerics were good little sheep; those who didn't, were pigs who should be drowned.

And if Jews who wouldn't buy into the Christian clerics' con game were pigs to be drowned, then what about the non-Jews (i.e., the "Gentiles")? Well, Dear, according to the clerics' Jesus, we Gentiles are dogs. Thus, speaking to a "**a Gentile, a Phoenician of Syria by nationality**", who had asked for his help, the clerics have their Jesus say to her (*Mark 7, 27*):

"Let the children [of Israel] be satisfied first; it is not fair to take the children's bread and throw it to the dogs."

Clear enough Dear? The Jews who followed Jesus are good little sheep, the Jews who didn't are pigs, and the rest of us are dogs. Riiiiight.

Yet, as rotten as the message of that parable is, Dear, the NT provides even more rotten garbage: the damnable clerics aren't satisfied with having sheep and dogs for followers (but no pigs, please!), they want dumb animals. Sheep are already dumb enough, I suppose, but they want only dumb dogs.

Embracing Ignorance / Rejecting Knowledge

To see what I mean by that last remark, consider some of the following horrible stuff that the clerics put in the mouth of their Jesus. You can see a little of this horridness from statements such as the one at *Luke 10, 21*:

At that moment Jesus exulted in the Holy Spirit and said, "I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for hiding these things from the learned and wise, and revealing them to the simple. Yes, Father, such was thy choice."

But what isn't revealed by the above "revelation" is that it was written "after the fact": after Paul introduced his crazy ideas (showing people how easy it was for them to get a ticket to heaven – just tell the clerics that you believe their craziness!), uneducated people flocked to the scheme; subsequently, the above idiocy quoted from *Luke* was written, to congratulate the uneducated simpletons!

Similar is available directly from Paul, urging followers to reject knowledge (*Colossians 2, 8*):

Be on your guard; do not let your minds be captured by hollow and delusive speculations, based on traditions of man-made teaching and centered on the elemental spirits of the universe [or, as given in a footnote in the New English bible, "teachings... centered on the elements of the natural world, or elementary ideas belonging to this world"].

Dear: a single word to describe “**man-made teaching and centered on... the elements of the natural world**” is science! People are to reject science for the mysticism promoted by Paul? Shucks, who would have thought Paul would have promoted that!

I'm sorry, Dear, but it's really quite difficult for me to constrain either my anger or my cynicism. But really, Dear: how can people tolerate such astounding idiocy? It turns society upside down, having society led by idiots who deride intelligence.

No wonder Christian Europe plunged into its Dark Ages. No wonder the Islamic world still wallows in its Dark Ages. Both sets of clerics rejected the wisdom of the assessment by Socrates:

There is only one good, knowledge, and one evil, ignorance.

Promoting “Class Warfare” and Misrepresenting “Authority”

And actually, Dear, although it may be hard to imagine, it gets even worse. For one, the damnable clerics who wrote the NT promote “class warfare”. They set the poor against the rich, the uneducated against the educated, the dumb against the intelligent, consumers against producers – of course with the clerics on the side of the majority (poor, uneducated, dumb, consumers). And I must admit that there was a method in what otherwise seems to be clerical madness, because apparently they learned that the majority – the mob – did have political power, even in the Roman Empire, and the only thing that the clerics want more than more money is more power!

To show you what I mean, I'll first illustrate the clerics' awareness that the people had power. You can see it in the following exchange between Jesus and some Jewish priests, as given at *Mark 11, 27*:

They came once more to Jerusalem. And as he [Jesus] was walking in the temple court the chief priests, lawyers, and elders came to him and said, “by what authority are you acting like this? Who gave you authority to act in this way?” Jesus said to them “I have a question to ask you, too, and if you give me an answer, I will tell you by what authority I act. The baptism of John [the Baptist]: was it from God, or from men? Answer me.” This set them arguing among themselves: “What shall we say? If we say, ‘from God’, he will say, ‘Then why did you not believe him?’ Shall we say, ‘from men?’” – but **they were afraid of the people** [bold type added], for all held that John was in fact a prophet. So they answered, “We do not know.” And Jesus said to them, “Then neither will I tell you by what authority I act.”

Now, Dear, consider multiple idiocies in the above little story – and then, in the next subsection, I'll add remarks on the one perceptive statement.

There are three obvious idiocies in the above “parable”. The first is rather trite, namely, notice that the Jewish priests did answer the question posed by Jesus (by answering “**We do not know**”); so, Jesus obviously welched on his promise! A second idioy is the suggestion that anyone would need “**authority**” from someone to cure people of illness – I wonder if any cleric knows the difference between authority and competence! And a third idioy is to inquire if John the Baptist got “**authority**” from anyone but himself to “**forgive sins**”: John was the same as any schizophrenic who thought he could communicate with some giant Jabberwock in the sky!

Another group of idiocies buried more deeply in the above story relates to the question of how people “gain authority”. Thus, to gain power, the clerics misrepresented the concept of ‘authority’, similar to how some kooks pose as policemen, to try to gain something from the people they “arrest”. Such people are both liars and thieves.

In general, Dear, consider the following methods for “gaining authority”.

1. *Morally, by demonstrating leadership skills, bravery, knowledge, wisdom, and similar.* In general, this method is unavailable to all clerics!
2. *Immorally, by force.* At the time when the NT was written, at the beginning of Christianity, this method was unavailable to the clerics: they (similar to essentially all clerics!) were too cowardly. And yes, Dear, I agree: using force to gain authority is immoral, but it wasn't this immorality that stopped the clerics; it was their cowardice. When clerics have someone to do their fighting for them, again and again they've demonstrated that their moral standards doesn't stop them from grabbing authority; it's their cowardice that constrains them!
3. *Immorally, by duping simpletons and by skullduggery.* Now that's something that the clerics are skilled at! As I'll be showing you in later chapters in this **Qx** and in **Yx**, Paul accomplished the first step (duping simpletons), and it was then up to the clerics to build on Paul's gains, using even more skullduggery – by writing the gospels, in which they fist claim that Jesus got his authority i) by accomplishing miracles, ii) by being baptized by John the Baptist (giving him authority from God to forgive sins), and iii) by showing that their Jesus fulfilled a bunch of “prophecies” of the OT, and in which the clerics then claim that Jesus passed on “authority” to them!

Thus, in contrast to honorable, moral ways of gaining authority, the clerics who wrote the above parable suggest that some giant Jabberwock in the sky just passed out “authority” to them, e.g., to cure illnesses and infirmities, and of course, to forgive “sins”.

Preaching to the Losers – for Clerical Gain!

But then, beyond those idiocies in the above parable, there’s one perceptive statement: “**they [the priests] were afraid of the people**”. As you might expect, Dear, and as I’ll be showing you in **Yx**, it has always been that way: the clerics are afraid of the people. Then, see what the Christian clerics decided: afraid of the people, they pitched their con game to the (poor, uneducated, dumb, consuming) majority!

To see more about how the clerics tailored their message for the most uneducated, gullible, and superstitious people, consider again the Sermon on the Mount as given at *Luke 6, 20*:

“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...

“But alas for you who are rich; you have had your time of happiness;
 “Alas for you who are well-fed now; you shall go hungry.
 “Alas for you who laugh now; you shall mourn and weep.
 “Alas for you when all speak well of you...”

Although, no doubt, this sermon is well received by a crowd of losers (as I suggested in earlier **Qx**-chapters reviewing *Matthew*), it has to be one of the dumbest sermons ever committed to paper – and it promotes acts that are staggering in their immorality. In contrast, in the Gnostics’ gospel written by Mathaias (*The Book of Thomas the Contender*), Jesus reportedly said the opposite:

And the savior answered, saying, “Blessed is the wise man who sought after the truth...”

Dear, please spend some time considering what the damnable clerics who wrote the NT are trying to sell. Consider two groups of people. Imagine that one group (the majority!) is a bunch of losers: those who are receiving a continuous series of signals that they’re failing to achieve their survival goals (they’re “**in need**”, “**hungry**”, and “**weeping**”). Someone then comes along and “**blesse**s” them? Tells them they’re on the right track, that “**the**

kingdom of God” is theirs”? Why? Because of how they helped others? How? They haven’t been able even to look after themselves.

Now, consider the other group (the minority), a group of winners: “rich”, “well-fed”, “laughing”, those whom others “speak well of”. The clerics’ Jesus then says “Alas” to this group of winners – and threatens them with failures. Why? Because they are successful? These are the people who make the “ships and shoes and sealing wax” (and, I hope, made a profit doing it!), which the rest of us consume. They are the producers. Meanwhile, the weepers are the consumers whose wanton consumption has surpassed their own meager ability to produce.

So, the essence of the morality that the clerics’ Jesus preached in this Sermon on the Mount (but not that what the Gnostics’ Jesus preached!) is that the good guys – the successful and happy producers – are the bad guys, and meanwhile, the sloths of society are “blessed”! That’s crazy: totally bananas.

Please, Dear, never buy into this immorality. Of course, if it’s reasonable for you, don’t ignore the losers; if it’s reasonable for you, please consider ways that you might help them turn their lives around. But Dear, please never, NEVER, NEVER accept the morality that your achievements – and the achievements of others – are “sinful”.

Dear, to any and all clerics who tell you “Alas” for your successes, then you have your grandfather’s permission (for what it’s worth!) to tell them to blow it out their ears. It drives me to another limerick:

*Although Jesus kept blessing the losers
(All the needy, the weepers, and users),
I know bloody well
That it’s evil as hell
To say naught but “alas” for producers!*

Anyway, Dear, I hope you can see both some of the flaws and some of the attraction in this philosophy, which is at the heart of Christianity (and therefore of Mormonism). It’s flawed; it’s immoral (with a value on a morality scale of about –8) because it’s anti-life, describing failure as a blessing and success as a sin.

But I admit that the morality promoted in the NT is attractive to some people: both for those who fail and for at least some who succeed. Those who fail to achieve in this life are “awarded” (by a bunch of con-artist clerics) the “moral high ground” and the fanciful notion of eternal life in heaven; they also gain the potential to leech from those who succeed. Meanwhile, many who succeed are quite satisfied with the clerics preaching this horrid morality, because it can keep the losers in line – and probably at not too great a cost, provided that those who succeed take neither the morality nor the entire religion seriously (for if they did, it would lead to their ruin). And thus Napoleon’s sinister assessment of the Christian religion (equally applicable to Islam and Mormonism):

[It’s] excellent stuff for keeping common people quiet... Religion is what keeps the poor from murdering the rich.

Corrupting the Human Spirit

Meanwhile, though, such policies horribly corrupt the human spirit. As another example, consider the immorality – the ignorance – the evil – of the following statement by “Saint” Paul (*1 Corinthians 4, 7*):

Who makes you, my friend, so important? What do you possess that was not given you? If then you really received it all as a gift, why take the credit to yourself?

What an insult to human accomplishments! Think of how Aristotle, Beethoven, Copernicus, Darwin, Einstein, Edison, Epicurus... struggled and achieved – and the idiot (“Saint” Paul) asks, “What do you possess that was not given you... Why take the credit to yourself?” What utter garbage.

Dear: All life desires to succeed; those species that didn’t have this “spirit” were eliminated along evolution’s path. And yet, for the past almost 2,000 years, the damnable Christian clerics have preached a sermon of anti-life: failure is blessed, success is a sin; those who succeed are in debt to those who fail; those who succeed received their successes as gifts; those who fail have a sanctified claim on the products of the producers. It’s as horrible a concept as any that has ever polluted humanity.

Let me show you what Gerald Massey wrote about such idiocy (in his series of lectures, notes from which were assembled in ~1900, and which you can find on the internet).

“Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.” Do you call the teaching of that saying divine? I think it would be false and fraudulent if uttered by a voice from the Infinite with all heaven for its mouthpiece!

The poor in spirit are the accursed, the outcasts, and pariahs of the earth; those who sink into the squalor and crawl in the filthy dens of poverty, to become the natural victims of all its parasites of prey. The poor in spirit are the prematurely old men, weary, worn-out women, and wizened children, all bleaching into a ghastly white in the chilling shadow of daily want! The poor in spirit are those who crouch and offer their backs to the whip, who remain bowed just as they were bent, and allow their hands to be fettered and held fast in the attitude of prayer, when they ought to be up and striking. They who are content to crawl like caterpillars, and be trodden as caterpillars underfoot.

Poverty of spirit is the very devil; the source of half the evil extant; most of the meanness in human nature may be traced to poverty of spirit! It dwarfs the mental stature of men, makes them bow the neck, and creep and grovel for a little gain, or go down on all fours in the dirt, as beasts in human form, from lack of spirit enough to stand erect! The poor in spirit dare not think for themselves, or utter what they think! They only wonder what other folk will think! They who are only mere preliminary people that go monkeying round under the pretence of being women and men! In this world of struggle... the poor in spirit stand no chance, and find no place; there is no victory for those who fight no battle.

And as to heaven – do you really think heaven is a harbor of refuge for the poor in spirit and the area-sneaks of earth? The poor and needy, the hungry and suffering, are not the blessed, and no assumption of divine authority on the part of the sayer will ever make them so. These beatitudes are not divine revelations; they are only the false promises of the priests, who were the crafty founders of the faith, made comfortable to Roman rule.

Misrepresenting Wealth & Productivity

But let me leave that stupidity behind for now, and move on to still more immoralities promoted by the damnable clerics who wrote the NT. Yet, I'll try to quicken my pace, by briefly listing some additional examples.

- “The love of money is the root of all evil things...” (*1 Timothy 6, 10*). As I've addressed in an earlier chapter (N), this idiocy reveals a total misunderstanding both of why people seek money and what money represents, namely, the best in any society: productivity, mutual benefits, and trust.
- “So I say to you, use your worldly wealth to win friends for yourselves, so that when money is a thing of the past, you may be received into an eternal home.” (*Luke 16, 9*). What total rot! The clerics who promote such junk obviously have no idea about either money or friends. Is it that the only “friends” the clerics have are those who

can be bought?! Surely no one is so dumb as to think that “friendship” bought with money is worth a damn.

- “What sets itself up to be admired by men is detestable in the sight of God.” (*Luke 16, 15*). What total craziness! Dear: consider some things “set up” that are admired by men: our government, our legal system, our great universities, and so on. These are “detestable in the sight of God”? What were the crazy clerics who wrote this junk smoking?
- “When you have carried out all your orders, you should say, ‘We are servants and deserve no credit; we have only done our duty.’” (*Luke 17, 9*). The damnable clerics don’t want humans in their pews, they want automatons, devoid of human spirit, behaving like good-little Nazis, saying “we have only done our duty”.
- “No servant can be the slave of two masters; for either he will hate the first and love the second, or he will be devoted to the first and think nothing of the second. You cannot serve God and Money.” (*Matthew 6, 24*). As I already wrote in **Qx11**, it’s hard to imagine how anyone’s mind could be so warped as to write such rubbish. Why does the author think in terms of “servants” and “slaves”? Who in hell (or anywhere else) wants to be a servant or slave of anybody, including God? How in hell can a person be a servant or slave to money? Where did the author get the crazy idea that anybody “serves” money?! Some people may be “slaves” to excessive security or to desires that can be purchased by money (possibly because of childhood depravities), but even this extreme is not “serving money”: people save money for how it can subsequently serve its owner. As for how anyone can be a slave to some imagined giant Jabberwock in the sky – apparently people can, if they foolishly buy into the clerics’ con game.

As I also already wrote in **Qx11** (going through *Matthew*), separating people from what their money is, of course, the essence of all con games. But the Christian clerics added an astounding new twist to their con game: convince the marks that what they owned was evil!

Pity the poor people who had yielded their ability to judge such rot as is reported at *Matthew 19, 22*:

“If you wish to go the whole way [that is, if you would do everything needed to pretend that you’ll get eternal life, then besides obeying the clerics’ commandments], go, sell your possessions, and give to the poor, and then you will have riches in heaven; and come, follow me.” When the young man heard this, he went away with a heavy heart; for he was a man of great wealth.

The clerics’ Jesus then turned to his disciples and reportedly said:

“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.”¹

What hideousness! Dear: if people earn money honestly, their wealth reflects their society’s judgment of the contribution they make to the society’s welfare. The clerics claim that wealth reflects immorality is, itself, immoral as their hell!

And yes, Dear, I grant you that our society, in particular, displays many cases of poor judgment of the contributions of its members. The two richest people in this country (Bill Gates and Warren Buffet) have contributed much, but (in my judgment) not sufficient to justify their wealth. Similarly, the amount of money earned by movie “stars”, sports “heroes”, and many lawyers sickens me – especially when I compare it to the amount that our society pays our teachers, police, members of our military, and many others, including scientists. Trying to correct such poor judgments is an enormous and continuous task – and about the only advice I can give you, Dear (should you ever choose to undertake the task of trying to correct “the system”) is what I’ve written before: if in doubt, let the system go free.

On the other hand, there are also many cases in which people gain substantial wealth by selling some worthless (or, in the case of the clerics, worse than worthless) confidence scheme, but these 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 idiotic (similar to the stupidity that producers are evil) that it reflects a morality too gross even to flush down a toilet. It drives me to still another limerick.

*A question continues to lurk,
That’s basic and not just a quirk:
From the text that I’ve read,
Summing all that he said,
Was Jesus just simply a jerk?*

¹ Incidentally, Dear, in case I didn’t mention it before, recently on a TV program I heard an explanation for this business about a camel going through the eye of a needle. Apparently it was common for there be to relatively small openings, called “eyes of a needle”, in the walls around ancient towns. These openings were large enough for people to go through, but to thwart looters (and maybe warriors), not large enough to permit a loaded camel to pass.

Preaching Pacifism and Promoting Division

And yes, Dear, I dearly wish that the immorality, the ignorance, the evils in the NT would stop, but they just keep coming. As additional examples, consider the following illustrations, which show that the clerics' Jesus (i.e., in reality, the clerics who concocted this junk) had very limited intellectual capabilities.

Thus, on the one hand, the NT has Jesus preaching (e.g., *Matthew 5, 9*):

“How blest are the peacemakers; God shall call them his sons.”

Okay – in fact, good! So then (since these clerics claim that their Jesus was not only a son of God but even the son of God), let's assume that their Jesus is one of the peacemakers.

But then, on the other hand, look what the clerics have him preach, e.g., at *Luke 6, 28*:

“Love your enemies; do good to those who hate you; bless those who curse you; pray for those who treat you spitefully. When a man hits you on the cheek, offer him the other cheek too; when a man takes your coat, let him have your shirt as well. Give to everyone who asks you; when a man takes what is yours, do not demand it back...”

What idiocy! Such a (pacifist) policy doesn't lead to peace, it leads to war. For example, after Hitler was allowed to overrun Czechoslovakia, he proceeded to take Poland and France as well.

Dear, please don't buy such junk: to preach passivism is to promote war. What's being promoted is “surrender to tyranny” – and of course, the biggest tyrant imaginable is the clerics' imagined God. But, Dear, please never do surrender to tyranny: it has never worked, and it never will.

And yes, Dear, I know that Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. made progress using “Satyagraha” and “passive resistance”, respectively, but as I tried to show you in **P10**, such methods of fighting evil can be effective only under special circumstances, namely, by tapping into some “moral outrage” of a majority of the people, who are thereby led to realize that an injustice should and could be corrected. Thus, the method used by Gandhi and King was to tap into “people power”.

But if there's no "moral majority" that can be moved to pressure politicians (e.g., no "moral majority" could influence a Hitler or a Stalin simply by showing them the evil of their ways, no "moral majority" would have granted this country its independence, and for thousands of years, no "moral majority" was available to influence the practice of slavery), then passivism wouldn't and never will work.

And though I've described it before, let me mention it again. The ignorance, the evil, is the initiation of violence. Whoever initiates violence (a rattlesnake, a cougar, a human, a Hitler) is saying, in effect:

No – I'm not gonna rely on what makes me human; instead, I'm gonna behave like an animal. Never mind my mind; I'm gonna rely on muscle.

As soon as anyone confronts you with such an attitude (e.g., by stealing your coat, your money, your car, or your child...), then, Dear, identify that person as evil – and plan not to "turn the other cheek" or let him kidnap your other child or whatever other stupidity the clerics promote. Instead, plan on defeating him. As for the method to defeat him, there's only one general principle to apply: use your brain as best you can (i.e., be moral!), which of course includes protecting yourself as best you can. I won't repeat details, but repeat just the advice: rely on the police as much as possible – and rely on the damnable clerics as little as possible!

Again, Dear, please don't buy into the idiocy of passivism – unless you see the potential for tapping into "people power". In general, fight evil as best you can: by educating ignorant people if possible (as did Gandhi and King), but if necessary, then by force – and if possible, of course use force approved by your society (such as the police or the military).

Also, of course you should yield to a thief who threatens you, but do so only to protect yourself: as soon as he's gone and you're safe, call the police. Again, do what is reasonable to stop such evil people: if they are permitted to prosper, to grow in strength, the ultimate is another Hitler – and then another war caused by temporary "appeasement" of the thieves and brutes of this world.

Further, Dear, even if you could, please don't "love" such enemies (enemies of rational humans). Using your brain as best you can, work toward their downfall – not only for your own benefit, but to benefit all rational humans.

As a specific illustration, maybe you can do your part to undermine this horrible immorality of loving one's enemies promoted by the idiotic clerics who wrote the NT

In fact, the clerics who wrote the NT add still another twist of craziness into their immorality. Thus (as I showed you above) in *Matthew 5, 9*, first we find: “**How blest are the peacemakers; God shall call them his sons**”. Well, then, since Jesus claimed that God called him his son, then it would seem reasonable that Jesus was a peacemaker – even “**the prince of peace**”?

But that assumes that readers of the Gospel are permitted to apply reason (!), for in *Matthew 10, 34*, Jesus reportedly said:

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

In fact, the clerics have their Jesus promote division not only within families but also throughout the world. Thus, at *Luke 12, 49* the clerics have their Jesus proclaim:

“I have come to set fire to the earth, and how I wish it were already kindled! I have a baptism to undergo, and what constraint I am under until the ordeal is over! Do you suppose I came to establish peace on earth? No indeed, I have come to bring division...”

And indeed he did: his passivism promoted the Hitlers of the world, and his idiotic ideas split families apart – which drives me to even more limericks.

*Although Jesus said those, all alone,
Without sin were to cast the first stone;
His reasoning's sad:
To not punish bad
Is the way still more evil is sown!*

*Although Christ claimed that he was all heart
Filled with love, which he'd love to impart,
I say it's untrue:
The worst thing to do
Is to work to break families apart!*

*Although Jesus preached pacifist lore
(That to those who would take you give more),
He was no “Prince of Peace”,
Since it never would cease:
Because yielding to tyrants breeds war!*

Promoting Hypocrisy

The NT is loaded with hypocrisy, but here, I'll show you just four examples. For the first example, remember that the clerics' Jesus maintained that the Commandments of Moses were still in full force. For example, at *Matthew 5, 17*, the clerics' Jesus is reported to have said:

“Do not suppose that I have come to abolish the Law... [of Moses]; I did not come to abolish, but to complete. I tell you this: so long as heaven and earth endure, not a letter, not a stroke, will disappear from the Law...”

Therefore, Commandment #5 (to honor one's father and mother) is allegedly still in full-force. But then, Dear, look at how the clerics' Jesus treated his own mother, as reported at *Mark 3, 31*:

Then his mother and his brothers arrived, and remaining outside sent in a message asking him [Jesus] to come out to them. A crowd was sitting round and word was brought to him: “Your mother and your brothers are outside asking for you.” He replied, “Who is my mother? Who are my brothers?” And looking round at those who were sitting in the circle about him he said, “Here are my mother and my brothers. Whoever does the will of God is my brother, my sister, my mother.”

Not only is that horrible, it's hypocrisy. It's disgraceful that he refused to go out to see his mother when she requested that he do so, but it's horrible that he publicly disowned her. But what I would have you notice, Dear, is that previously he had said that Commandment #5 was still in full-force, and yet here, he dishonored his mother. That, Dear, is an example of hypocrisy, preaching “do as I say; not as I do.”

In my second example, the clerics' Jesus combines hypocrisy with stupidity. At *Matthew 8, 22* and again at *Luke 9, 60*, a would-be follower of Jesus said “**Lord, let me go and bury my father first**”, to which the clerics have their Jesus reply: “**Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their own dead.**”

Think of it, Dear: someone planned to honor his father by burying him, and rather than commend the person for obeying the commandment to honor his

father, the clerics' Jesus advises the person to commit the ultimate dishonor by not giving his father even a decent burial.² That, Dear, is not only hypocrisy, it's dumb enough to drive me to another limerick:

*Although Jesus reportedly said
That the dead were to bury their dead;
Just think of that well,
The disease and the smell,
He must have had rocks in his head!*

For a third example of the hypocrisy promoted by the clerics' Jesus, first recall that he allegedly advocated that we were to love our enemies. Yet, illustrating his hypocrisy, look at how the clerics' Jesus reportedly recommended that his enemies be treated. One illustration is at the end of the parable that starts at *Luke 19, 11*, which ends with the king (meant to be either Jesus or God) saying:

“As for those enemies of mine who do not want me for their king, bring them here and slaughter them in my presence.”

Pity the poor Christians (and Mormons): by yielding their minds and their ability to judge, how are they able to decide which message to follow? Are the people to love their enemies or slaughter them?

And for my fourth and final example of his hypocrisy, consider the insults that the clerics' Jesus heaped on his “enemies”, as given (for example) at *Matthew 23, 15*:

“Alas for you, lawyers and Pharisees, hypocrites! You travel over sea and land to win one convert; and when you have won him, you make him twice as fit for hell as you are yourselves... You snakes, you viper's brood, how can you escape being condemned to hell?”

² Incidentally, Dear, if you wonder (along with essentially everyone who's read the above) what the devil “leave the dead to bury their dead” means, then let me add that I expect it's the clerical authors' method of repeating what Paul wrote at *1 Corinthians 7, 29*:

What I mean, my friends, is this. The time we live in will not last long. While it lasts, married men should be as if they had no wives; mourners should be as if they had nothing to grieve them...

That is, I expect that this is one of many cases where the clerical authors attributed to Jesus the teachings that actually originated from Paul; in turn, Paul's teachings reflect his crazy idea (which I expect originated with him, not with any historical Jesus) that the world was about to end – and therefore, there was no point in burying the dead!

Now, Dear, please consider the question, given immediately above, posed by the clerics' Jesus, about how to “**escape being condemned to hell**”. How could his enemies (the “lawyers and Pharisees”) have escaped “being condemned to hell”? Do you see it?

I suppose the answer is obvious: all that was necessary was for Jesus to practice what he preached, i.e., to forgive his enemies: to love his enemies! And the hypocrite Jesus called them hypocrites”?! Riiiiiiight. It's enough to drive me to more limericks.

*Though Jesus was quite definite:
“Be kind” to be God’s favorite;
But rather than kind,
With hate in his mind,
The hypocrite yelled “hypocrite”!*

*Though Jesus would frequently tell
“Treat all of your enemies well,”
Yet what did he do
To those that he knew?
He killed them – then burnt them in Hell!*

*Although Jesus condemned all of them,
He reserved for himself a pure gem:
By calling them vipers
And evil and gripers,
Do you see whom his words did condemn?!*

Advocating Double-Binds

There are a huge number of examples in this category of the clerics' craziness. I'll show you as many as I can stomach. For the first, remember that the clerics' Jesus warned his followers that the Commandments of Moses were still in full-force. Therefore, Dear, not only must we continue to sell our daughters into slavery and beat our slaves to death in the manner allegedly prescribed by Moses, but also, certainly we're to continue to follow Commandment #5, i.e., honor our parents. But then, Dear, look at what the clerics' Jesus allegedly said at *Luke 14, 26*:

“If anyone comes to me and does not hate his father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters, even his own life, he cannot be a disciple of mine.”

Again: pity the poor people. This time, though, pity them because, in their foolishness to try to obey, the words of the clerics' Jesus trap them in a double bind: they are to love their father and mother, but they are to hate their father and mother. They'll need to pay their clerics plenty to show them how to get out of that double bind!

But even if the poor Christian (and Mormon) sheep come up with sufficient cash for their clerics to release them from that double-bind, there's plenty more where that one came from. For example, there's Matthews' report that the clerics' Jesus said:

“Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted.”

Now, Dear, although I'm glad to see that the crazy cleric who wrote this junk was at least aware of the interconnectedness of opposites, yet simultaneously, I'm appalled that the author didn't see that this sort of garbage would twist followers into a terrible double-bind: given this concept of humility, no one could possibly become humble – becoming “humble” to be “exalted” is not only hypocrisy, it can't be done! Of course, maybe the cleric saw it clearly – as another cash cow!

As another example of the many double-binds into which the clerics' Jesus places his victims, consider again *Luke 14, 26*:

“If anyone come to me and does not hate his father and mother, wife and children, brothers and sisters, even his own life, he cannot be a disciple of mine.”

Dear, please think about the above quotation in context with the other idiocy preached by the clerics' Jesus: he commands people to love others as they love themselves, and yet in the above, he tells people to hate their families and themselves – and therefore, perforce, hate everyone! The poor fools who follow the clerics' Jesus are then driven into another double-bind: first, they're told that, to get into heaven, then “love thy neighbor as thyself”, and now, they're told that the way to get into heaven is to hate themselves. So then what: hate thy neighbor as thyself? But that means... It's crazy!

The Combined Hypocrisy & Double-Bind of “Christian Charity”

Sorry for the subtitle, Dear, but the fools who wrote the NT just keep digging themselves into a deeper pit of idiocy. To illustrate what I mean, consider *Mark 10, 39*:

Jesus said, “I tell you this: there is no one who has given up home, brothers or sisters, mother, father, or children, or land, for my sake and for the Gospel, who will not receive in this age [that is, the end of the world was at hand] a hundred times as much – houses, brothers and sisters, mothers and children, and land...”

Ignoring the idiocy of how anyone would have hundreds of mothers, consider now the similar idiocy in *Matthew*, for example,

“Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth... But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven... If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasures in heaven.”

What I would have you do now, Dear, is consider what the clerics are having their Jesus preach as “Christian charity”: not generosity but greed! Not to help other humans simply from “the goodness of their hearts” (“Christian charity”!), but give to others so that the givers will get the biggest prize of all (“**treasurers in heaven**”). So, the “Christian thing” to do isn’t to give; it’s to get! Give a little, to get a lot more back!

The Christian-claim that this is generosity is not only hypocrisy, it forces followers into another double-bind. And actually, it’s a wonder that the Christian (and Mormon) clerics can keep a straight face preaching this stuff. From one side of their face they preach “**it’s better to give than receive.**” Then, from the other side, they preach that the reason to give (a little) is to get a huge reward, i.e., eternal life! As a result, the poor Christian (and Mormon) followers (trying hard to suppress a natural inclination to think!) are caught in another double-bind: to give in order to get (a lot more!) is not giving – it’s as close as possible to robbery without going to jail! But if the Christians don’t give, then the purpose of joining the group (eternal life) is thwarted. So that means – another double bind! Perhaps one can see why the Christian (and Mormon) clerics want their followers “to believe” rather than “to think”: surely anyone who has even the most meager capabilities of thinking would see through this craziness!

If you think about it some, Dear, I expect you’ll see that “Christian charity” is not only cheap and insincere but also down-right dishonest. Give up a few cans of food or some old clothes, not only without any sincere concern for those in need, but out of greed for the return on this “charity”.

For contrast, Dear, think of Humanists who spend a lifetime of the most intense effort imaginable to develop a new vaccine, a new machine, some stunning poetry, or a better philosophy – or who give up their lives to defend freedom for the rest of us. How could clerics be so evil, so dumb, as to preach such crap?!

Anyone is similarly bananas who doesn't see that the reason for showing "love" to one's neighbor is simply "[what goes around comes around](#)". The golden rule isn't some golden key that'll get a person into some dream world after death, it's just a reasonable way to get along with others in this real world. Pity the poor Christians and Mormons who can't think for themselves and try to follow the teachings of the clerics' Jesus!

I'm sorry, Dear, but I really can't (or don't want to) take any more of this crap. Instead, I'm gonna do two things.

One is to vent some of my anger with some more limericks:

*Although Jesus is rarely faulted,
How I wish that his sayings were halted:
A kid older than three
Should be able to see
HUMILITY can't strive for EXALTED!*

*Although Christ threatened sinners with Hell,
There is something he never did tell:
Since we're to be humble –
So low we can't stumble –
How can losers help others do well?!*

*Though Jesus told people: "Be meek;
Let villains slap cheek after cheek."
I find that I stumble:
Should they be called humble
When heaven's the goal that they seek?*

*Yes, Jesus said give to the needy,
To all who just whimper "please feed me";
Those who don't – go to hell
Those who do – fare quite well –
Cause heaven is home for the greedy!*

*Although Jesus said what we're to do:
You must "give" to get Heaven for you;
But to give, so you'll get,
Means you gave nothing yet –
It's a hideous Catch Twenty Two!*

And the other is to take a break. I expect that you should, too – and then later, if you're up to it, try to push on with your reading of the NT. But first, maybe you'd like to consider the morality of getting more exercise.