

## Qx16 – Insanities Promoted in the New Testament

Dear: In the previous chapter, I tried to show you some policies in the four gospels (*Mark, Matthew, Luke, and John*) of the New Testament (NT) that were inconsistent, incompatible, or incomprehensible – or all of the above!<sup>1</sup> In this chapter, first I want to show you at least a little about the similar policy incoherencies in Paul’s epistles (i.e., the various letters allegedly written by him that appear in the NT after *Acts*); then, I want to show you what I think shouldn’t be described with words any milder than “policy insanities”. And yes, Dear, I know that the word ‘insanity’ is not a medical term and that it can be offensive, but for reasons that I trust will become clear, I think that the word ‘insanity’ is highly appropriate. By ‘insanity’ I mean that whoever wrote what’s attributed to Paul wasn’t sane, i.e., that the author was (or the authors were) irrational – in the extreme – in a word, bonkers.

If the author of what’s attributed to Paul (or even just some of what’s attributed to Paul) was, in fact, Paul, then there’s separate evidence (besides the irrationality of his writings) that he was insane. For example, at *Acts 26, 24* there’s the opinion of one of his contemporaries: “Paul, you are raving; too much study is driving you mad.” Also, as you can find on the internet, many people and for a variety of reasons have suggested Paul suffered from temporal-lobe epilepsy: 1) because of the flashes of light he stated that he experienced, 2) because of his statement at *2 Corinthians 12, 7*: “I was given a sharp physical pain which came as Satan’s messenger to bruise me [or an alternate reading is: “a painful wound to my pride (literally a stake, or thorn, for the flesh)]”, 3) because of his claimed ability to “speak in tongues” (aka “babbling”), and 4) because of his apparent abnormal stimulation from words and disinterest in (and crazy ideas about) sex. But all that aside, I suggest that the author (or authors) of Paul’s epistles was insane simply because of what these letters contain: as I’ll try to show you, the writings reveal a mind that not only “went around the bend”, but while doing so, managed to tie itself in a large number of logical knots.

Before showing you some of the logical absurdities in Paul’s letters, however, I want to give you at least a brief survey of some other people’s opinions about some of the policy incoherencies advocated in what’s

---

<sup>1</sup> Dear: If you want to examine more of them, see [www.skepticsannotatedbible.com](http://www.skepticsannotatedbible.com).

attributed to Paul. Also, to save space and to permit the text to flow a little more smoothly, I'm going to terminate using all the "weasel words", such as "what's attributed to Paul" and "whoever was the author (or authors) of Paul's letters." In what follows, whenever you see "Paul", realize that I should modify the word "Paul" with such phrases, but as do other authors, I'm going to avoid repeating them. Further, I should point out that, in what follows, I'll be just "scratching the surface"; to fully appreciate the policy incoherencies in what Paul wrote, Dear, you should consult other books.

As a case in point, I'd encourage you to read the 1909 book by M.M. Mangasarian *The Truth About Jesus: Is He A Myth?*<sup>2</sup> Here, I'll quote some of Mangasarian's summary comments about Paul [to which I've added a few notes in "square brackets"].

In comparing the Jesus of Paul with the Jesus whose portrait is drawn for us in the gospels, we find that they are not the same persons at all. This is decisive. Paul knows nothing about a miraculously born savior. He does not mention a single time, in all his thirteen epistles, that Jesus was born of a virgin, or that his birth was accompanied with heavenly signs and wonders. He knew nothing of a Jesus born after the manner of the gospel writers.

It is not imaginable that he knew the facts, but suppressed them, or that he considered them unimportant, or that he forgot to refer to them in any of his public utterances. Today, a preacher is expelled from his denomination if he suppresses or ignores the miraculous conception of the Son of God; but Paul was guilty of that very heresy. How explain it? It is quite simple: The virgin-born Jesus was not yet invented when Paul was preaching Christianity. Neither he, nor the churches he had organized, had ever heard of such a person. The virgin-born Jesus was of later origin than the Apostle Paul.

Let the meaning of this discrepancy between the Jesus of Paul, that is to say, the earliest portrait of Jesus, and the Jesus of the four evangelists [i.e., the authors of the four gospels] be fully grasped by the student, and it should prove beyond a doubt that in Paul's time the story of Jesus' birth from the virgin-mother and the Holy Ghost, which has since become a cardinal dogma of the Christian church, was not yet in circulation. Jesus had not yet been Hellenized [i.e., not "transfigured" into a character consistent with the Greek concept of a God – the meaning of which I'll illustrate below, a few pages later]; he was still a Jewish Messiah [or perhaps even an Egyptian Gnostic!] whose coming was foretold in the Old Testament, and who was to be a prophet like unto Moses, without the remotest suggestion of a supernatural origin.

---

<sup>2</sup> Available, e.g., at [http://www.infidels.org/library/historical/m\\_m\\_mangasarian/index.shtml](http://www.infidels.org/library/historical/m_m_mangasarian/index.shtml).

No proposition in Euclid is safer from contradiction than that, if Paul knew what the gospels tell about Jesus, he would have, at least once or twice during his long ministry, given evidence of his knowledge of it. The conclusion is inevitable that the gospel Jesus is later than Paul and his churches. Paul stood nearest to the time of Jesus of those whose writings are supposed to have come down to us, he is the most representative, and his epistles are the first literature of the new religion. And yet there is absolutely not a single hint or suggestion in them of such a Jesus as is depicted in the gospels. The gospel Jesus was not yet put together or compiled, when Paul was preaching.

Once more; if we peruse carefully critically the writings of Paul, the earliest and greatest Christian apostle and missionary, we find that he is not only ignorant of the gospel stories about the birth and miracles of Jesus, but he is equally and just as innocently ignorant of the teachings of Jesus. In the gospels Jesus is the author of the Sermon on the Mount, the Lord's Prayer, the Parable of the Prodigal Son, the Story of Dives, the Good Samaritan, etc. Is it conceivable that a preacher of Jesus could go throughout the world to convert people to the teachings of Jesus, as Paul did, without ever quoting a single one of his sayings? Had Paul known that Jesus had preached a sermon, or formulated a prayer, or said many inspired things about the here and the hereafter, he could not have helped quoting, now and then, from the words of his master. If Christianity could have been established without a knowledge of the teachings of Jesus, why then, did Jesus come to teach, and why were his teachings preserved by divine inspiration? But if a knowledge of these teachings of Jesus is indispensable to making converts, Paul gives not the least evidence that he possessed such knowledge.

But the Apostle Paul, judging from his many epistles to the earliest converts to Christianity (which are really his testimony, supposed to have been sealed by his blood), appears to be quite as ignorant of a Jesus who went about working miracles – opening the eyes of the blind, giving health to the sick, hearing to the deaf, and life to the dead – as he is of a Jesus born of a virgin woman and the Holy Ghost. Is not this remarkable? Does it not lend strong confirmation to the idea that the miracle-working Jesus of the gospels was not known in Paul's time; that is to say, the earliest Jesus known to the churches was a person altogether different from his namesake in the four evangelists?

If Paul knew of a miracle-working Jesus – one who could feed the multitude with a few loaves and fishes, who could command the grave to open, who could cast out devils, and cleanse the land of the foulest disease of leprosy, who could, and did, perform many other wonderful works to convince the unbelieving generation of his divinity – is it conceivable that either intentionally or inadvertently he [Paul] would have never once referred to them in all his preaching? Is it not almost certain that, if the earliest Christians knew of the miracles of Jesus, they would have been greatly surprised at the failure of Paul to refer to them a single time? And would not Paul have told them of the promise of Jesus to give power to work even greater miracles than his own, had he known of such a promise? Could Paul really have left out of his

ministry so essential a chapter from the life of Jesus, had he been acquainted with it? The miraculous fills up the greater portion of the four gospels, and if these documents were dictated by the Holy Ghost, it means that they were too important to be left out. Why, then, does not Paul speak of them at all? There is only one reasonable answer: A miracle-working Jesus was unknown to Paul.

What would we say of a disciple of Tolstoy, for example, who came to America to make converts to Count Tolstoy and never once quoted anything that Tolstoy had said? Or what would we think of the Christian missionaries who go to India, China, Japan, and Africa to preach the gospel, if they never mentioned to the people of these countries the Sermon on the Mount, the Parable of the Prodigal Son, the Lord's Prayer – nor quoted a single text from the gospels? Yet Paul, the first missionary, did the very thing which would be inexplicable in a modern missionary. There is only one rational explanation for this: The Jesus of Paul was NOT born of a virgin, he did NOT work miracles, and he was NOT a teacher. It was after his day that such a Jesus was – I have to use again a strong word – invented.

It has been hinted by certain professional defenders of Christianity that Paul's specific mission was to introduce Christianity among the Gentiles, and not to call attention to the miraculous element in the life of his Master. But this is a very lame defense. What is Christianity, but the life and teachings of Jesus? And how can it be introduced among the Gentiles without a knowledge of the doctrines and works of its founder? Paul gives no evidence of possessing any knowledge of the teachings of Jesus, how could he, then, be a missionary of Christianity to the heathen?

There is no other answer which can be given than that the Christianity of Paul was something radically different from the Christianity of the later gospel writers, who in all probability were Greeks and not Jews. Moreover, it is known that Paul was reprimanded by his fellow-apostles for carrying Christianity to the Gentiles. What better defense could Paul have given for his conduct than to have quoted the commandment of Jesus: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature"? And he would have quoted the "divine" text had he been familiar with it. Nay, the other apostles would not have taken him to task for obeying the commandment of Jesus had they been familiar with such a commandment. It all goes to support the proposition that the gospel Jesus was of a date later than the apostolic times.

That the authorities of the church realize how damaging to the reality of the gospel Jesus is the inexplicable silence of Paul concerning him, may be seen in their vain effort to find in a passage put in Paul's mouth by the unknown author of the book of *Acts*, evidence that Paul does quote the sayings of Jesus. The passage referred to is the following: "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Paul is made to state that this was a saying of Jesus. In the first place, this quotation is not in the epistles of Paul, but in the *Acts*, of which Paul was not the author; in the second place, there is no such quotation in the gospels. [Dear: shortly, courtesy another author, I'll show you that the source of this quotation is actually the Greek reporter Thucydides]. The

position, then, that there is not a single saying of Jesus in the gospels which is quoted by Paul in his many epistles is unassailable, and certainly fatal to the historicity of the gospel Jesus.

Again, from Paul himself we learn that he was a zealous Hebrew, a Pharisee of Pharisees, studying with Gamaliel in Jerusalem, presumably to become a rabbi. [Actually, Dear, as you can find on the internet, there is serious question about Paul's claim that he studied under Gamaliel]. Is it possible that such a man could remain totally ignorant of a miracle worker and teacher like Jesus, living in the same city with him? If Jesus really raised Lazarus from the grave, and entered Jerusalem at the head of a procession, waving branches and shouting, "Hosanna" – if he was really crucified in Jerusalem, and ascended from one of its environs – is it possible that Paul neither saw Jesus nor heard anything about these miracles? But if he knew all these things about Jesus, is it possible that he could go through the world preaching Christ and never once speak of them? It is more likely that when Paul was studying in Jerusalem there was no miraculous Jesus living or teaching in any part of Judea.

Now, Dear, I hope that Mangasarian's suggestion that Jesus was a myth doesn't distract you from what I consider to be the main points that he makes in the above quotation. As I mentioned in the previous chapter (after another quotation from Mangasarian), I expect that there was a real "teacher" named Jesus, around whom the legends mushroomed. In Yx, I'll go into reasons why I expect that Jesus did exist; perhaps the dominant reason is that approximately 20% of the sayings that are attributed to him seem to have been original (i.e., not copied from the existing Jewish or Greek literature). Nonetheless, as I'll be trying to show you in this and subsequent chapters, Mangasarian's points are critical for understanding the policy incoherencies in the NT: Paul's Jesus and therefore the religion that Paul promoted is different from the other religion that's promoted in the NT and that's normally associated with the "historical" Jesus.

The difference in these religions (difference that cause many of the NT policy incoherencies) is so great that commonly the two religions are called "Peterine Christianity" (because this version seems to have been promoted by the Apostle Peter) vs. "Pauline Christianity". "Peterine Christianity" is also called "Messianic Christianity", because at least some of it seems to be consistent with the Jewish expectation that a "messiah" would come to lead the Jewish people – and Peterine Christianity identified that messiah as Jesus. I think that more appropriate terminology to describe the two religions would be, however, "Peterism" vs. "Paulism", leaving the term "Christianity" (or "Jesusanity" or "Jesusism") to identify what Jesus seems to have taught (perhaps as best recorded in the Gnostics' *Gospel According*

\* Go to other chapters *via*

to *Matthew* and therefore perhaps “Jesusanity” was a offshoot of Gnosticism). At any rate, let me add (but not explain until later) that the dominant “Christian religion” (including Mormonism) is now, today, neither Jesusism nor Peterism but Paulism.

As you probably expect, an enormous amount of study has (unfortunately!) been devoted to trying to understand the differences among the various “divisions” of Christianity. I discourage you, Dear, from spending any more time studying these difference than is necessary for you to reach the conclusion that they’re all silly speculations by primitive people with immature minds – and in some cases, speculations by people who were probably insane! But in case you haven’t yet reached that conclusion, let me now show you a little from another excellent survey article that’s available on the internet, this one at <http://www.metalog.org/comm2.txt>.

On that web page, it states that the article isn’t copyrighted – which I’m glad to see, but it wouldn’t really matter, because I’d be glad to give the author full recognition for his or her accomplishments, but as far as I’m able to tell, the web page doesn’t identify the author. It’s a long article; below I’ll quote just the introduction and the conclusion, keeping references as given by the author and adding a few notes in “square brackets”.

### THE PAUL PARADOX

Those who study the New Testament [NT] may well note that popular “red-letter” editions of the text, with Christ’s words thus highlighted, contain virtually no such rubrics [i.e., “textual distinctions”] throughout the Epistles of Paul. With the sole exception of the eucharistic formula at *I-Cor* 11:24-25 [“This is my body, which is for you; do this as a memorial of me... This cup is the new covenant sealed by my blood...” – which I suspect, Dear, was concocted by some cleric, rather than stated by a historical Jesus, and that this cleric or another added it to what Paul wrote!], he [Paul] does not quote any sayings of the historical Yeshúa/Jesus, either as found in the written Gospels or from a contemporaneous oral tradition [from which perhaps *The Gospel of Thomas* was derived]. Indeed furthermore, he [Paul] never even once alludes to the panorama of the Savior’s biography, from the Nativity up to the Passion [where by “the Passion” is meant the “scenes” from the Last Supper to the execution of Jesus], which fills the pages of the first four books of the NT.

This is, on the face of it, a most puzzling omission, although, astonishingly, at *Acts* 13:24-25 he [Paul] does quote John the Baptist!... [On the other hand (and, Dear, illustrating what Mangasarian meant by the Hellinization of Jesus)], *Acts* 20:35 [“Happiness lies more in giving than in receiving” – which Paul claims are “the words of our Lord Jesus”]... is actually a citation from [the Greek reporter] Thucydides’ *Peloponnesian War* [and it’s a pity that Paul didn’t claim that Jesus

didn't state, also, Thucidides (or Thucydides') more famous line: "The secret of happiness {is} freedom, and the secret of freedom {is} a brave heart", while *Acts* 26:14 ["It is hard for you, this kicking against the goad" – which Paul claims was spoken to him by the vision of Jesus] is in fact a line from Euripides' *Bacchae*! [and surely it strains credulity that Jesus would return from the dead to recite the words of the famous Greek playwright, Euripides (c.485–406 BCE); too bad that Paul didn't claim that Jesus recited the more penetrating lines from Euripides: "Slight not what's near through aiming at what's far" and "O mortal man, think mortal thoughts!" – which might have eliminated all further thoughts by "Christians" of heaven, hell, and all gods!]

Beyond this remarkable lack of historical concern, however, there is an even more enigmatic aspect of Paul's record in the NT. For an objective, philosophical reading of the documents would seem to reveal a number of logical contradictions, both within his [Paul's] biography and also between his theology and that of the Evangelists [i.e., the Apostles allegedly identified by Jesus]... In sum, and stated more formally: the Pauline antinomies [i.e., statements "against the laws" – of logic] are logical contradictions and therefore cannot in principle be resolved by means of either historical investigation or textual criticism, both of which are empirical methodologies.

Neither is this the place to provide a retrospective survey of the many past commentaries on these complex questions. I shall only append a series of quotations from a number of eminent figures – starting with Anselm of Laon, Peter Abelard (citing Jerome, Augustine and Origen), Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus, Erasmus, Teresa of Avila, Blaise Pascal, and John Locke – who are in general agreement that Paul's doctrines appear to be seriously at odds with the Gospel message. These excerpts suffice to show that what might be called "the Paul paradox" has been recognized by a remarkably wide spectrum of prominent individuals across the centuries. [And, Dear, I encourage you to go to the web page <http://www.metalog.org/comm2.txt> to see these "commentaries".]

In the article, the author next lists and provides details for about 30 of the "paradoxes", i.e., "logical inconsistencies" (within what Paul wrote) or "incompatibilities" (between what Paul wrote and what is given in one or more of the synoptic gospels). To conserve space, I won't paste the many pages here (but encourage you, Dear, to go to the original article if you want to see the details); instead, I'll just quote the author's conclusions:

Although Paul did in fact compose some eloquently poetic passages... these must, in light of the aforementioned doctrinal conflicts, be considered no more than ornamentation in his writings. Those documents, in their entirety, proclaim a discipleship which is fundamentally incompatible with the message of Christ himself as recorded in the historical Gospels.

Furthermore and most remarkably, prior to Clement of Alexandria and Irenaeus of Lyon at the close of the second century, there is no single author who quotes from both the Gospels and from [Paul's] Epistles. There was thus an exceedingly long period of schism between the traditions of the Twelve [Apostles] and of Paul, prior to the earliest attempts at textual reconciliation.

The irony of course is that the Gospels themselves, of which tradition Paul was evidently ignorant, were ultimately only preserved by the Pauline Church, which also disseminated the very OT which Paul himself had disdained. My purpose here, however, has been merely to format a set of scriptural dichotomies, in order to exhibit the underlying logic of the ancient Messianic/Paulianity schism as essentially a conceptual (and of course personal) rather than a factual issue. This in turn may hopefully serve to stimulate a discussion both of the apostolic status of Saul of Tarsus [i.e., Paul] and thus of his inclusion in the canon [i.e., the inclusion of his letters in the Bible]. For he seems never to have joined Christ's Discipleship at all (which would have meant accepting Peter's spiritual authority), much less to have become an Apostle...

*These basic questions cannot be papered over, nor can they be settled by institutional fiat. For their illuminating implication is that traditional Christianity – as defined by the classical NT canon including both the Gospels and Paul's Epistles – is logically self-contradictory and hence inherently unstable.* [Italics added.] Or, in a contemporary analogy, we might say that Paul's writings are like a computer virus: a surreptitious theological reprogram which, downloaded with the Gospels, completely changes their message, rendering it not gibberish [that's debatable!] but rather transmuted into another doctrine altogether – historical Church Christianity instead of the original Messianic Brotherhood [or, Dear, as I'll be calling it, "Paulism" – which is not the 'religion' promoted by Jesus but is the religion practiced by most 'Christians' (and Mormons).]

Now, Dear, although in the above I've encouraged you to read the "commentaries" that the author assembled, and thereby, I've suggested that I won't review these commentaries here, nonetheless, let me now quote three of them – if for no other reason than the hope of whetting your interest!

George Bernard Shaw, *Androcles and the Lion*, Introduction (1915); *Everybody's Political What's What?* (1944): "There is not one word of Pauline Christianity in the characteristic utterances of Jesus... There has really never been a more monstrous imposition perpetrated than the imposition of Paul's soul upon the soul of Jesus..."

Bruce Vawter, *The Four Gospels* (1967): "We have no authentic information about the activity of most of the Twelve after the first days of the Church in Jerusalem, but it is likely enough that they remained identified with Jewish Christianity, particularly, perhaps, with the Galilean Christianity about which we know practically nothing... This Christianity... all but disappeared."

Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (1993); *The New Testament* (video course, The Teaching Company, 2000): “Whether seen from a social or a theological point of view... Christianity in the early centuries was a remarkably diversified phenomenon... Many of Paul’s opponents were clearly Jewish Christians... [who] accepted the binding authority of the Old Testament (and therefore the continuing validity of the [Mosaic] Law) but rejected the authority of the apostate Apostle, Paul... Paul, interestingly enough, never mentions Jesus’ interpretation of the [Mosaic] Law, and Paul was quite insistent that keeping the Law would never bring Salvation. The only way to be saved, for Paul, was to trust Jesus’ death and resurrection... *Paul transformed the religion of Jesus into a religion about Jesus.*” [Italics added.]

Now, Dear, as you can find on the internet, there’s much more that can be (and has been!) written about the “new religion” invented by Paul. Yet, rather than my showing you more, I think it’s more important that I describe for you what I call “Saint Paul’s insanities” – especially because certain grandchildren have been indoctrinated with “Paulism” (in a version called “Mormonism” – because when he wrote the Book of Mormon, Sidney Rigdon copied much of Paul’s ravings into his manuscript, as I’ll show you in a later chapter).

As I already mentioned, it’s my opinion that the only evidence needed to justify the description of Paul as “insane” (i.e., that he rather desperately needed psychiatric help) is his writings. Let me show you a little of this evidence, now, starting at the beginning of the first of his “letters” that appears in the NT (i.e., *Romans*). I won’t go through much of it, Dear, for reasons that I think will become painfully clear. Thus, Dear, while reading the quotations below, I challenge you not only to try to follow Paul’s contorted, distorted, insane “logic” but also to attempt to discern the depth of his depravity (in which he claims not only to be on a mission from the creator of the universe but also, on numerous occasions, claims to speak for God).

So now, with that “introduction” out of the way, let me start with *Romans 1*, 1, in which Paul writes:

From Paul, Servant of Christ Jesus, apostle by God’s call...

Immediately, Dear, in Paul’s opening line, I hope you notice something, which for fun, I’ll summarize as “something new, something borrowed, and something blue.”

What's "new" is that – for the first time in the entire Bible – we find a direct communication: it's not a myth, it's not a story, it's not a report of something, it's not a quote from somebody... it's a letter, frozen in time, relaying a person's thoughts. Of course, there's the possibility that some later cleric "redacted" (i.e., rewrote, reworked, modified, manipulated) what Paul wrote, but setting aside that worry (at least for now!), here we have something that's a refreshing change: an unequivocal "revelation" of what somebody really thought! Meanwhile, what's "borrowed" is that Paul is claiming his "authority" to be an "apostle" not because he was assigned this authority from Jesus (as was the claim of the original twelve apostles) but because he received his apostleship directly "by God's call". And what's "blue", Dear (in the sense of making a person "sad") is that in the first line of his letter, Paul is claiming not only to be in direct communication with the creator of the universe but also to have received an "appointment" (his "apostleship") from God. For some strange reason I seem to hear a certain grandchild say: "Riiiiiiiiiiight – show me the data!"

But unfortunately, Paul apparently didn't have a grandchild who would return him to reality, because at *Romans 1, 5* he's at it again

Through him ["Jesus Christ our Lord"] I [Paul] received the privilege of a commission in his name to lead to faith and obedience men in all nations...

Doncha know, Dear, Paul's got authority from the creator of the universe (and his or her son) to lead you **to faith and obedience**? Okay, Dear? You're to obey! Don't say "Hey"; just obey! And don't say "No way!"; OBEY! And of course you're not supposed to think for yourself? What are you – one of those damnable scientific humanists? Don't think for yourself; have faith. Don't evaluate; **OBEY!**

Sorry, Dear, sometimes I get carried away – sometime leading me to limerick land:

*"Saint" Paul chose to go for expedience,  
While mixing his sacred ingredients:  
He didn't say "Think"  
But told us to drink  
From his cup filled with faith and obedience!*

But, back to Paul. At *Romans 1*, 17, he writes (because it seems to support what he plans to promote)

... as Scripture says, “he shall gain life who is justified through faith...”

or, if you don’t like that version (from the New English Bible), then according to the King James Version

... as it is written, “The just shall live by faith...”

which actually has a meaning different from what’s written in the New English Bible! [And if I had to choose between the two, Dear, I’d put more trust in the version given in the New English Bible – because its translators have shown me that they tried harder to show the reader what was actually contained in the original manuscripts (e.g., “Reed Sea” rather than “Red Sea” and “young girl” rather than “virgin”).]

Meanwhile, according to the New English Bible, the “Scripture” that Paul seems to be referencing in the above quotation is at *Habakkuk 2*, 4 (not at *John 3*, 36, Dear, because *the Gospel According to John* won’t be written until 50 to 100 years after Paul has written this letter to the Romans!). It’s

The reckless will be unsure of himself, while the righteous man will live by being faithful...

That’s not what Paul wrote! Or, according to the King James Version, *Habakkuk 2*, 4 states:

Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his faith...

And that’s similarly not what Paul wrote – but it’s closer to what the KJV states Paul wrote – maybe suggesting that the people who wrote the KJV tried harder to be consistent than correct! But in either case, either Paul didn’t study his “scripture” as well as he claims (a claim that, as you can find on the internet, is challenged by some “Biblical scholars”) or Paul lied to make his point (to which, as I’ll show you later, he readily admits), even by misquoting “scripture”.

But all of the above is relatively trivial stuff that can be brushed off as one of Paul’s “little white lies”. So, let me get to more important stuff that’s not brushed off so easily, starting at *Romans 1*, 18 [to which I’ve added some

notes in square brackets, such as these – and I’ve put Paul’s words in italics, in hopes that they’ll then be easier to distinguish from my notes].

*For we see divine retribution revealed from heaven and falling upon all the godless wickedness of men. [Dear: Wouldn’t that be great if it were so?! Then we might have some evidence for the existence of any postulated “divine retribution” – as well as any “divinities”! Instead, all data support the hypothesis that there are no gods – and never were!] In their wickedness, they [“the godless”] are stifling the truth. [Oh, really? And how, pray tell, might they do that? If as you say, Paul, that you see “divine retribution”, then wouldn’t that reveal “the truth”! But then, pray tell, what “truth” are you referring to? That  $1 + 1 = 2$  (which is actually a definition rather than a “truth”), or that God exists (which is actually meaningless gibberish, because the words ‘God’ and ‘exists’ are undefined, or what?) For all that may be known of God by men lies plain before their eyes; [Oh, wonderful, please say more!] Indeed God himself has disclosed it to them. [Well, great, but you haven’t said anything yet.] His invisible attributes, that is to say his everlasting power and deity, have been visible, ever since the world began, to the eye of reason, in the things he has made.*

Dear: please look at that example of Paul’s “reasoning” again. It’s the same “first cause” junk that Aristotle promoted ~400 years earlier – and the same junk that the stupid Pope John Paul continued to promote! Paul stated

God’s invisible attributes... have been visible... to the eye of reason, in the things he has made.

In less flowery language, that’s saying just that “somebody” must have made this universe – and that somebody is Paul’s (or Aristotle’s) god. But the kid in the back row still wants to know: “Yah but... who made God?”

And of course the clerics’ answer (direct from Aristotle) is that God made himself (the “first cause”). But as I’ve reviewed before, that answer is logically inconsistent. The advocates first assume that everything has a cause (and therefore this universe must have been “caused” by God, “proving” that he “exists”), but then without as much as an embarrassed smile, the advocates add, in conclusion, that something didn’t have a cause (i.e., God) – which violates their premiss that everything has a cause!

Logically, that’s absurd. Better would be to assume (as the Hindus do – and did, thousands of years before Paul wrote this stuff) that there was no beginning (which eliminates the need for a “first cause”). Still better is to admit that humans don’t understand how this universe was created. And better still is to proceed with scientific investigations of how this universe

might have created itself, out of totally nothing (just as you create electrical charge, from nothing, when you comb your hair).

Which then leads me to more serious complaints against all of them (Aristotle, Paul, and thousands of others, up to and of course including the stupid Pope John Paul and similar stupid clerics in all religions). Already, ~100 years before Aristotle (and in turn relying on literally thousands and thousands of years of experiments), the “father of modern medicine”, Hippocrates (c.460–400 BCE) clearly stated the alternative

There are in fact two things, science and opinion; the former begets knowledge, the latter, ignorance.

All of this “first-cause nonsense”, such as Paul’s “*God’s invisible attributes... have been visible... to the eye of reason, in the things he has made*”, is mere opinion – begetting ignorance! In contrast, the only way to gain knowledge about the external world is *via* science: first make sure that any opinion (or hypothesis) summarizes a substantial quantity of data, then make sure that the derived opinion can produce testable predictions, then test the predictions, gain more data, form new opinions (hypotheses) and continue – without end!

Paul’s stupidity is enough to drive me to another limerick:

*It is said that Saint Paul never rested,  
And it’s clear that he never once jested;  
The result was quite sad  
For he drove himself mad  
With reasoning never once tested!*

Further, Paul should have known better. He claims to have been a tent maker (*Acts 18, 3*). Thereby, he must have known that neither he nor anyone else could possibly make a tent (or a wheel or a boat or a sail or a plow or...) without testing hypothesis. That’s how knowledge about the world is gained. And yet, Dear, here in *Romans 1, 18-20*, Paul states his elegantly worded opinion that “*God’s invisible attributes... have been visible... to the eye of reason*”, without commenting on experimental tests of his opinion – because there are none! – when then leads him to ignorance.

In fact, it leads to more than ignorance, because as Socrates (a contemporary and co-patriot of Hippocrates) summarized so well: “There is one good, knowledge [obtained by application of the scientific method] and one evil, ignorance [derived from untested opinions, such as Paul’s].” Therefore, Dear, while reading more of Paul’s opinions, expect to encounter not only more opinions, but also ignorance – and therefore, evil.

First, though, Paul manages to relay more stupidity. Thus, at *Romans 1*, 21, he relays

[Because “God’s invisible attributes... have been visible... to the eye of reason”] *there is therefore no possible defense* [by “the godless”] *for their conduct; knowing God, they have refused to honor him as God, or to render him thanks.*

Mind boggling! How could anyone write something so stupid?! He states “*there is therefore no possible defense*”, but two “defenses” that are totally obvious are: 1) that, at least for the defendants, God’s “invisible attributes” aren’t, in fact, visible (which actually wouldn’t be much of a surprise!), and/or 2) that any defendant’s “eye of reason” sees something different (e.g., that the universe was created by a symmetry-breaking quantum fluctuation in a total void). Thereby, Paul, how about considering the obvious: that “the godless” decided that all ideas of all gods were just that, i.e., ideas – and dumb ideas at that. Thereby, why would “the godless” consider giving “honor” or “thanks” to a stupid idea concocted by clerics as a part of their con game? It’s crazy! [Or maybe I should correct that: Paul’s crazy!]

Yet, let me continue with Paul’s craziness (still at *Romans 1*, 21):

*Hence all their thinking* [i.e., the thinking of “the godless”] *has ended in futility, and their misguided minds are plunged in darkness.*

Bizarre! The thinking of “the godless” ones (such as Buddha, Confucius, Heraclitus, Protagoras, Democritus, Socrates, Hippocrates, Epicurus, and no doubt millions of unnamed others) “ended in futility”? “Their minds are plunged in darkness” because they refused to accept the nonsensical ideas that some giant Jabberwock in the sky made himself?! As a certain grandchild would say: “Gimme a break!”

But I’ll just push on with Paul’s stupidity, now to *Romans 1*, 22:

*They [the “the godless”] boast of their wisdom [Well, as well they should – but show me the data! Certainly Socrates, Buddha, Confucius, Epicurus... never made such boasts!], but they have made fools of themselves [Ha! Paul: guess who’s making a total fool of himself!], exchanging the splendor of immortal God [Oh, my, aren’t those pretty words! Totally meaningless, mind you, but the words certainly are pretty!] for an image shaped like mortal man, even for images like birds, beasts, and creeping things.*

Paul, you’re bananas! Just because people decide that all ideas about all giant Jabberwocks in the sky are stupid doesn’t mean that these people start worshipping images! Apparently you want your words to sing to you, e.g., “birds, beasts, and creeping things”, but just for a change, try using some words that convey some meaning.

But I’ll try to go on, now at *Romans 1, 24*:

*For this reason God has given them [“the godless”] up to the vileness of their own desires [Hello? Our “own desires” are vile? Do tell! Like desires to breath, eat, and maybe think? Now, Paul, I could understand why you might describe somebody’s desire to think to be ‘vile’, but breathing? Gimme a break!] and the consequent degradation of their bodies [If you wanna see bodies degrade, Paul buddy, try not breathing and eating. In fact, I rather wish... Ah, never mind] because they have bartered away their true God for a false one [This guy Paul has lost it!] and have offered reverence and worship to created things instead of to the Creator, who is blessed for ever; amen.*

Now, Dear, I hope you noticed something special in the above – but if you didn’t notice it, don’t worry about it, because Paul will repeat it many times. What Paul just finishing doing was to explain God’s “reason”: “**For this reason, God has...**” Whenever you read something such as that, Dear, I hope your first reaction will be to take a big “Gulp”! That is, Dear, whenever you hear anybody (but anybody!) claim that they know God’s reasons, then I hope your first reaction will be to jerk your head forward – as if to indicate a gigantic GULP! But then, Dear, please, Please, PLEASE, PLEASE never swallow such garbage! No data have ever been presented to substantiate any claim by anybody that he or she ever had, ever has, or ever will have “authority” to speak for the creator of the universe, describing its “reasons”. In fact, or at least as far as is known, the original quantum fluctuation in the total void never had any “reasons”!

But let me go on with Paul’s craziness (now at *Romans 1, 26*):

*In consequence, I say, God has given them up to shameful passions. [So now we're into "shameful passions", not just "the vileness of their own desires". But, Paul, pray tell, who gets to define what passions are "shameful"? It wouldn't happen to be you and your fellow clerics, would it? How about the passion for petting puppy dogs? How about the passion for slurping strawberry milkshakes? How about the passion for listening to Beethoven while watching a sunset?] Their women have exchanged natural intercourse for unnatural [How in hell, Paul, did you jump from petting puppy dogs, slurping strawberry milkshakes, listening to Beethoven, and watching a sunset, to women having unnatural intercourse?! You wouldn't happen to have sex on your mind, would you Paul? What's the matter? Women avoid you? Have you ever thought about why?], and their men in turn, giving up natural relations with women, burn with lust for one another; males behave indecently with males, and are paid in their own person the fitting wage of such perversion."*

Astounding! The above, alone, should be sufficient to certify that Paul belonged not in a church but in a mental institution. Although, now that I think of it...

Please, Dear, look at that quotation again. Paul starts (at *Romans 1*, 24) with "For this reason [i.e., that "the godless" allegedly worship images] God has given them up..." and repeats, "In consequence, I say, God has given them up..." So, Dear, in case you had any doubts about it: **Paul knows God's reasons!** That's right, Dear, not only was Paul assigned his job by God but also Paul knows God's reasons, e.g., for assigning Paul a job! Paul himself said: "For this reason God [blah, blah, blah]." You might have thought that a mere mortal wouldn't know God's reasons, but then [doncha know] Paul was no mere mortal. Why, shucks, he probably had nice little chats with the good-little Godie almost every day. I mean, Paul didn't claim wisdom (as he says "the godless" do) – cause who needs wisdom, when they're plugged into the mind of God?!

But watch out, Dear. Soon after people say that they're doing God's will and that they know God's reasons, commonly their next step in their delusion is to say that they speak for God. And doncha know, soon after that, they commonly claim that they are God. Therefore, Dear, I for one would vote, now (only one and a half pages into his first letter!), for having Paul not "beatified" (to be a "saint") but "certified" – as insane – because I'm willing to bet good money on the possibility that his insanity (and his ignorance and his evil) is only gonna get worse.

As for the rest of Paul's paragraph, it's a pity – for Paul and for all "Christians" (or better, for all "Paulists", including all Mormons) – that Paul

didn't have a grandchild who would have brought him back to reality with "Show me the data!" Seriously, Dear, what data support Paul's contention that the sexual behavior of "the god-less" differs from that of "the god-more"? And even if there were some data, Dear, I bet it would be difficult to interpret them, more difficult to deduce any hypotheses from them, and then, even more difficult to test the predictions of any hypothesis.

To illustrate what I mean, suppose that the sexual behavior of people were independent from their opinions about any giant Jabberwock in the sky. Further, suppose more-educated people are more likely to believe that all stories about all giant Jabberwocks in the sky are just silly stories (a possibility that, as I'll show you later, is supported by polling data, which indicate that the more education people have, the less likely they are to buy into any clerics' con game). In addition, suppose that more-educated people generally feel more liberated sexually, free to behave in a manner than they consider appropriate rather than following dominant cultural norms. I don't know if data support that third assumption, but accepting it solely for the sake of this argument, then a correlation could probably be found between "belief in god" and "sexual behavior", but as I've written before: "Correlation doesn't mean causation!" That is, Dear, in the scenario depicted, the "causative correlation" is with "level of education" – not with opinion about the existence of any giant Jabberwock in the sky!

But anyway, let me get back to the idiot Paul, now at *Romans 1, 28*:

*Thus, because they [‘the godless’] have not seen fit to acknowledge God, he has given them up to their own depraved reason. [“Depraved reason”! Talk about the pot calling the kettle black! If a person decides that no data support the speculation that God exists, then how is it “depraved” to behave in a manner consistent with the conclusion that there are no gods, e.g., in interactions with others, to behave at least as well as dolphins do to one another? Wouldn't it be more appropriate to describe as “depraved reason” to base one's behavior on speculation about the existence of some giant Jabberwock in the sky?! I mean, after all, at least the behavior of dolphins is observable!] This leads them to break all rules of conduct. [Oh for cyrin' out loud, Paul: how could you be so stupid?! Because Confucius, Buddha, Socrates, Epicurus... didn't believe in your stupid god, did they then “break all rules of conduct”?! Didn't they, in fact, set standards of conduct that idiots such as you couldn't even dream of being able to emulate? But then, maybe it's unfair to compare their conduct with yours – cause in contrast to certain people whose names I could mention, they had functioning brains!] They are filled with every kind of injustice [Who? Socrates? – or you?!], mischief [Who? Confucius? – or you?!], rapacity [Greedy? Who? The Buddha? – or you?!] and malice [Who? Epicurus? – or*

you?! and so on it goes]; *they are one mass of envy, murder, rivalry, treachery, and malevolence; whisperers and scandal-mongers, hateful to God, insolent, arrogant, and boastful; they invent new kinds of mischief, they show no loyalty to parents, no conscience, no fidelity to their plighted word; they are without natural affection and without pity. They know well enough the just decree of God, that those who behave like this deserve to die, and yet they do it; not only so, they actually applaud such practice.*

Dear: are you beginning to see why I described (and will continue to describe) Paul as insane? And are you beginning to see his ignorance and the possibility that it'll lead to evil. And the Catholic Church has the audacity to call this insane, ignorant, evil person a "Saint"! Anyone who would claim that "godless" is synonymous with all that crap that he wrote is bonkers. And notice that he slipped in that such people "***deserve to die***". Socrates and Epicurus deserved to die? Let me just respond that anyone who "thinks" in such a manner, desperately needs psychiatric help.

Now, Dear, you might think (or, maybe better, "hope") that evidence of Paul's insanity couldn't get much worse, but I'm sorry to point out to you that I'm now only on the second page of *Romans* – and you ain't seen nothin' yet! So, hang in there, kid, while I move on to the next glorious paragraph written by the illustrious "Saint" Paul (*Romans 2, 1*) – to which I'll add some paragraph breaks, because my comments make the long paragraph even longer.

*You therefore have no defense* [Hello? What's he talking about? Who's he talking about? Ah, there it is:] – *you who sit in judgment, whoever you may be* [Well, I'm me, and I've been judging you, Paul, to be an idiot – and actually, I have a damn good "defense", because the evidence you've already provided is overwhelming. For example, you just finished demonstrating your stupid "judgment" of the god-less!] – *for in judging your fellow-man you condemn yourself* [Oh, really? Then you just finished condemning yourself, ya clown! And in my case, judging you, I condemn myself to what? Thinking? Okay, I'll buy that. What else do you have, you raving maniac?], *since you, the judge, are equally guilty.* [So, you are "equally guilty" of all the charges you laid on the godless. How very honest of you to admit that you're a closet homosexual, filled with "every kind of injustice, mischief, rapacity, and malice." But as for my being guilty of such stuff (along with Confucius, Buddha, Socrates, Epicurus, et al.), if you don't mind terribly, Paul, pray tell: how was this "guilt" established? Trial by jury? Trial by our peers? Or simply your prerogative?]

*It is admitted* [by whom?] *that God's judgment is rightly passed upon all who commit such crimes as these* [It's not admitted by me! How can a symmetry-breaking quantum fluctuation in a total void {viz., "the creator of the universe"} pass judgment on anything; it had no ability to "judge" – thought was beyond it – and maybe I'm

beginning to see why Paul “thinks” he can speak for God! Hmmm...]; *and do you imagine – you who pass judgment on the guilty while committing the same crimes yourself* [Hello? How did all these judges also start having unnatural sexual activities, and so on? I thought it was clear that only you were into that stuff, judging others. It’s a mighty broad bush that you’re painting with, Paul me boy, and you got paint all over your face] – *do you imagine that you, any more than they, will escape the judgment of God?* [Well, let’s hope so: let’s hope that they, too, consider your stupid ideas of God to be stupid. Any other questions?]

*Or do you think lightly of his wealth of kindness, of tolerance, and of patience* [Yes! Very lightly! Along with him, they don’t exist!], *without recognizing that God’s kindness is meant* [Oh boy, here it comes: not only does Paul claim that he’s doing God’s job, and not only does Paul claim that he knows God’s reasons, now Paul’s gonna claim that he knows God’s purpose! **It sure is great that Paul knows God’s purpose.** I wonder if God agrees...] *to lead you to a change of heart?* [Wow! Good job, Paul! Previously God never clearly stated his purpose. Oh, true, early in the Bible he told us to go out and multiply {sex, sex, and more sex, doncha know}, and later he told us to join his rooting sections {cause he’s a jealous god, doncha know}. Still later, he wanted the Israelites to murder all the people living peacefully on their own land {cause he always wanted to be a landlord, doncha know}, and now, thanks to Paul, we learn what else god wants: he wants us to have a change of heart. Course, there’s a bit a problem with that instruction: exactly what does God want? That we get heart transplants? Naw, I guess not. That we change our ways? Hmmm, that’s interesting. Like maybe stop listening to crazy people? Hmmm. Like maybe start thinking for ourselves? Hmmm. Like maybe evaluating rather than obeying? Hmmm. Like reaching the obvious conclusion that all gods always were just figments of primitive people’s minds, ideas that were then jumped on by a bunch of con-artist clerics to leech of productive people? Wow! That’s great. Let’s see if that what you mean, Paul old buddy]

*In the rigid obstinacy of your heart* [Who has “rigid obstinacy”? The “god-less” or the “god-more”? Isn’t “rigid obstinacy” synonymous with the word ‘religious’?!] *you are laying up for yourself a store of retribution for the day of retribution, when God’s just judgment will be revealed, and he will pay every man for what he has done.* [Oh, how delightful! There’s gonna be a “day of retribution”. There’ll be a day when those who chose to obey and those who chose to evaluate will both get what they deserve. Wouldn’t that be great. And the data that supports this speculation? But you know, I wouldn’t be surprised if there weren’t just a single “day of retribution” but many such days – even every single day! People who choose to evaluate for themselves get to live each day of their lives; people who choose to obey, lose every day!]

*To those who pursue glory, honor, and immortality by steady persistence in well-doing, he [God] will give eternal life; but for those who are governed by selfish ambition* [My God, Paul, get real! What could be a more “selfish ambition” than “glory, honor, and immortality”? The man is bonkers!!], *who refuse obedience* [Yah,

that's me: I refuse to obey you, Paul, especially because you're obviously a raving maniac] *to the truth* [The "truth"? Gimme a break? Because you say it's so, therefore, it's the "truth"?!] *and take the wrong for their guide* [As near as I can guarantee anything, I guarantee that anyone who takes Paul for their guide is choosing "the wrong"!], *there will be the fury of retribution. There will be trouble and distress* [although how anyone can have trouble without distress is another question] *for every human being who is an evil-doer* [and the "evil-doers" are the ignorant, and the ignorant are... Hmm, I wonder why Paul's name leaps to mind], *for the Jew first* [why?] *and for the Greek also* [well, that sounds fair – but what about the Romans, Chinese, Americans...?!]; *and for every well-doer* [Ah, boy, I guess Paul's finally writing about "the godless"] *there will be glory, honor, and peace, for the Jew first* [How come they get to be first?] *and also for the Greek* [and what about all the others?!]."

*For God has no favorites* [Oh, great. And it's sure good to know that **Paul not only was assigned his job by God and knows his reasoning and his purpose but also Paul knows God's policies**]: *those who have sinned outside the pale* [viz., 'importance'] *of the Law of Moses will perish outside its pale, and all who have sinned under that law will be judged by the law.* [There is, however, a slight logical problem here, Paul-me-boy: for those who are outside "the pale" of the Law of Moses {where by "pale" I mean "shroud" or "cloud" or "curse"!}, for example, those of us who refuse to sell our daughters into slavery and refuse to beat our slaves to death in the manners proscribed by Moses, then not only don't we give a damn about what Moses wrote but also, guess what: we then don't sin! To 'sin', you see, means "to break some religious law", so without religion, we're without sin. So then, how can you logically address "those who have sinned outside the pale of the Law of Moses"? The set is empty. Oh, I see: I asked you how you could "logically address" – and you don't constrain yourself with logic. Cute, Paul, but also rather dumb, cause it leads the reader to conclude that you've lost your marbles.]

*It is not by hearing the law, but by doing it, that men will be justified before God.* [My God, Paul, you've definitely gone round the bend! Why in hell (where I assume your God lives) would a native Australian or American, for example, be judged "for doing [the law of Moses]" when he or she never heard of it. Look, Paul, I have an idea for you: try counting. No, nothing else, just keep counting. Maybe by keeping your mind occupied with counting, you won't pollute humanity with so much garbage!].

*When Gentiles* [non-Jews] *who do not possess the law* [of Moses] *carry out its precepts by the light of nature* [You mean like selling their daughters into slavery and beating their slaves to death in the approved manner], *then, although they have no law, they are their own law, for they display the effect of the law inscribed on their hearts.* [Paul, you must have stopped counting! How could you write something so stupid? The laws of Moses are "inscribed" on everybody's hearts? We all just know the proper way to sell our daughters into slavery and to beat our slaves to death?]. *Their conscience is called as witness, and their own thoughts argue the case on either*

*side, against them or even for them, on the day when God judges the secrets of human hearts through Christ Jesus. So my gospel declares.*

Poor old Paul. He almost regained his sanity, there, but unfortunately failed. He almost saw the Jewish religion (and similarly all religions) to be a crock of lies. He almost saw that the murderer Moses was just another damnable charlatan running still another con game. He almost saw that it's Mother Nature and evolution that have established for humanity some obvious rules of conduct (well known to dolphins!) for promoting survival of our genetic code. He almost saw that (for humans as for dolphins) information on how best to behave to promote our survival is contained in each of us, within what we call our "conscience" – meaning that it's instinctive (maybe even programmed in our genes).

But then, just when he almost saw that basing morality on crazy ideas about giant Jabberwocks in the sky was one of the greatest mistakes made by humanity – if not the single greatest mistake – poor old Paul lost it all, tumbling back into the garbage dump: *"on the day when God judges the secrets of human hearts through Christ Jesus. So my gospel declares."* Too bad, Paul: I wonder if you realize how close you came, there, to becoming a human. Sorry that, instead, you became a "saint". More's the pity.

So, Dear, with regrets, let me continue – but I'll skip over the rest of *Romans 2* as well as the first part of *Romans 3*, because in them, apparently, Paul is writing a lecture to Jewish people (even though he claimed that his job was to bring the "good news" to the Gentiles). Yet, Dear, should you ever want to dig into some details of Paul's alleged affiliation with the Jews (though why anyone would want to is another matter!), let me warn you that an enormous amount of speculation has been written on this topic.

For example, as you can find on the internet, much has been written challenging Paul's claim that he was "thoroughly trained in every point of our [the Hebrew's] ancestral law" (*Acts 22, 3*), even trained by the Jewish rabbi Gamaliel. The essence of these challenges is that he couldn't have been so trained (or, if trained, then he failed the course!), both because he then wouldn't have been involved in the persecution of followers of Jesus (because Gamaliel was opposed to such persecution) and because he displayed such ignorance of Jewish law (representing it as a burden on the Jewish people rather than a part of their "covenant" with their God).

So, Dear, skipping all of that, let me start again at *Romans 3, 20*, where at the conclusion of his long harangue against the Jews, Paul writes the astoundingly stupid statement “...*law brings only the consciousness of sin*”, to which maybe my most important response, Dear, is to encourage you to try to avoid people who make such statements, not only because their ignorance can be dangerous for you but also because such “malcontents” can easily drag you down to their own misery and discontent with life. Let me try to explain what I mean.

First, consider the ignorance of the statement “law brings only the consciousness of sin”. As a start, consider laws in this country that guarantee your freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and so on. Do such laws bring “only the consciousness of sin”? What stupidity! But further, Dear, now consider all the “Thou shalt not...” laws, such as “thou shalt not steal”. A malcontent such as Paul (someone who always sees a half-full glass of water as half-empty) claims that such laws bring “only the consciousness of sin”, but those of us who see the glass half-full see that such laws exist not to bring “consciousness of sin” but to promote harmony in society. “Thou shalt not steal” may bring “consciousness of sin” to a criminal (e.g., all con artists, such as Paul!), but to the rest of us, “thou shalt not steal” brings security: not consciousness of sin but consciousness of a well-functioning society. So again, Dear, I advise you to try to avoid such ignorant malcontents as Paul: their ignorance can be dangerous to you, and their attitude can drag you down to their level of misery.

Anyway, let me now continue on at *Romans 3, 21* where after displaying that he doesn't understand law, Paul shows that he also doesn't understand justice.

*But now, quite independently of law, God's justice has been brought to light.* [That's crazy! If there were no law, justice would be meaningless! Natural justice depends on the “law” of causality (i.e., all effects are justified by their cause); personal justice (you generally get what you deserve) also depends on the “law” of cause and effect. Similarly for interpersonal or social justice: even though (as Emerson said) social justice is just “opinion”, yet there's opportunity for near unanimity of opinion, because we've all learned natural and personal justice (as taught by Nature through her “law” of causality) and because we all agree on the fundamental goal (as all life has learned) that the good is to live, i.e., the “law” of survival. Thus, it's stupid, it's ridiculous, to say that justice is independent of law: if there were no law (e.g., no “law” of causality), then the concept of “justice” is meaningless: everything is then random; everything is equally and simultaneously totally justified or totally unjustified, i.e., there is no meaning to the word “justified”].

But anyway, let me continue (still at *Romans 3, 21*):

*God's justice has been brought to light. [To Paul – who understands not only God's reasons and plans and policies but also his idea of "justice"!]* *The Law [of Moses] and the prophets [viz., the OT] both bear witness to it [God's justice]: it is God's way [and I, Paul, know not only God's purpose and his reasons and his policies but also his "way"] of righting wrong [if so, then "God's justice" has only to do with personal and interpersonal justice, for in the case of natural justice, wrong is impossible (unless causality can be violated)], effective through faith in Christ for all who have such faith – all, without distinction. [Cutting out the crap, what apparently Paul just wrote was: "God's justice... is God's way of righting wrong." Or, cutting out the useless word "God", we're left with: "justice is... righting wrong." Which of course is fine, save for the minor matter: who gets to define what's right vs. wrong?! That's the crux of the matter – the crux of social justice – and if Paul doesn't immediately address how right or wrong are to be defined, then he's just blowing hot air. So, then, let's see how he addresses the matter of right vs. wrong.] For all alike have sinned [Hello?], and are deprived of the divine splendor [Hello?!], and all are justified [Hello??!] by God's free grace alone, through his act of liberation in the person of Christ Jesus [What the devil is Paul talking about!!]..."*

Now, Dear, I want to stop examining this part of the text, right here, because surely the pages (of the original letter from Paul) were scrambled before they were distributed: surely even someone as crazy as Paul couldn't have presented such a disconnected argument! As you can see from your copy of the Bible, Paul now goes on to write about the "sacrificial death" of Jesus and to the question "What room then is left for human pride?" But surely, even in his insanity, Paul first attempted to explain what he meant by the "sacrificial death" of Jesus! Therefore, let me now jump ahead to *Romans 5, 12*, to show you what Paul apparently meant by what he wrote in *Romans 3, 21* (!); after doing that, I'll return, to start again, at *Romans 3, 23*.

Thus, at *Romans 5, 12*, Paul begins to try to explain what he means by "for all alike have sinned":

*Mark what follows [says Paul, and I'll add: for it's the mark of a man gone mad]. It was through one man [Adam, of Adam and Eve fame] that sin entered the world [Riiiiiiight], and through sin, death [That is, Dear, in Paul's deranged mind, death is not the natural course of all life, for the benefit of the survival of all species; instead, according to Paul, death is a punishment for sin], and thus death pervaded the whole human race, inasmuch as all men have sinned [and inasmuch as possibly no one, in the history of the world, has ever had such a stupid idea. How could Paul not have noticed that plants and animals also die? Or did he think that they "sinned" too? The little bunny rabbit is a sinner? Daffodils sin? This fellow Paul is mad!].*

*For sin was already in the world before there was law [viz., the Law of Moses – but, Dear, can you imagine such a stupid statement? On the one hand, the “law” of causality was in existence, as were “laws” to promote the survival of the species, long before humans came on the scene, and on the other hand, how could anyone possibly break a law (i.e., “sinned”) if the law didn’t exist?!], though in the absence of law no reckoning is kept of sin [Well, then, if it’s not “reckoned”, how is sin described? Further, in the absence of the “law” of causality, all is chaos!]*

*But death held sway from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned as Adam did, by disobeying a direct command [so, the good is to obey! – even though Adam didn’t know what “good” meant!! Again, Dear, even if people were so naïve as to buy into the stupid story about Adam and Eve (invented thousands of years before Paul by people who were even more naïve), surely they could see that Adam didn’t sin, because he wasn’t permitted to know the difference between right and wrong. Therefore, Adam couldn’t know that it was “right” to obey and “wrong” to disobey! God might as well have told two bunny rabbits not to eat clover and not to have sex. For Paul (or God) to then claim that the bunny rabbits “sinned” (because they ate clover and had sex) is crazy!].*

*But God’s act of grace is out of all proportion to Adam’s wrongdoing [I should certainly hope so, because Adam did nothing wrong!]. For if the wrongdoing of that one man brought death upon so many [It didn’t, you crazy clown! How could anyone be so stupid as to claim that all people die because Adam ate an apple!], its effect [i.e., I guess, the effect of his “wrongdoing”] is vastly exceeded by the grace of God and the gift that came to so many by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ. [That is, God had Jesus killed to “atone” for Adam’s having eaten the apple! But how about, instead, if God had told poor old Adam, first, how to distinguish right from wrong and that he was supposed to obey?!]*

*And again, the gift of God [viz., eternal life] is not to be compared in its effect with that one man’s [viz., Adam’s] sin; for the judicial action, following upon the one offence, issued in a verdict of condemnation [Paul always wanted to be a lawyer, doncha know!], but the act of grace, following upon so many misdeeds [hello?], issued in a verdict of acquittal. [A lawyer gone mad!] For if by the wrong doing of that one man [Adam] death established its reign [it didn’t], through a single sinner, much more shall these who receive in far greater measure God’s grace, and his gift of righteousness, live and reign [in?] the one man, Jesus Christ. [Here’s a guy fascinated by Roman law and perplexed by the question “Why did Jesus die?” So, he invented a story – which is totally bizarre!]*

*It follows, then [in the twisted legal mind of “Saint” Paul, because for sane people, nothing could follow from this craziness – except, one would hope, incarceration of Paul in an institute for the insane!], that as the issue of one misdeed was condemnation for all men [in Paul’s astoundingly warped sense of justice! Can you believe it, Dear? Can anyone with a function brain believe this crap? Your great,*

great, great... grandfather ate an apple, so you're guilty (and so is everyone else) and you're sentence is the death penalty! What better word than "bonkers"?!, *so the issue of one just act is acquittal and life for all men*. [What sort of justice is this? Supposing, just for the sake of argument, that Paul's insane ideas aren't crazy, then how pray tell is it "just" to kill a totally innocent person, Jesus, for the "sins" of the "guilty"?]. *For as through the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners* [That is, Dear, you're a sinner, and subject to "the death penalty", because Adam ate an apple!], *so through the obedience of the one man* [Jesus: obedient because he let his father kill him!] *the many will be made righteous*. [Thus, Dear, the only way that Paul saw to get out of his craziness was to double it!!].

*Law intruded into this process to multiply law-breaking* [that is, I guess, the Law of Moses introduced more ways to sin – as if the purpose of laws is to break them!]. *But where sin was thus multiplied, grace immeasurably exceeded it* [so it was "grace" for Jesus to die!!], *in order that, as sin established its reign by way of death, so God's grace* [viz., killing his son] *might establish its reign in righteousness, and issue in eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord*.

Dear: If this is the first time that you've been served "Saint" Paul's insanity "raw", directly as he wrote it, then I suspect that you have difficulty swallowing it, perhaps wondering how anyone could write anything so stupid. So, in case you think that you might have misinterpreted what he wrote, let me assure you that it really is as stupid as it appears. In Paul's mangled mind, the story of what happened is roughly as follows.

Paul's God placed two little bunny rabbits (called Adam and Eve) in the Garden of Eden and told them not to eat any of the clover and not to have sex – although earlier, he said that their purpose was "to multiply". But that contradiction didn't bother the bunnies. For a minute or so, they just sniffed the air (as bunny rabbits are wont to do, twitching their noses), looked intently at God, saw his mouth move and heard noise come out, but upon seeing that he wasn't planning on eating either them or the clover, and upon not being frightened by (and of course not understanding) the noise coming out of God's mouth, the bunny rabbits went back to eating the clover – and in time had lots of little baby bunnies. Later, according to Paul, God looked down and saw that the bunny rabbits hadn't obeyed his order: they were eating clover and engaging in sex! So, God found himself a totally innocent deer (whom God never told not to eat clover or have sex), and decided to kill the deer. Just before he was about to be killed, the deer looked at God with his big brown eyes as if to say: "How come you're gonna kill me? How about letting this cup pass me by?" And in response to those big, brown, inquisitive eyes, God said (at least according to Paul): "Look, little deer, I gotta kill you cause those bunny rabbits were bad. If I murder you, then that'll cleanse the bunnies of their sins." The deer looked at God again, as if to say "But, but, but...", but to no avail: God nailed him to a cross and killed him.

Ain't that a beautiful little story? And no, Dear, I ain't makin' it up: Paul did! It's the official story line of Christianity (and Mormonism) – although, again, it should be called “Paulianity” – or more accurately, “Insanity”!

Anyway, Dear, now that some of the pages have been arranged in what I assume was their original order, maybe Paul's earlier brilliant comments (at *Romans 3, 23*) might make sense – or at least be consistent with the nonsense about the bunny rabbits. He wrote:

*For all alike have sinned* [because, according to Paul, we're all related to Adam, he sinned, and so everyone must be a sinner (doncha know) or else why would people die?!], *and are deprived of the divine splendor* [which one might think means “not dying”, but of course Paul has dreams of a much more splendid “divine”], *and all are justified by God's free grace alone, through his act of liberation in the person of Christ Jesus. For God designed him* [Jesus – and I, Paul, know not only God's purpose, reasons, plans, aims, policies, and ways, but also his designs] *to be the means of expiating sin by his sacrificial death* [just as in the “old days” of offering “sacrifices” to the gods, but in this case, sacrifice an innocent person (i.e., Jesus) to “expiate” the sins of the guilty?!]...

*God means by this* [and of course I, Paul, know not only God's purpose, reasons, plans, aims, policies, ways, and designs, but also what God “means”] *to demonstrate his justice* [And Dear, I trust you notice this “justice”: kill the innocent to “expiate” the sins of the guilty. So, Dear, the next time your parents catch you doin' who-knows-what that you-know-you-shouldn't-be-doin', just say to them: “Oh no you don't! Don't punish me. That's not the godly thing to do. God doesn't punish the guilty, he punishes the innocent. That's God's kind of justice. Do you think that you know better than God? I'm not to be punished: I'm the guilty one! For cryin' out loud, punish one of the innocent kids!” – and I wonder why I think both that you wouldn't make such a request and, if you did, that your parents would ignore it – except probably to consider getting you psychiatric help!], *because in his forbearance he [God] had overlooked the sins of the past – to demonstrate his justice now in the present, showing that he is himself just and also justifies any man who puts his faith in Jesus.*

*What room then is left for human pride?* [Where did pride come into it?] *It is excluded. And on what principle? The keeping of the Law [of Moses] would not exclude it* [Agreed: be proud of your ability to keep the Law, if you think it important], *but faith does.* [Well, what's wrong with pride! Be proud of your accomplishments!] *For our argument [Paul's and God's, I presume!] is that a man is justified by faith* [and what meaning do you want us to take for the phrase “a man is justified”? Justified in existing?] *quite apart from success in keeping the law...* [Totally bananas: preaching not to have pride; preaching to be like sheep – so that a person will be “justified”, which is undefined. And with this garbage he proposes to be “placing law itself on a firmer footing”?!]

*If Abraham was justified by anything he had done, then he has a ground for pride. But he has no such ground before God; for what does Scripture say? “Abraham put his faith in God, and that faith was counted to him as righteousness.” Now if a man does a piece of work, his wages are not “counted” as a favor; they are paid as debt. But if without any work to his credit he simply puts his faith in him who acquits the guilty [Who wants to live in a society in which the guilty are acquitted? – and the innocent are punished for the guilty?!], then his faith is indeed “counted as righteousness” [No: it’s counted as stupidity and as disloyalty to humanity! Putting faith in someone (or some god) who acquits the guilty is pledging allegiance to a tyrant!] In the same sense, David speaks of the happiness of the man whom God “counts” as just, apart from any specific acts of justice: “Happy are they,” he says, “whose lawless deeds are forgiven [you bet that they’re glad to get away with their lawless deeds!], whose sins are buried away; happy is the man whose sins the Lord does not count against him.” [Again, you bet: happy the man who gets away with his crimes]...*

Here, Dear, let me interrupt Paul’s craziness to quote some from Graham Lawrence’s online book *The Fallible Gospels*, which I’ve already referenced. The following is from his Chapter XV:

Paul is really a dreadful cheat about this concept of faith, avoiding definition and moving the theological goalposts to suit his purpose. To the Jews, faith had been trust in their God to guide the destiny of their nation as the Chosen People. To Paul, faith meant completely uncritical acceptance of what Paul said God had done and what Paul said the crucifixion and resurrection meant. Faith essentially meant loyalty and obedience to him [Paul], not just trust in and devotion to God.

Paul cheats because by using the same word... ‘faith’ in entirely different things are identified and given the same status and significance. Paul points out that Abraham was ‘justified’ by God because of his faith (*Rom. 4: 1-5*); he could not have been justified by the Law of Moses because he pre-dated Moses. Paul’s logic is that you, too, are therefore justified by faith, made into a just person and given a new status in the eyes of God. The trouble is, he meant that you are justified by your faith in Jesus, as interpreted by Paul.

This contains a hole sufficiently large for me to drive a logical coach and four horses through without brushing the sides. Just as Abraham pre-dated Moses, he pre-dated Jesus. If Abraham was justified by faith before the crucifixion and resurrection, then you don’t need to know about or believe in the crucifixion and resurrection to be saved, in exactly the same way and for exactly the same reason that you do not need the Law of Moses.

Now, Dear, as you might imagine, I’ve had about all of “Saint” Paul’s insanity that I can take, but for reason that I trust will become clear, let me

try to push on a little further, now jumping from *Romans 5* to *Romans 7, 7*, where Paul continues with the following craziness.

*What follows? Is the law [of Moses] identical with sin? Of course not. But except through law, I should never have become acquainted with sin. For example, I should never have known what it was to covet, if the law had not said “Thou shalt not covet.”* [Apparently Paul never saw a child watching another child eating a candy – and coveting it!] *Through that commandment, sin found its opportunity, and produced in me all kinds of wrong desires.* [Not, of course, that the child just started salivating, watching the other child eating a candy, but instead it was sin, realized (no doubt) through some lawyer’s use of the word ‘covet’!]

*In the absence of law, sin is a dead thing.* [In the absence of lawyers, a child wouldn’t desire another child’s candy?!] *There was a time when, in the absence of law, I was fully alive* [that is, when he was a child, Paul didn’t start salivating when another child ate a candy in his presence]; *but when the commandment came* [and Paul became a lawyer, learning what ‘covet’ meant], *sin sprang to life* [I wanted the child’s candy] *and I died* [Riiiiiiight]. *The commandment which should have led to life* [oh!], *proved in my experience to lead to death* [maybe it was a poisonous candy!], *because sin found its opportunity in the commandment, seduced me* [to want the child’s candy], *and through the commandment killed me* [that is, because Paul wanted the other child’s candy, he’s gonna die].

*Therefore* [if your brain as is warped as Paul’s], *the law is in itself holy* [whatever that means!], *and the commandment is holy and just and good* [thou shalt not want the other child’s candy!]. *Are we to say then that this good thing was the death of me? By no means. It was sin that killed me* [not the poisonous candy!], *and thereby sin exposed its true character: it used a good thing* [the law or the candy?] *to bring about my death, and so* [if someone has a brain as warped as Paul’s], *through the commandment, sin became more sinful than ever* [which is a really neat trick; I guess it means that the candy also rotted Paul’s teeth].

Dear: can you imagine that this crap has been promoted for almost 2,000 years and is used as the basis for a religion?

No sane person could either write or accept such totally stupid concepts. In contrast to Paul’s idiocy, there’s an almost endless quantity of reliable data that supports the concept that people do, in fact, covet. For example, Dear, and as I’ve written before, if you hadn’t quenched your thirst for three days and you then saw someone with water, I guarantee that you’d covet the other person’s water; similarly, if you hadn’t eaten in a week and you saw someone else eating some food, again I guarantee that you’d again break the stupid commandment of Moses that says “Thou shalt not covet.” That is, what’s wrong is the stupid commandment: “Thou shalt not covet.”

Therefore, legal and judicial questions have nothing whatsoever to do about whether you “sinned” by “coveting”; the questions are: why and what did you do about your “covertness”?

But let me continue for a little while with Paul’s craziness.

*I discover this principle, then: that when I want to do the right, only the wrong is within my reach [what craziness!]. In my inmost self I delight in the law of God, but I perceive that there is in my bodily members a different law, fighting against the law that my reason approves and making me a prisoner under the law that is in my members, the law of sin. [It’s a sin to want a drink of water so you’ll survive?! That’s crazy!]*

*Miserable creature that I am, who is there to rescue me out of this body doomed to death? ... In a word then, I myself, subject to Gods’ law as a rational being [Paul claims that he’s rational?! Gulp.], am yet, in my unspiritual nature, a slave to the law of sin. [It’s a sin to want a drink of water when you’re dying of thirst. Riiiiight.]*

*It follows, my friends, that our lower nature has no claim upon us; we are not obliged to live on that level. If you do so, you must die. [And if you don’t get a drink, you’ll die a lot sooner!] But if by the Spirit you put to death all the base pursuits of the body, then you will live. [Wanting a drink of water when you’re dying of thirst is a “base pursuit”?! I guess Paul knows how to live without water!]*

*For those who are moved by the Spirit of God are sons of God... and if children, then heirs. We are Gods’ heirs and Christ’s fellow-heirs, if we share his sufferings now in order to share his splendor hereafter. [Whatever. Get on with it.]*

*Up to the present, we know, the whole created universe groans in all its parts as if in the pangs of childbirth. Not only so, but even we, to whom the Spirit is given as first fruits of the harvest to come, are groaning inwardly while we wait for God to make us his sons and set our whole body free. [Again, get on with it.]*

*The good which I want to do, I fail to do; but what I do is the wrong which is against my will; and if what I do is against my will, clearly it is no longer I who am the agent, but sin that has its lodging in me.*

Talk about a cop out! First, Dear: people always do what they want – it’s just that, many times, the “wants chosen” are selected with insufficient thought about consequences. But in the case of coveting water when you’re dying of thirst, then surely the consequences of not satisfying your wants are obvious to anyone – save a raving lunatic such as Paul. To Paul, wants (such as wanting air, water, food, companionship, love, accomplishments, etc., every item on Maslow’s pyramid of “wants”) are sins!

Paul was totally bonkers. And let me add, Dear, that if the army of the “butcher emperor” [of Rome] “Saint” Constantine, the subsequent murder of millions of “heavens” and “infidels”, plus now, a trillion dollar bankroll (of various Christian churches) didn’t back the craziness promoted by Paul, it would be thrown into the trash can of human stupidities! Leading me, of course, to more limericks.

*Although Paul said that Christ was divine,  
The atonement HE made I decline:  
Since I wasn’t there  
I really don’t care –  
The original sin wasn’t mine!*

*Although Paul called it God’s greatest grace  
It’s now blighted the whole human race:  
To forgive me and you,  
For sins we didn’t do,  
Smacks both justice and us in the face!*

*Although Jesus (according to Paul)  
In his death cancelled Adam’s great fall;  
Yet he couldn’t know  
A “yes” from a “no”,  
So Christ’s death cancelled nothing at all!*

*When I read what Saint Paul had to write,  
I conclude that the man wasn’t bright:  
That death came from sin  
Is not only thin,  
Like his logic it just isn’t right!*

*Though Paul’s phrasings were sometimes quite fine,  
Yet his logic crossed over the line:  
My alibi’s sound  
I wasn’t around –  
So keep passing the cup; it’s not mine!*

*If it helps, then I’ll grant you, Paul tried,  
But his brain, like some bacon, was fried:  
If plants die cause they’re bad,  
Then poor Paul was quite mad:  
The sole good done by Paul was he died!*

*As for Paul, only priests can pretend  
That his brain didn't drift round the bend:  
To say that we covet,  
Not cause we don't have it,  
But by law: it turns logic on end!*

*Although Paul had his fits of insanity,  
Yet he won over sin with his vanity:  
To avoid further schism  
Between Peter and Paul-ism  
Paul called his new creed Christianity!*

Sorry, Dear, but that's all I can take for now. I'll end with four points:

1. I haven't finished describing Paul's insanity – but I hope I've shown you enough, so that I can now continue to show you more injustices, immoralities, inhumanities... promoted in the NT. Later, in Yx (in a chapter entitled "Saint Paul's Insanities"), I'll complete presentation of my case that Paul's mind went way, way round the bend.
2. Already, though, I should add a summary point, namely, that it's not because Paul started from a crazy premiss (viz., that Jesus' death was "sacrificial") that I maintain that Paul was insane. Probably all of us, some time or other, adopt crazy premisses – although surely only a religious fundamentalist would adopt a premiss as crazy as Paul's! Instead, I maintain that Paul was insane in part because he never checked to determine if his premiss was consistent with other data (e.g., to explain why plants and animals die) and in part because he was unable to reason from his premiss in a logical manner – leading him to absurd conclusions (such as that the world was about to end), which in turn he also failed to test against data.
3. I also want to add, Dear, to urge you to be careful if you're thinking something similar to: "But in the gospels, Jesus said that the world was about to end and that he was required to die for the sins of the people." I urge you to take care to notice, on the one hand, that the NT gospels were written decades after Paul's letters AND by "Paul's people"; therefore, what the authors of the gospels claimed Jesus said could be (instead of what you've been told) a repeat not of what Jesus said but of what Paul said. And on the other hand, Dear, you may want to read all the Gnostic "gospels". I have, and nowhere in any of them are there any comments

that the world was about to end or that Jesus would die as “atonement” for people’s sins.

4. And then, Dear, saving my most important point for last: Isn’t it about time you got some exercise?!