

Qx18 – Crimes Against Humanity Promoted in the NT

Dear: In case you're getting lost in the quagmire (or worried that I am!), let me remind you about the path of "morality and justice" on which I've been trying to lead you – just as a good grandfather should! (☺) Granted that, a few chapters ago, I took a "detour" to show you some of the incoherencies and insanities in New Testament (NT) policies, but with the previous chapter, I returned to describing more NT violations of natural, personal, and interpersonal justice, especially those inequities associated with the clerics' damnable ideas about sins and prayers.

In their essences, all prayers are attempts to promote injustices, and all sins depend on the unjustified assumption that clerics have been given authority by some giant Jabberwock in the sky (or by the wind god, mountain god, volcano god...) to define rules, regulations, and laws to control people – for the benefit of the clerics. The title of the previous chapter was "Sins Against Humanity" – partly as a joke, because ideas of sins and prayers are so ridiculous that maybe the best way to criticize them is with ridicule.

In this chapter, I want to show you still more immoralities and injustices promoted in the NT, but in contrast to the case for sins and prayers (for which ridicule might be the best remedy) for the examples of this chapter, I think that the best recourse would be indict all clerics who promote the NT for "Crimes Against Humanity". Correspondingly, Dear, expect my mood to change: from making fun of the silliness in the NT, to becoming very angry at the damn clerics for all the harm they've done – and continue to do – especially to children.

And of course I realize that, at present in our country, it's essentially impossible to convict clerics for crimes against humanity. As I'll show you in the X-chapters (dealing with social justice and possibilities for peace and prosperity), our Supreme Court's interpretation of the First Amendment to our Constitution (dealing with religious freedom) is that any group is permitted to promote (for profit) any type and amount of religious ignorance, provided only that the promoters claim to "believe" that their ignorance is "true". Further, a "crime" is still defined to be only whatever those in power define it to be.

Yet, there's hope. At present, 10 to 20% of the people in this country are secular humanists – and we consider it to be a crime to indoctrinate children with such blatant ignorance as is promoted in all “holy books”. As well, I'm certain that eventually the majority in this country and throughout the world will agree with Schopenhauer (1788–1860):

No child under the age of fifteen should receive instruction in subjects which may possibly be the vehicle of serious error, such as philosophy, religion, or any other branch of knowledge where it is necessary to take large views; because wrong notions imbibed early can seldom be rooted out, and of all the intellectual faculties, judgment is the last to arrive at maturity.

Meanwhile, until more people realize the harm clerics do by promoting their ignorance, perhaps the best that can be hoped for is that people will find ways to sue the clerics for damages. In that regard, most welcome are the recent successful lawsuits against clerics for raping children's bodies; maybe soon, someone will successfully sue the damnable clerics for raping children's minds. No doubt it'll require multiple years of efforts by many people, but I'd hope that, eventually, all organized religions will be sued for every penny that they've conned from people (probably summing to trillions of dollars), with the money returned to the people and with all clerics warned that, in the future, they'll be personally liable for promoting unverified and unverifiable religious balderdash.

But that's only a hope of mine about the future; for now, I'll turn to the task of showing you what I maintain are crimes against humanity promoted in the NT. In particular, what I want to show you in this chapter are some details of why I maintain that all Christian (and Mormon) clerics should be charged with such crimes, just as I maintain that all Muslim and Jewish clerics should be similarly charged.

And in case you don't see the damages that, in particular, Christian (and Mormon) clerics have done and continue to do, then, Dear, consider some analogies. Thus,

- Suppose that a group of “skinheads” routinely met to promote hate of homosexuals, quoting such filth from the NT as “Saint” Paul's ignorance “males behave indecently with males, and are paid in their own person the fitting wage of such perversion” and with the group of skinheads probably claiming (as some idiot clerics have recently claimed) that AIDS is God's “fit justice” for “such perversion”, or

- Suppose that a group of “neo-Nazis” routinely met to promote hate of Jewish people, quoting such filth from the NT as “Saint” John’s: “**Your father** [Jesus allegedly said to a group of Jews who didn’t believe that he was the son of God] **is the devil**”, or
- Suppose that KKK members routinely met to promote reintroduction of slavery, quoting such filth from the NT as “Saint” Paul’s idiocy: “**Slaves, obey your earthly masters with fear and trembling, single-mindedly...**”, or
- Suppose that a group of “religious freaks” routinely met to promote hate of nonbelievers, quoting such filth as “Saint” Peter’s: “**These men [unbelievers] are like brute beasts, born in the course of nature to be caught and killed.**”

If such occurred, Dear, I’d advocate that such “hate mongers” should be charged with crimes against humanity. And if our laws are currently inadequate to yield a conviction, then I’d encourage people who are damaged by such “hate mongers” to sue them for damages (and I would hope that the awards for damages would be so financially crippling that the perpetrators would be forced to abandon the propagation of their hate).

I’d similarly encourage the indictment of all, current Christian (and Mormon) clerics who promote the NT – but not “simply” for the hideous stuff quoted above, but instead, for much broader crimes against humanity. That is, they should be indicted not just for promoting hate of various groups, but for the damages they continue to do to the minds of especially children, as well as to those adults whose mental capabilities are obviously subnormal.

If I were forced to provide a concise description of my indictments, I’d charge the clerics responsible for promoting the NT with what I call the “crime” of “Corrupting Immature Minds”. If I were permitted (or required) to describe my indictments in more detail, I’d first group them in the following three categories:

- 1) Corrupting immature minds by perpetuating ignorant ideas about the existence of heaven, thereby causing immature people to adopt misguided goals,
- 2) Corrupting immature minds with ignorance, especially by promoting the idiotic idea that the world is (or was!) about to end, thereby causing immature people to adopt misguided priorities, and
- 3) Corrupting immature minds by preaching fear, promoting injustices, and perpetuating the hideous ideas of hell, thereby (among other consequences) causing immature people to inflict horrible harm on other humans.

I'd mention, in addition, that in every case, the damnable clerics perpetrated such crimes primarily for their own power and profit – or because of their own stupidity.

But enough of the “generalities” of that “introduction”. Now, I'll turn to some details about my criminal indictments against all Christian (and Mormon) clerics, starting with:

Indictment #1

All Christian (and Muslim and Mormon) Clerics are Charged with Corrupting Immature Minds by Perpetuating the Ignorant Idea of the Existence of Heaven, Thereby Causing Immature People to Adopt Misguided Goals and Thereby Causing a Huge Number of People an Enormous Amount of Harm.

I've chosen to address this indictment first, Dear, because there's at least a chance to have a little fun with it! To do so, all that's needed is look at what the crazy clerics responsible for the NT wrote about their heaven. I'll show you some of it, below, and if such craziness doesn't get you smiling, then maybe you should check out to see if you have the correct grandfather!

Seriously though, Dear, if the clerics offer you heaven (provided that you jump through all their hoops, of course including paying them 10% of your before-taxes income), then don't you think it would be reasonable for you to request (and responsible for them to provide) an adequate description of what they're offering? I mean, how about a “product brochure” or similar?!

Well, the only “brochure” that the Christian clerics provide is the Bible; so, what does it say about heaven? First, unsurprisingly, there's essentially nothing about heaven in the OT – save that it's the place through which the birds fly, from which the rains come, and where the gods (not just God!) reside. This is “unsurprising”, because prior to the Jewish clerics adopting some of Zarathustra's ideas about heaven and hell, they apparently promoted the concept that, if the Israelites obeyed them, then the people would prosper here, on Earth – without any promise of an “after-life” in some “happy hunting grounds”. Later, some Jews (the Pharisee sect) decided that they'd prefer to dream that they'd be able to live forever in heaven, and therefore, that idea does appear in the OT, but as far as I know, the majority of Jewish clerics no longer promote such a fantasy.

The Christian NT, however, is loaded with nonsense about heaven. Thus, from an internet search through the NT, from the 270 (!) “hits” for the word ‘heaven’, the following picture of heaven emerges.

- It’s populated by “**the poor in spirit**” (*Matthew 5, 3*) and “**those who are persecuted because of righteousness**” (*Matthew 5, 10*) – with the fundamental definition of “righteousness” being “obey the clerics”!
- Dwellers in heaven receive “**great rewards**” (*Matthew 5, 12*), but not those who “**do acts of righteousness before men, to be seen by them**” (*Matthew 6, 1*).
- Apparently there’s a “pecking order” in heaven (*Matthew 5, 19*): “**Anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever practices and teaches these commands will be called great in the kingdom of heaven.**”
- There is, however, a bit of confusion concerning the previous point, for at *Matthew 7, 21*, the clerics’ Jesus states: “**Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of heaven, but only he who does the will of my Father who is in heaven.**” This would seem to contradict “**anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments... will be called least in... heaven**”, because upon breaking a commandment (i.e., disobeying “**the will of my Father**”), it would seem that the person shouldn’t be there. Whatever.
- And unfortunately there’s another problem with the class distinction in heaven. According to *Matthew 11, 11*: “**Among those born of women there has not risen anyone greater than John the Baptist; yet he who is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he.**” So, assuming that John the Baptist was one of the good guys, either people improve a lot when they go to heaven or no one’s there!
- According to *Matthew 8, 11*, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are there (in spite of their hideous behavior while on Earth, lying, pimping their wives, cheating their brothers out of their inheritances, and so on), and are feasting (which probably would require that they have mouths, teeth, and so on).
- The last point, however, seems to contradict *John 3, 13*, which states: “**No one has ever gone into heaven except the one who came from heaven – the Son of Man.**” So, how did Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob get there? Whatever.
- It also contradicts what Paul wrote. According to him (*1 Corinthians 15, 50*), the dead are “**raised**” into different bodies because “**flesh and blood can never possess the kingdom of God, and the perishable cannot possess immortality**” – which would then make it rather difficult to recognize anyone – and for Abraham et al. to be feasting!

- But then, be aware not only that Paul provided not even a sliver of data to support his speculation but also that he stated (at *1 Corinthians 15, 36*): “**The seed you sow does not come to life unless it has first died**” – demonstrating not only that he didn’t know where people go after they die (i.e., their elements are recycled in the biosphere and geosphere) but also that he didn’t have a clue about how plants grow!
- According to Paul, there are multiple levels of heaven, although he admits to some uncertainty about whether or not a person’s body remains intact: “**I know a man in Christ who fourteen years ago was caught up to the third heaven. Whether it was in the body or out of the body I do not know.**” (*2 Corinthians 12, 2*)
- Also, the following analogies are provided to describe what heaven is “like”.
Matthew 13, 24: “**like a man who sowed good seed in his field...**” [Heaven is like a man?!]; *Matthew 13, 31*: “**like a mustard seed, which a man took and planted in his field...**” [Heaven is like a mustard seed?!]; *Matthew 13, 33*: “**like yeast that a woman took and mixed into a large amount of flour until it worked all through the dough...**” [Heaven is like yeast? Yuk!]; *Matthew 13, 44*: “**like treasure hidden in a field...**” [What? Heaven is like having a lot of money, and yet, love of money is claimed to be the root of all evil?!]; *Matthew 13, 45*: “**like a net that was let down into the lake and caught all kinds of fish...**” [Now that seems more reasonable: like a net – to catch fools!]; *Matthew 13, 47*: “**like a merchant looking for fine pearls...**” [Heaven is like a shopkeeper?]; *Matthew 18, 23*: “**like a king who wanted to settle accounts with his servants...**” [What are these guys smoking? What could be less heavenly than a king?]; *Matthew 22, 2*: “**like a king who prepared a wedding banquet for his son...**” [What’s with the royalty hang-up?] But actually, none of those analogies do anything for me. What I’d really like to know is whether or not there’s adequate parking, indoor plumbing, electrical connections (110 or 220V?), TV, and high-speed internet connections, including Wi-Fi!
- But then, maybe *Luke 10, 20* gives a hint of what’s available in heaven: “**However, do not rejoice that the spirits submit to you, but rejoice that your names are written in heaven.**” So, written records are kept – suggesting that there are no computers in heaven, let alone decent internet connections.
- Those who live in heaven behave like children: “**I tell you the truth, unless you change and become like little children, you will never enter the kingdom of heaven**” (*Matthew 18, 3*), “**Therefore, whoever humbles himself like this child is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven**” (*Matthew 18, 4*), “**Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them, for the kingdom of heaven belongs to such as these**” (*Matthew 19, 14*). What I wonder is, did any of the clerics who cooked up this garbage have any children? Who ever met a humble child? Who hasn’t been horrified by the cruelty of children to other children? But most children are trusting; they can be easily duped – so is that what the clerics are actually promoting: be as naïve – as easily duped – as children?

- Children already have their angels in heaven: “See that you do not look down on one of these little ones. For I tell you that their angels in heaven always see the face of my Father in heaven” (*Matthew 18, 10*). So, if there are now several billion children in the world, that means there are several billion angels now in heaven, who “see the face of my Father” – which must mean either that the place is plastered with God’s posters or that in heaven, there’s sure one humongous TV screen!
- However, you really shouldn’t set your hopes on heaven, because according to the clerics’ Jesus, heaven is only temporary: “Heaven and earth will pass away, but my words will never pass away” (*Matthew 24, 35*). Maybe he saved his words on a really, really, good compact disc – but he may want to check if there’s a bug in his program, because something seems to be really wrong: how can the clerics promise ‘immortality’ in heaven when Jesus allegedly said that “heaven... will pass away”?
- Angels aren’t married (the same as on Earth, as every young man knows!) and when singles die, they still don’t get married: “When the dead rise, they will neither marry nor be given in marriage; they will be like the angels in heaven.” Why angels don’t want to get married isn’t mentioned; maybe they’re still looking for heavenly partners.
- Apparently there are thrones in heaven (so maybe that’s what all that royalty stuff was about): “When the Son of Man comes in his glory, and all the angels with him, he will sit on his throne in heavenly glory” (*Matthew 25, 31*). How sitting on a throne could be “glorious” isn’t mentioned; I assume the author never tried it. Others either get chairs or sit on something else: “And God raised us up with Christ and seated us with him in the heavenly realms in Christ Jesus” (*Ephesians 2, 6*). What I’d really like to know, however, is if there are any good walking trails, and I know some grandchildren who would probably want to know if there are any good trees to climb, trails to hike, bikes to ride, and pools in which to swim. Sitting around all day would be boring as hell.
- Heaven is ruled by various “authorities” (*Ephesians 3, 10*): “His intent was that now, through the church, the manifold wisdom of God should be made known to the rulers and authorities in the heavenly realms...” How any place could be heaven that has rulers and authorities (except, of course, for the rulers and authorities) isn’t addressed.
- In heaven is to be found the long-lost “ark of his covenant” as well as “God’s temple” (*Revelation 11, 19*), cause there (doncha know) “there are neither moths nor rust and no thieves” (*Matthew 6, 20*). In addition, inheritances “never perish, spoil or fade” (*1 Peter 1, 4*). As well, “treasures” are inexhaustible (*Luke 12, 33*) – unless of course you treasure not being a slave: “And masters, treat your slaves in the same way. Do not threaten them, since you know that he who is both their Master and yours is in heaven...” (*Ephesians 6, 9*); “Masters, provide your slaves with what is right and fair, because you know that you also have a Master in heaven” (*Colossians 4, 1*). How anyone could be considered to be in heaven and simultaneously be a slave isn’t addressed.

- In heaven, unfortunately, there is additional evil (besides slavery): “For our struggle is not against flesh and blood, but against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms” (*Ephesians 6, 12*). Gees, that would serve as a great title for a book: *On the Evils in Heaven!* How there can be “spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms” isn’t addressed.
- And as might be expected, this evil in heaven has led to war there, too: “And there was war in heaven. Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, and the dragon and his angels fought back” (*Revelation 12, 7*). The question of how the dragon got into heaven isn’t addressed.
- Apparently the wars in heaven (against the angels of the dragon) are fought on horseback (*Revelation 19, 11*): “I saw heaven standing open and there before me was a white horse, whose rider is called Faithful and True. With justice he judges and makes war... The armies of heaven were following him, riding on white horses and dressed in fine linen, white and clean.” So that just goes to show: my German shepherd Heidi will make it to heaven! After all, although horses are good, Heidi is... And by the way, for some unspecified reason, tanks, submarines, fighter jets, aircraft carriers, long-range bombers, ballistic missiles, etc. aren’t used in these “heavenly wars”. But what I really wonder about is: which slaves are required to keep the stables clean and does Satan offer better positions in hell?
- But except for soldiers, apparently there’s no work in heaven: “Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord; from now on... they will rest from their labor...” (*Revelation 14, 13*) – which must mean that the smell from the stables is really terrible! Too bad that the clown who wrote this didn’t realize that any place without work (even cleaning stables!) would be hell. As someone else wrote (here paraphrased): “It’s amazing how many people seek an eternity of ease in heaven, when hell for them is nothing to do on a rainy Sunday afternoon.”
- In addition, apparently heaven is a hellishly noisy place: “After this I heard what sounded like the roar of a great multitude in heaven shouting: ‘Hallelujah! Salvation and glory and power belong to our God’...” (*Revelation 19, 1*). “And I heard a sound from heaven like the roar of rushing waters and like a loud peal of thunder. The sound I heard was like that of harpists playing their harps” (*Revelation 14, 2*). Which must mean that grandparents never go to heaven – because if there’s anything they can’t stand, it’s too much noise!

Anyway, Dear, as far as I can make it out, the above is the “official” description of heaven, as revealed to the Christian clerics by God almighty himself and faithfully recorded by the clerics in the error-free Holy Bible itself.

Personally, I wouldn't want even to visit the place. Nothing productive to do – save maybe to join in the war to fight the angels of the dragon. But even this war would be boring, with no threat to one's survival. Apparently the warriors don't even get their clean, white, fine-linen uniforms dirty! As for the childlike wimps who reportedly live there, bowing and scraping to their mighty master, Mark Twain's comment comes to mind: “[Go to heaven for the climate; hell for the company!](#)” Come to think about it, it's amazing how closely the alleged wimps who live in heaven resemble the clerics who provided its description. Hmmmmmmm...

Actually, if I had my choice of the type of heaven I might “buy into”, I'd be more inclined to choose the version described by the Gnostics' Jesus in the *Gospel of Thomas* (from the Nag Hammadi Library). Thus, when the Gnostics' Jesus was asked “[When will the kingdom \[of heaven\] come?](#)”, he answered (*Thomas* 113):

“It will not come by watching for it. It will not be said, ‘Look here!’ or ‘Look, there!’ Rather, the Father's kingdom is spread out upon the Earth [now], and people don't see it.”

Further, if there ever was a historical Jesus, then the above quotation from the *Gospel of Thomas* may be close to what he actually said – rather than some of the atrocious stuff that the Christian (and therefore Mormon) clerics attribute to him – because it's also close to what's in the NT at *Luke 17, 20*:

[The Pharisees asked him, “When will the kingdom of God come?” He said, “You cannot tell by observation when the kingdom of God comes. There will be no saying, ‘Look, here it is!’ or ‘There it is!’; for in fact the kingdom of God is among you.”](#)¹

In any event, Dear, my own assessment of all data available to me is that the only heaven is the one that's here and now, in sunrises, strawberry milkshakes, the smiles of certain grandchildren – and even in doing what I can, to fight the “angels of the dragon” (i.e., the clerics), here, on Earth – such as by charging them with crimes against humanity, e.g., for perpetuating the silly idea of “heaven”, without possessing a shred of data to support their speculations. Which then brings me to my attempt to formulate criminal charges against all clerics who promote such junk.

¹ To which The New English Bible adds, as a footnote, the following alternative translations of the final clause: “[for in fact the kingdom of God is within you](#)” or “[for in fact the kingdom of God is within your grasp](#)”, or “[for suddenly the kingdom of God will be among you.](#)”

In the above listing, I jokingly commented that the NT's *Ephesians* contains the ingredients for a great title of a book: *On the Evils in Heaven*. But seriously, a far more important book should be written (if it hasn't been, already) entitled: *On the Evils of Heaven*. The nature of this evil was brilliantly summarized by the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900) as follows:

If one shifts the center of gravity of life out of life into the “Beyond” – into nothingness – one has deprived life as such of its center of gravity. The great lie of personal immortality destroys all rationality, all naturalness of instinct – all that is salutary, all that is life-furthering.

Please read that summary again, Dear, and think about it for a while.

And actually, it's not just a single book, but millions of them that could and should be written entitled *On the Evils of Heaven*. Please, Dear, read again what Nietzsche wrote and think again about the meaning of his statement “the great lie of personal immortality destroys all rationality, all naturalness of instinct.” And while you think of your mother, and she could think of hers, I could think of mine. Did a day pass when they didn't divert their thoughts from reality by drifting off into dreams of their immortality? How many times, when they could have helped us gain some wisdom, did they instead attempt to addict us in a delusion on which the drug-dealing clerics got them hooked?

Or, Dear, if that's too personal – or too painful – then think of the most recent “suicide bomber” who blew himself (or herself) into bits for the “Jihad”, convinced that such evil guaranteed entry into an imagined paradise. How many millions of people have similarly, if not so dramatically, destroyed their lives in their delusions of immortality? Then, Dear, please consider still again what Nietzsche wrote: “If one shifts the center of gravity of life out of life into the ‘Beyond’ – into nothingness – one has deprived life as such of its center of gravity.”

You can find many example in the NT wherein the clerical authors promote adoption of their misguided goal; below, I'll show you just three.

One is at *Luke 14, 12*, where the clerical author had enough sense to recognize that people sought happiness, but urged people to seek their happiness only when they're dead. They have their Jesus say:

* Go to other chapters via

“When you are having a party for lunch or supper, do not invite your friends, your brothers, or other relations, or your rich neighbors; they will only ask you back again, and so you will be repaid. But when you give a party, ask the poor, the crippled, the lame, and the blind, **and so find happiness** [bold type added]. For they have no means of repaying you, but you will be repaid on the day when good men rise from the dead.”

My second example suggests that “Saint” Paul also saw that people sought happiness. At *Acts 20, 35* he reportedly said (claiming that Jesus had said it) that “**Happiness lies more in giving than in receiving.**” But whoever wrote *Acts* (probably the same unknown cleric who wrote *Luke*), badly misrepresented both the authorship of the quotation (as I mentioned before, it was the Greek reporter Thucydides, not Jesus) and the idea behind it. He used the quotation to argue that people should then be generous – but he missed the point that, then, the donator’s purpose would be his or her own happiness, rather than recognizing (as dolphins apparently do) that helping others has survival benefit for their own genes.

And my third example of how the clerics promote the adoption of their misguided goal of heaven is from the *Fist Letter of James (1, 25)*:

But the man who looks closely into the perfect law, the law that makes us free, and who lives in its company, does not forget what he hears, but acts upon it; and that is the man who by acting **will find happiness.**

The author doesn’t recognize what he sees, but sees that the goal is happiness. To then see that our feelings of happiness are just “signals” telling us that we think we’re making progress toward our goals would, of course, be too much to expect of idiot clerics – instead, they were fixated on the goal of getting eternal life in heaven (or getting their pockets full of the people’s money), thereby polluting the lives of literally billions of people.

And thus, Dear, maybe you see the nature of what I’m certain should be a criminal indictment against all Christian (and Muslim and Mormon) clerics: on behalf of humanity, they should be charged with the crime against humanity of promoting the shifting of “**the center of gravity of life out of life... into nothingness.**”

That’s what I meant by wording the above Indictment #1 as I did:

All Christian (and Muslim and Mormon) Clerics are hereby Charged with Corrupting Immature Minds by Perpetuating the Ignorant Idea of the Existence of Heaven, Thereby Causing Immature People to Adopt Misguided Goals, and Thereby Causing a Huge Number of People an Enormous Amount of Harm.

Further, not only is Nietzsche's assessment a powerful summary of my first indictment, it's also a penetrating introduction to my second indictment, which I'll summarize as follows:

Indictment #2:

All Christian (and Mormon) Clerics are Charged with Corrupting Immature Minds with Ignorance, Especially for Promoting the Idiotic Idea that the World Is (or Was!) about to End, thereby Causing Immature People to Adopt Misguided Priorities and Thereby Causing a Huge Number of People an Enormous Amount of Harm.

And yes, Dear, I realize that the above indictment is a rather “amorphous” (viz., “without any clear shape, form, or structure”), but the problem isn't that the indictment can't be more specific (as I'll try to show you below), it's that it's so huge!

As an indication of the magnitude of this indictment, consider the following summary given by Somerset Maugham (1874–1965), to which I've added both the ellipsis (viz., the “...”) and the notes in brackets [to try to get you to read the quotation more slowly – for reasons I trust you'll notice]:

I couldn't but surmise that the devil [Satan], looking at the cruel wars that Christianity has occasioned, the persecutions, the tortures Christian has inflicted on Christian, the unkindness, the hypocrisy, the intolerance... must consider the balance sheet with complacency. And when he [Satan] remembers that it [Christianity (and therefore Mormonism)] has laid upon mankind the bitter burden of the sense of sin that has darkened the beauty of the starry night and cast a baleful shadow on the passing pleasures of a world to be enjoyed, he must chuckle as he murmurs: give the devil his due.

Now, Dear, I don't want to pursue the suggestion that the devil (or the dragon) has been behind the creation of the NT or to comment on for whom the Christian (and Mormon) clerics have actually been working, all along. When you read books by Somerset Maugham, Dear, be prepared to just “go with the flow”!

Instead, below I'll just list some examples from the NT, under the subtitles listed, to illustrate specifics of my second indictment against the clerics.

Corrupting the Essence of Life

I've shown you this example before, Dear, but it's worth repeating – and rejecting – again! It's from *1 John 2, 15*:

Do not set your hearts on the godless world or anything in it. 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, spring not from the Father but from the godless world. And that world is passing away with all its allurements, but he who does God's will stands for evermore.

The above has now been standing for almost 2,000 years as one of the dumbest statements ever recorded. In my view, anyone who promotes such idiocy commits a horrible and unforgivable crime against humanity. To summarize, I'll just repeat what Somerset Maugham wrote:

And when he [Satan] remembers that it [Christianity]... has darkened the beauty of the starry night and cast a baleful shadow on the passing pleasures of a world to be enjoyed, he must chuckle as he murmurs: give the devil his due.

Corrupting the Concept of Love

As illustrated by dolphins helping one another, love among members of the same species promotes their survival (and therefore the survival of the species). Consequently, love among humans is (in Nietzsche's words) "life-furthering" and should be viewed – and promoted – as such. For contrast, consider the idiocy promoted at *1 John 4 & 5*:

Dear friends [viz., fellow Christians] let us love one another, because love is from God. [A dolphin's instinct to help a wounded dolphin is from God rather than its DNA?!] Everyone who loves is a child of God [What's God got to do with it?!] and knows God [Hello? How about the possibility that we (as well as dolphins!) "know" to love one another, because the knowledge to help members of our species is programmed into our genes by natural selection?!] but the unloving know nothing of God [Therefore, given that the 'unloving' don't help but hinder others, it follows that all clerics "know nothing of God"!]. For God is love [Riiiiiiight]; and his love was disclosed to us in this, that he sent his only son into the world to bring us life. [Riiiiiiight. And the data supporting this suggestion are where?] The love I speak of is not our love for God [I should hope not!], but the love he showed to us in sending his Son as the remedy for the defilement of our sins. [Or do you mean as a method to start up your con game to leech off productive people?]

* Go to other chapters via

If God thus loved us, dear friends [Rest assured that he didn't!], we in turn are bound to love one another. [And is that why you clerics order the killing of other clerics who set up competing con games?] Though God has never been seen by any man [Shucks, I wonder why. Have you ever considered the obvious reason?!], God himself dwells in us if we love one another [and the data base that supports that speculation is what?]; his love is brought to perfection within us [A scary prospect if ever I heard one!]. . .

God is love [Riiiiiiight]; he who dwells in love is dwelling in God, and God in him. [Words without meaning!] This is for us the perfection of love [To what does the pronoun 'this' refer? To what's coming or to what's already stated?], to have confidence on the day of judgment [It's easy to have confidence, especially for con artists, but having knowledge is rather more difficult!] and this we can have, because even in this world we are as he is. [Christians are gods?!] There is no room for fear in love; perfect love banishes fear. [What nonsense! The author must never have had any children (or, at least, never any children that he loved); otherwise, he couldn't possibly have written "perfect love banishes fear"; parental love, which is probably about as "perfect" as love can be, is loaded with fears!] For fear brings with it the pains of judgment, and anyone who is afraid has not attained to love in its perfection. [What total rot! Only scared little god-lovers have such "pains of judgment"; love of children brings with it fear of their being harmed, e.g., with their bodies and/or their minds raped by ignorant clerics of the world.] We love because he loved us first. [Gimme a break!] But if a man says, 'I love God', while hating his brother, he is a liar. If he does not love the brother whom he has seen, it cannot be that he loves God whom he has not seen [This guy is bananas! How about the possibility that I hate the meaningless idea of god and love my brother – and it is out of love for others that I hate the idiotic idea of god!].”

Sorry, Dear, but it's really quite difficult for me to continue to read such idiocy. Unfortunately, however, it continues, as I'll now demonstrate.

Corrupting Language, Logic, and Therefore People's Minds

Hundreds if not thousands of examples are available in the Bible of the criminal use of language. I'll show you many examples in later chapters. Here, as just a few examples, consider the following potential bumper sticker derived from one of the quotations above:

GOD IS LOVE. LOVE IS BLIND. THEREFORE...

Or maybe better, although it's longer (maybe it could be posted on the back-window of one's car!):

GOD IS LOVE... But
‘LOVE’ HAS MANY MEANINGS,
‘IS’ HAS FOUR, AND ‘GOD’ HAS NONE!

As another example, consider the logical “disconnect” of two of the quotations already given from *The First Letter of John*: (i) “**Anyone who loves the world is a stranger to the Father’s love**” (*1 John 2, 15*) and (ii) “[God’s] love was disclosed to us in this, that he sent his only son into the world to bring us life” (*1 John 4, 10*). Now, if it were so (but of course it’s not!) that God gave us so many “presents” (the world, life, “dominion” over all life, etc.), then it would follow that we should show gratitude for these “presents”, e.g., by looking after them, i.e., by showing love to them. Thereby, “**anyone who loves the world**” would be, not “**a stranger to the Father’s love**”, but respectful of the Father’s love!

Confusing the Hell out of (or into) Simple-Minded People

Sorry about the title of this category, Dear, but – well, feel free to choose a better one. I’ve already spent a chapter and more on the incoherencies and double binds of Christianity; here, I’ll mention just a single example that can be derived from the above quoted idiocy in the *First Letter of John*; i.e.,

Do not set your hearts on the godless world or anything in it. Anyone who loves the world is a stranger to the Father’s love.

I’ve already commented on the idiocy of the above statement. Meanwhile, though, it’s only the clerics who reported that its origin was their Jesus. In contrast, the Gnostics had their Jesus promote an entirely different perspective. Thus, compare the above with the following from *The Apocryphon of James* (another of the “gospels” found in the Egyptian desert near Nag Hammadi in 1945, and to which I’ve added the underlining):

Hearken to the word, understand knowledge, love life, and no one will persecute you, nor will anyone oppress you, other than... yourselves.

How can anyone make sense of the policies promoted by “the real Jesus” when different “reporters” give diametrically opposed descriptions of such policies?! One tells us to hate life; the other tells us to love life!

Corrupting People's Ability to Plan for the Future by Promoting the Speculation that the World Is (or Was!) About to End

Should anyone desire to argue the case, I'd tend to agree that, on its surface, promoting the (data-less) speculation that the world is (or was!) about to end is so silly that it shouldn't be classified as a crime against humanity. It seems to be more mischief than 'malfeasance' (viz., "**wrong or illegal conduct, especially in politics or the civil service**"), i.e., at worst, 'misfeasance' (viz., "**acting improperly or illegally in performing an action that is in itself lawful**"). That is, it's not quite so bad as inappropriately yelling "Fire!" in a crowded theater, but given the limited mental capabilities of many people and given the apparent desire of so many people to follow some authority figure, then having "religious leaders" (i.e., chief con-artists) telling their "flocks of followers" that the world is about to end has had horrible consequences.

And let me add, perhaps incidentally, that I expect it was Paul who first promoted the speculation that the world was about to end. I doubt that it was promoted by any historical Jesus (even though the synoptic gospels suggest he did), because I found no hints of this idea in the Gnostic gospels. Also, I don't trust anything the NT writers attributed to John the Baptist. I suspect that "Saint" Paul was the source of this "end-time speculation", because it's consistent with his idea (which I'll go into in some detail later) that something significant had happened with the death of Jesus. I suspect that the clerics who wrote the NT (viz., Paul's people) then concocted the lie that Jesus was the one who first promoted the idea.

In any event, the data-less speculation about the imminent end of the world can be found in many places in the NT, especially in Paul's letters. Below I'll show you some examples, not only of the idea that the world was about to end but also of the resulting horrible policies that followed from such a crazy assumption.

My first example (of many that could be chosen) starts at *1 Corinthians 7, 29*, which over flows with idiocy:

What I [Paul] mean, my friends, is this: the time we live in will not last long. [Which could mean that Paul was saying that none of us lives very long, but as you'll see at the end of this quoted paragraph, it's clear that he's expressing his conviction that the world is about to end.] **While it lasts, married men should be as if they had no wives** [How's that for a "Christian family value"?!], **mourners should be as if they had nothing to grieve them** [Which seems to be the nearest anyone else in the NT says

something consistent with the idiotic idea attributed to Jesus at Matthew 8, 22 “**Leave the dead to bury their dead**” – which, as far as I can tell, is one of many examples of the clerics who wrote the NT (who did so after Paul had written his letters) having Jesus preach what Paul taught, which of course, is the exact opposite from what clerics promote, i.e., that Paul preached what Jesus taught!], **the joyful as if they did not rejoice** [Crazy!], **buyers must not count on keeping what they buy, nor those who use the world’s wealth on using it to the full. For the whole frame of this world is passing away. I [Paul] want you to be free from anxious care.** [Like little children!] **The unmarried man cares for the Lord’s business; his aim is to please the Lord.** [Save, of course, for those unmarried men who...!] **But the married man cares for worldly things; his aim is to please his wife; and he has a divided mind.** [Save, of course, for those married men who...!] **The unmarried or celibate woman cares for the Lords’ business; her aim is to be dedicated to him in body as in spirit** [Save, of course, for those unmarried women who...!]; **but the married woman cares for worldly things; her aim is to please her husband** [Save, of course...!].

How’s that for an “official” family value, i.e., don’t marry! And yes, Dear, I agree that if people adopted what Paul preached it would be the end of the human race. Consequently, it seems to me that if one is to understand what otherwise seems to be Paul’s total insanity, then it’s essential to assume that Paul (in his insanity!) was totally convinced that the world was about to end.

And although it’s not necessary to see the cause of crazy policies to conclude that they’re crazy, I’ll repeat my suggestion of what might have happened. After “Saint” Paul concluded that the world was about to end, I expect that other clerics then adopted this same craziness. For example, there’s “Saint” John’s bizarre statement at *1 John 2, 18*:

My children, this is the last hour! You were told that Antichrist was to come, and now many antichrists have appeared; which proves to us that this is indeed the last hour.

I expect that, next, the clerics who wrote the NT concocted policies consistent with the wild idea that the world was about to end, and then, fabricated the lies that Jesus had promoted policies consistent with this craziness.

But whatever were the machinations that led to the wild speculation that the world was about to end, the result was an astounding group of idiotic policies. To show you some of them, I’ll quote from the 1909 book by M.M. Mangasarian entitled *The Truth About Jesus: Is He A Myth?* (which I’ve quoted and referenced before and which you can find on the internet).

* Go to other chapters *via*

I was waiting for transportation at the corner of one of the principal streets of Chicago, the other day, when, looking about me, I saw the tremendous buildings which commerce and wealth have reared in our midst. On one hand was a savings bank, on the other a colossal national bank, and up and down the street a thousand equally solid and substantial buildings, devoted to the interests of commerce and civilization. To bring out and emphasize the wide breach between the man who preached the Sermon on the Mount, and progressive and aggressive, busy and wealthy, modern Chicago, I took the words of Jesus and mentally inscribed them upon the walls of these buildings

Upon the savings bank – and a savings bank represents economy, frugality, self-sacrifice, self-restraint – the desire of the people to provide for the uncertainties of the future, to lay by something for the education of their children, for the maintenance of their families when they themselves have ceased to live – I printed upon the facade of this institution, figuratively speaking, these words of... Jesus: *Take no thought of the morrow, for the morrow will take care of itself.* And upon the imposing front of the national bank, I wrote: *Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth.* If we followed these teachings, would not our industrial and social life sink at once to the level of the stagnating Ascetics?

Pursuing this comparison between Jesus and modern life, I inscribed upon the handsome churches whose pews bring enormous incomes, and on the palatial residences of Bishops with salaries of from twenty-five to a hundred thousand dollars [Dear: Whoever put this on the internet added: “This was 1909 folks! EFF”] these words: *How hardly shall a rich man enter into the kingdom of Heaven, and It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of Heaven.* In plain words, the gospel condemns wealth, and cries, *Woe unto you rich, and Sell all thou hast and give it to the poor,* which, by the way, would only be shifting the temptation of wealth from one class to another. Buckle was nearer the truth, and more modern in spirit, when he ascribed the progress of man to the pursuit of truth and the acquisition of wealth.

But let us apply the teachings of Jesus to still other phases of modern life. Some years ago our Cuban neighbors appealed to the United States for protection against the cruelty and tyranny of Spanish rule. We sent soldiers over to aid the oppressed and down-trodden people in the Island. Now, suppose, instead of sending iron-clads and admirals – Schley, Sampson and Dewey – we had advised the Cubans *to resist not evil and to submit to the powers that be,* or suppose the General of our army, or the Secretary of our navy, had counseled seriously our soldiers to remember the words of Jesus when fighting the Spaniards: *If a man smite thee on one cheek,* etc.

Write upon our halls of justice and court-houses and statute books, and on every lawyer's desk, these solemn words of Jesus: *He that taketh away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.* Introduce into our Constitution, the pride and bulwark of our liberties, guaranteeing religious freedom unto all – these words of Paul: *If any man preach any other gospel than that which I have preached unto you, let him be*

accursed. Think of placing nearly fifty millions of our American population under a curse! Tell this to the workers in organized charities: *Give to every man that asketh of thee*, which, if followed, would make a science of charity impossible.

To the workingmen, or the oppressed seeking redress and protesting against evil, tell this: *Blessed are they that are persecuted*, which is equivalent to encouraging them to submit to, rather than to resist, oppression. Or upon our colleges and universities, our libraries and laboratories consecrated to science, write the words: *The wisdom of this world is foolishness with God, and God has chosen the foolish to confound the wise...*

Please, Dear, think about the hideousness outlined in the above. By corrupting the minds of immature people with the speculation that the world is (or was!) about to end, such people could no longer set realistic priorities in their lives. For causing so much resulting harm to so many people, I would have the damnable clerics thrown out of society – but as minimum, maybe people would get together and sue the damnable clerics for every penny that they have ever collected in their con games, in an attempt to make them pay for at least some of the damage they've done.

And I wrote only “some of the damage”, because next there's my third indictment, which outlines evil that really gets me angry.

INDICTMENT #3:

All Christian (and Mormon and Muslim) Clerics are Charged with Treason Against Humanity, for Promoting Social Injustices, for Corrupting even the Concept of Justice, for Preaching Fear, and for Advocating even Torture, thereby not only Causing a Huge Number of People an Enormous Amount of Direct Harm but also Causing Immature People to Inflict Horrible Harm on Other People.

Dear: below, I'll list some examples from the NT that illustrate this Christian conspiracy; they are relevant also for Mormonism (since similar is found in the Book of Mormon); in later chapters in this **Qx**, I'll show you that similar hideousness is contained in the “holy book” of Islam, the Koran. Constrain your anger as long as you can, and so will I.

Degrading Women

My first example is another policy concocted by the insane “Saint” Paul, this one given at *1 Corinthians 11, 3*:

I [Paul] wish you to understand that, while every man has Christ for his Head, woman's head is man... A man has no need to cover his head, because man is the image of God, and the mirror of his glory, whereas woman reflects the glory of man [Riiight]. For man did not originally spring from woman [Riiight], but woman was made out of man [Riiight], and man was not created for woman's sake, but woman for the sake of man [Riiight]; and therefore it is woman's duty to have a sign of authority [a "veil"] on her head, out of regard for the angels [or "for fear of the angels" – and pigeons?!].

Paul continues with his degradation of women at *1 Corinthians 14*, 34–35, although it should be noted that some Biblical scholars suggest that this was added by some later, comparably insane cleric:

As in all congregations of God's people, women should not address the meeting. They have no license to speak, but should keep their place as the law directs. If there is something they want to know, they can ask their own husbands at home. It is a shocking thing that a woman should address the congregation.

To which I trust all my granddaughters will solemnly and appropriately respond: "Blow it out your ear!"

Promoting Slavery

Here is more from the idiot Paul, from *Colossians 3*, 22:

Slaves, give entire obedience to your earthly masters, not merely with an outward show of service, to curry favor with men, but with single-mindedness, out of reverence for the Lord. Whatever you are doing, put your whole heart into it, as if you were doing it for the Lord and not for men, knowing that there is a Master who will give you your heritage as a reward for your service. Christ is the Master who slaves you must be...

Isn't it neat that the dear godie in heaven is in favor of slavery?

Promoting Intolerance and Narcissism

There are many examples of this in the NT, both in "Paulism" and in "Peterism". Thus, Paul tells his "flock" not to "mix" with unbelievers (*2 Corinthians 6*, 14–18):

Do not unite yourselves with unbelievers; they are no fit mates for you... Can Christ agree with Belial, or a believer join hands with an unbeliever? [Well, as a matter of fact, yes!] Can there be a compact between the temple of God and the idols of the heathen? [And, doncha know, the bodies of Christians (and Mormons) are "temples of God" – except for those whose brains demand that words have meaning.] And the temple of the living God is what we are. [How's that for narcissism?!]

God's own words are: "I will live and move about among them; I will be their God, and they shall be my people." [And the confirmation that these words are from God and not from still another idiot cleric are what?] And therefore, "come away and leave them, separate yourselves, says the Lord; touch nothing unclean." [People who don't believe in Paul's god are "unclean"? How's that for intolerance?!]...

"Saint" Peter allegedly promoted similar intolerance and narcissism. Immediately below I'll quote from *1 Peter 2, 9–10*, but I should add that, in reality, it's highly doubtful that this was written by Peter, who probably couldn't write. Biblical scholars have suggested that, instead, the following was probably written by some cleric about 50 years after Peter died:

But you [who believe in this gobbledygook] are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a dedicated nation, and a people claimed by God for his own, to proclaim the triumphs of him who has called you out of darkness into his marvelous light. You are now the people of God, who once were not his people; outside his mercy once, you have now received his mercy.

Happiness is being "a royal priesthood", "a people claimed by God for his own", "the people of God" – and not just the racist pigs that their words reveal they are.

The intolerance in the NT is especially rampant against Jews who were convinced that the Jesus-story was bunk, i.e., the vast majority of them! In earlier chapters, I showed you some examples of this anti-Semitism (or, more accurately, anti-Judaism). Here, I'll show you just three examples that promote intolerance for those whose opinions differ from those of the damn con-artist clerics.

The first example starts at *John 8, 44*:

"Your father [Jesus allegedly said (but almost certainly never did!) about Jewish people who didn't believe the claim (that Jesus almost certainly never made) that he was the son of God] is the devil and you choose to carry out your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning, and is not rooted in the truth; there is no truth in him. When he tells a lie, he is speaking his own language, for he is a liar and the father of lies. But I speak the truth, and therefore you do not believe me. [Riiiiight] Which of you can prove me in the wrong? [Which of you can prove that Superman isn't weakened by kryptonite?!] If what I say is true, why do you not believe me? [Well, isn't it obvious? Just because somebody says something is so doesn't make it so!] He who has God for his father listens to the words of God. You are not God's children; that is why you do not listen."

My second example is from *2 Peter 2*, 10–14:

Above all he [God] will punish those who follow their abominable lusts. They flout authority; reckless and headstrong, they are not afraid to insult celestial beings... **These men are like brute beasts, born in the course of nature to be caught and killed** [bold type added]. They pour abuse upon things they do not understand...

I added the bold type in the above but will add no comment, because I'm not keen on displaying to my grandchildren how I can pour abuse on idiots, using language that my grandchildren might think I don't use.

And my third example is one of many that were written in the form of parables. Most of these parables are rather long, but this one (starting at *Mark 11*, 12) is short enough for me to quote in full:

On the following day, after they [the clerics' Jesus and his disciples] had left Bethany, he [Jesus] felt hungry, and noticing in the distance a fig-tree in leaf, he went to see if he could find anything on it. But when he came there he found nothing but leaves, for it was not the season for figs. He said to the tree, "May no one ever again eat fruit from you!"

I trust you agree, Dear, that the above is a weird little "story".

But, Dear, it's not describing something that actually occurred; it's a parable, created out of thin air by some idiot cleric. How one knows it's a parable, is because otherwise it makes zero sense: if the magician Jesus wanted something to eat and stayed in character, then he could have zapped a mountain to make up a roast-beef sandwich with mayonnaise, turned the fig-tree into a package of Fig Newtons, or whatever. And why "curse" the tree? It wasn't the season for figs. Why not curse the season – or change it!

So then, the question is: what's the crazy Christian cleric trying to convey with this stupid little parable. Well, Dear, maybe I should again ask you to walk on it, or sleep on it, so you'd see it by yourself, but the payback isn't worth your time. So, I'll just dump an obvious interpretation on you (and I wrote "an" interpretation, Dear, because as with any parable, many interpretations can usually be found): the fig-tree represents the Jews; the clerics claim that their Jesus wanted fruit from the tree (i.e., the clerics wanted more paying customers in their pews), and couldn't find any among the skeptical Jews; so, he cursed the tree (i.e., he cursed all Jews): **"May no one ever again eat fruit from you!"**

Well, Dear, chalk up another failure of the clerics' Jesus: not only were his prophecies not worth a damn, neither were his curses. Thus, fortunately for humanity, the Jewish fig-tree has borne an enormous amount of fruit for the rest of us. For example, it bore Spinoza (who hundreds of years ago showed the world that the “god idea” was silly), Freud (who saw that all religions were childish fantasies), Einstein (who agreed with Freud and Spinoza and of course made huge accomplishments in physics), as have many other “figs” from the Jewish “fig tree” in many other fields of endeavor. And of course some of the fruit has been rotten (I’m thinking of the fruit from Marx and, for that matter, Paul and all subsequent Jewish clerics who promoted Paulism!), but even in such cases of rotten intellectual fruit, the curse of the clerics' Jesus, “**May no one ever again eat fruit from you**”, has been as barren as his prophecies.

Promoting Tyranny

The following was apparently written by “Saint” Paul (*Romans 13*, 1–6), in which I’ve added the bold type. If someone made such a statement today, I trust you agree that the person should be tried for treason, which carries the death penalty. I maintain that all Christian (and Mormon) clerics who continue to promote this crap should be similarly indicted.

Every person must submit to the supreme authorities. There is no authority but by act of God [what an asinine statement!], and the existing authorities are instituted by him; consequently, anyone who rebels against authority is resisting a divine institution, and those who so resist have themselves to thank for the punishment they will receive. For government, a terror to crime, has no terrors for good behavior. You wish to have no fear of the authorities? Then continue to do right and you will have their approval, **for they [the politicians] are God’s agents working for your good**. But if you are doing wrong, then you will have cause to fear them; it is not for nothing that they hold the power of the sword, **for they are God’s agents of punishment, for retribution on the offender**. That is why you are obliged to submit. It is an obligation imposed not merely by fear of retribution but by conscience. That is also why you pay taxes. **The authorities are in God’s service** and to these duties they devote their energies.” [And as for the horrible people who instigated the American revolution, then...]

From this idiocy – this treason against humanity – arose the collusion between clerics and political leaders, with the clerics thereby “sanctifying” the “divine authority” of dictators (from Constantine to Hitler), resulting in thousands of years of uncountable and indescribable horrors inflicted on humanity. Please, Dear, think about it: if people had not rejected this

idiocy, this evil, there would have been no Magna Carta, no parliamentary system in England, and no America. Preaching this garbage from the NT, as U.S. Supreme Court judge Antonin Scalia did in a recent speech (as I'll show you in an X-chapter) is treason against humanity.

Corrupting Even The Concept of Law

Again it was “Saint” Paul (the true founder of Christianity and Mormonism) whose crazy ideas of the law have polluted humanity for the past ~2,000 years. You can see some of his idiocy at his “epistle” *1 Timothy* 8–11:

We all know the law is an excellent thing, provided we treat it as law, recognizing that it is not aimed at good citizens, but at the lawless and unruly, the impious and sinful, the irreligious and worldly; at patricides and matricides, murders and fornicators, perverts, kidnappers, liars, perjurers – in fact all whose behavior flouts the wholesome teaching which conforms with the gospel entrusted to me...

Dear: please think about the idiocy of the above statement. What about laws that guarantee freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom of (and from!) religion? As you can see from the NT, even Paul claimed rights of the accused (under Roman Law). And yet, obviously he was unable to see that the prime purpose of laws is exactly opposite from what he wrote: not to punish people but to protect them. The ideas that Paul conveyed in the above corrupt any society to its core.

Corrupting Even the Concept of Justice

And even worse, Paul (in his insanity) promoted corruption of the most basic concept of social justice: what he promoted and what has been adopted as the “core belief” in Christianity (and therefore Mormonism) is simply unfair. This “core belief” is that God the father punished (killed!) his innocent son (Jesus) to “atone” for the sins of the guilty (i.e., allegedly, us), who (Paul claims) are guilty because we're related to Adam, who ate the apple. What would you think of your own father, Dear, if he punished (killed!) his son to “atone” for your “sins”? I hope and trust that you'd call the police! And yet, look what the idiot Paul wrote (starting at *Romans* 5, 6):

For at the very time when we were still powerless, then Christ died for the wicked... Christ died for us while we were yet sinners, and that is God's own proof of his love towards us. And so, since we have now been justified by Christ's sacrificial death, we shall all the more certainly be saved through him from final retribution. For if, when we were Gods' enemies [Hello?!], we were reconciled to him through the death of his Son [Hello? the death of his son led him to have good thoughts about us?!], how much more, now that we are reconciled, shall we be saved by his life!

Dear: Who in his or her right mind would trust a god who killed his innocent son for the sins of others? What, then, would such a god do to others?! Who in his or her right mind would want to have anything to do with a god who punishes the innocent instead of the guilty?! It's a god who doesn't have a clue about the concept of justice!

And if you're wondering how anyone could be so deranged as to promote such garbage, Dear, then read on. What the cleric (probably not Paul – but claimed to be Paul!) who wrote *Letter to the Hebrews* apparently did was to take one step past the old idea of “blood sacrifice” of animals (which appears to have been practiced for at least 5,000 years prior to Paul). You can see the “logic” at *Hebrews 9*, 13–14:

For if the blood of goats and bulls and the sprinkled ashes of a heifer have power to hallow those who have been defiled and restore their external purity [which is what the crazy Christian clerics apparently thought; but of course, it's totally asinine!], how much greater is the power of the blood of Christ; he offered himself without blemish to God, a spiritual and eternal sacrifice; and his blood will cleanse our conscience from the deadness of our former ways and fit us for the service of the living God.

So, Dear, the whole fable about Christ dying for our sins (as apparently first concocted by Paul and then amplified by whoever wrote *Hebrews*) is apparently a continuation of the stupidity of “blood sacrifice”. In history, probably first was the “sacrifice” of virgins (or other beautiful people) to placate the gods (e.g., the volcano god); maybe next was ritual killings of various animals, as a sacrifice and as a purifier; then it was the killing of one's own child (as Abraham allegedly planned to do) to show one's obedience (to the gods, aka the clerics); and now, in their insanity, the Christian clerics took it one step further: the imagined sacrifice of God's own child – to “purify” everyone, to “atone” for the “sins” of all mankind.

It's stupid enough to drive me to another limerick:

*I suppose that you've heard of the feasts,
When the people would sacrifice beasts,
So here's what to do
To cleanse us anew:
Kill all gods for the sins of their priests!*

Which then leads me to suggest still another bumper sticker:

The next step is obvious:

SACRIFICE GOD FOR THE SINS OF THE PRIESTS!

Further, Dear, in all this ignorance you can see where Paul probably got his crazy idea that the world was about to end – which then the cleric who wrote Hebrews amplified. First, consider the next few lines after the quotation above, here from *Hebrews 9*, 23–28, especially noticing my bold type:

If, then, these sacrifices cleanse the copies of heavenly things [which seems to be more of Plato’s silly idea of Forms] **those heavenly things themselves require better sacrifices to cleanse them.** For Christ has entered, not that sanctuary made by men’s hands which is only a symbol of the reality, but heaven itself, to appear now before God on our behalf. Nor is he there to offer himself again and again, as the high priest enters the sanctuary year by year with blood not his own. If that were so, he would have had to suffer many times since the word was made. But as it is, he has appeared once and for all **at the climax of history** to abolish sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is the lot of men to die once, and after death comes judgment, so Christ was offered once to bear the burden of men’s sins, and will appear a second time, sin done away, to bring salvation to those who are watching for him.

What I expect happened is that Paul couldn’t understand why Jesus was killed. Rejecting the obvious explanation that Jesus (ben Pandera?) had violated the Jewish law against blasphemy of their God (a crime punishable by death), Paul apparently decided that God had sacrificed his son for the atonement of Adam’s (non-sin!) of eating the apple. Paul and/or later would-be Christian clerics then concluded that this event, the sacrificial death of Jesus must represent “**the climax of history**”, i.e., the world was about to end. And therefore all the idiocy about how to live the last few days (outlined in my Indictment #2), and therefore (I expect) the creation of the entire “Jesus fable” recorded in the synoptic gospels by subsequent clerics. All of which leads me to still another limerick

*Though they claim that Christ died for our sake –
That the blame for our sins he did take –
If he did what he said,
That is, rose from the dead,
Then it’s clear that his death was a fake!*

And though, thereby, maybe I can still maintain my sense of humor (while struggling through the quagmire of idiocies known as the NT), yet when I get to what follows, Dear, I’m sorry to warn you that my mood turns really sour.

Promoting the Authority of an Incompetent Judge, Who not only Lacks Basic Comprehension of Justice but also Advocates Fear & Torture

The clerics who wrote the NT allege that their Jesus had the authority to judge people. Setting aside until later all the contrived (and silly!) “justifications” for their Jesus being judge (namely, miracles, fulfillment of “prophecies”, etc.), I’ll just state the clerics’ conclusion. You can see this, for example, at *John 5, 27*:

“As Son of Man, he [that is, I, Jesus] has also been given the right to pass judgment.”

Also at *John 9, 39*, there’s:

Jesus said, “It is for judgment that I have come into this world...”

But, Dear, all of this is horribly perverted. In a sane social system, people aren’t to be responsible to some judge; instead, all judges – save the ultimate judge, Mother Nature herself – are to be responsible to the people!

What the damnable stuff in the NT really demonstrates is that the clerics who wrote this junk didn’t have the faintest idea about what “justice” means: justice isn’t what some judge says it is; justice is a process defined by the people. There’s no justice if some “king” chooses the “judges”. As a start toward justice, judges must be selected either directly or with the advice and consent of elected representatives of the people to be judged. And judges are to hold their office, not beholden to some damn king, but only to the people – who then can throw a judge out on his ear (or on her rear or in jail) if the judge commits an “impeachable” offense.

And surely the most fundamental requirement is that any judge must be fully committed to the basic idea of fairness. Yet in the case of the clerics’ Jesus, look at the long parable he reportedly told at *Matthew 20, 1–16*, about a landowner (Jesus or God) who went out to hire some workers. And yes, Dear, I know I went through this parable a few chapters ago, but please consider it again.

At the start of the day, the landowner hired some workers and promised to pay them a day’s wages for working the day; at midday, he hired more; and then one hour before sunset, he hired still more. The story continues:

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

Now, Dear, as I wrote in an earlier chapter, I have a fairly good idea of the purpose of this parable: the ignorant clerics who wrote it are attempting to "justify" the idea that Christians will get into heaven just by "believing" whereas the Jews, who struggled throughout their lives (and allegedly throughout their history) to achieve "righteousness", will gain no more. But, Dear, consider what this damnable little story is also advocating, namely, that the universe is ruled by an incompetent judge.

I say that the clerics' Jesus (or God) is incompetent as a judge, Dear, because he doesn't see the unfairness in what he advocates. I agree that, in the language of the parable, the landowner should be able to do what he pleases with his own money. And I agree that the landowner is abiding by the "letter of the law". But the clerics who wrote this damnable parable reveal that their Jesus missed the "spirit of the law", just as he allegedly criticized others, e.g., at *Matthew 23*, 23:

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

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

But, Dear, that's just the start. In addition, the clerics have their incompetent judge Jesus promote fear. You can see a little of this *Ephesians 6, 5*, where Paul promotes not only slavery but also fear:

Slaves, obey your earthly masters with fear and trembling, single-mindedly, as serving Christ.

The clerics who subsequently wrote the gospels, promoted more of the same, not only preaching fear but also advocating torture. For example, the cleric who wrote *Matthew* has John the Baptist state about Jesus (*Matthew 3, 11*):

His shovel is ready in his hand he will winnow his threshing-floor; the wheat [the good people] he will gather into his granary [heaven], but he will burn the chaff [sinners] on a fire that will never go out [in hell].

At *Matthew 13, 40*, the clerics have their Jesus say:

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

Still more of this horrible crap is at *Matthew 10, 28*, where the clerics have their Jesus say:

“Do not fear those who kill the body, but cannot kill the soul. Fear him rather who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.”

Almost identical horror is repeated at *Luke 12, 4*:

“Do not fear those who kill the body and after that have nothing more they can do. I will warn you whom to fear: fear him who, after he has killed, has authority to cast into hell. Believe me, he is the one to fear [i.e., fear the priests!].”

As Mangasarian wrote:

Any God who demands the worship of fear would be unworthy of the service of love.

At *Luke 13, 26*, where in response to the nonbelievers who yet would want to get into heaven, the clerics have their Jesus say:

“There will be wailing and grinding of teeth there, when you see Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God [heaven], and yourselves thrown out [into hell].”

At *John 15, 5*, the clerics have their Jesus say:

“I am the vine, and you are the branches. He who dwells in me, as I dwell in him, bears much fruit; for apart from me you can do nothing. He who does not dwell in me is thrown away like a withered branch. The withered branches are heaped together, thrown on the fire and burnt.”

I agree with Nietzsche that the idea of heaven has caused enormous harm to humanity. Recall his:

If one shifts the center of gravity of life out of life into the “Beyond” – into nothingness – one has deprived life as such of its center of gravity. The great lie of personal immortality destroys all rationality, all naturalness of instinct – all that is salutary, all that is life-furthering.

Yet, I’d argue that the problems caused by the horrible idea of heaven are minor compared with those caused by the hideous idea of hell. It’s an idea right up there (or better, down there) with treating humans as sheep.

Seriously, Dear, if ever you hear anyone describing people as if they were sheep, please avoid that person. But if you ever hear anyone describing “unacceptable” people as “chaff”, to be burned “on a fire that will never go out”, or as “withered branches” to be “thrown on the fire and burnt” or “thrown into a blazing furnace, the place of wailing and grinding of teeth”, then do whatever you consider reasonable to have that person confined in an institution for the criminally insane.

As certain as I am of anything, Dear, I’m certain that criminal charges should be filed against the lying clerics who wrote and promote the damnable NT, if for no other reason than for their promotion of the idea of hell. That is, at times I can overlook the arrogance of the Christian (and Mormon and Muslim) clerics as just another example of their ignorance, e.g., from *John 15, 5*, the arrogance of “apart from me you can do nothing”. Tell that to Darwin, Edison, Einstein, and all Humanists who ever lived!

But, Dear, I charge these damnable clerics not only with treason against humanity (for attempting to suppress the best of what makes us human, i.e., our ability to evaluate) but also for their evil of advocating the most wretched crimes against humanity that could ever be imagined.

You may object. You may remember my suggestion: thoughts aren't evil, but acts can be; therefore, you may protest that the idea of hell is just an idea, and therefore, not evil. Of course I agree with that, Dear, but the clerics did more than just think about hell. Leaving until Yx my description of the centuries of evil during which the clerics tortured, murdered, and immolated people who didn't agree with them (evils that still persist in Islamic nations), there can be evil when ignorance is advocated.

For example, think of the evil of inappropriately yelling "Fire!" in a crowded theater – and then think of the evil that has resulted from the damn clerics screeching that there's a fire to end all fires waiting to torture "sinners" for all eternity. As Robert Ingersoll wrote in his 1877 book *The Liberty of All*.

If there is a God who will damn his children forever, I would rather go to hell than to go to heaven and keep the society of such an infamous tyrant. I make my choice now. I despise that doctrine. It has covered the cheeks of this world with tears. It has polluted the hearts of children, and poisoned the imaginations of men... What right have you, sir, Mr. clergyman, you, minister of the gospel to stand at the portals of the tomb, at the vestibule of eternity, and fill the future with horror and with fear? I do not believe this doctrine; neither do you. If you did, you could not sleep one moment. Any man who believes it, and has within his breast a decent, throbbing heart, will go insane. A man who believes that doctrine and does not go insane has the heart of a snake and the conscience of a hyena.

Dear, for a moment more, please think about the hideousness of the idea being promoted. I know you agree that it's hideous to torture animals, and I'm certain that you agree that it's hideous to torture humans. But then, see what the damnable clerics are having their Jesus advocate: it's hideous to advocate the torture of humans even for the briefest moment, it's hideous to be associated in any way with the prolonged torture of humans, and it's unbelievably hideous to be associated in any way with the torturing of humans for eternity.

It's not only treasonous to humanity, it's advocating unadulterated evil. Anyone who loves humans (as the clerics claimed that their Jesus did) would not only refuse to sentence anyone to hell, he would (if necessary) give up his life to destroy hell!

Please never forget, Dear, that even at their worst, (i.e., at their stupidest) humans are colorful characters. A man stupidly concludes that the only way to win a certain woman's affection is by robbing a bank; a women stupidly

concludes that the only way she'll be able to afford braces for her little boy's teeth is to steal money from a man's wallets; a cleric stupidly concludes that he can help humanity by promoting some 2,000-year old fairy tale about a son of god; even the twisted mind of a rapist and murderer of little children may have charted a course to revenge some horror done to him. That is, all humans make mistakes – and some of these mistakes are so horrible that maybe it's best for the rest of society if the worst humans are executed.

But, Dear, even if you were to conclude that “capital punishment” is appropriate (e.g., for torturing and killing children), even if you were to conclude that some truly horrible people should be killed, yet surely you agree that limits are still appropriate. Their deaths are not to make them suffer, but to have their deaths serve as examples to others, to let each horrible person finally do something useful for humanity, namely, to serve as an example; then, perhaps some other victims will be spared from someone else committing a similar crime. But even then, at most, kill the horrible human – don't threaten torture, don't torture for a while, don't torture to death, don't torture for eternity! No matter what evil the stupid human did, it wasn't as evil as the proposed eternal torture. Yet, that's what the idiot clerics who wrote the NT have their horrible Jesus advocate.

Then, Dear, see why I maintain the clerics' Jesus is a horribly incompetent judge:

- He displays a total lack of comprehension of even the simplest idea of fairness,
- He promises heaven if people suspend their mental abilities and just “believe”,
- He threatens people with hell, otherwise, and
- He promotes torture of humans – and not for just a minute or two, but for eternity.

Dear: if ever there were “justifiable” causes for impeachment of some judge, then there are such causes for impeachment of the “God” of the Bible and his “son”. As I've tried to show you in earlier chapters, the teachings in the Bible dealing with justice reveal an astounding lack of even the most elementary understanding of natural justice (e.g., why a person is blind), personal justice (i.e., to get what you deserve), and social justice (e.g., equal pay for equal work).

Further, Dear, any judge who makes the slightest hint that anyone “deserves” even the slightest amount of torture is unworthy of being a judge and should be thrown out on his rear. And any judge (such as Jesus reportedly claimed to be) who “thinks” that anyone “deserves” to be tortured for eternity is pure, unadulterated evil – for whom impeachment would actually be far too lenient a punishment.

Dear: A prime reason for my writing this book to you was to answer your question about why I don’t believe in God; so, I’ll summarize still-another reason why I detest the ideas promoted by the principle clerics of our culture. Even if there were no additional evils of Christianity (and yet, as I’ve tried to show you, it contains a staggering number of additional immoralities), I’d choose not to be a Christian (or a Mormon or a Muslim). I’m opposed to such religions because (for one) I’m opposed to torture.

Laws are to be decided by the people (for example, through elected representative in a “legislative” branch of government). Justice is to be judged by a group in the “judiciary” branch of government, a group chosen by the people (for example, through elections or with the “advice and consent” of our representatives in the legislature). The administration of justice is to be done by a third group elected by the people (in “the administration”). And any or all of them are to be thrown out (and if appropriate, into jail) if they don’t meet the standards that the people demand. All of which leads me to suggest still another bumper sticker:

HELL – IMPEACH JESUS... RECALL GOD

And if I add to that all the balderdash (or jabberwocky) about Christ dying for our sins (in particular, for our “original sin” of eating the fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, becoming humans able to evaluate, being able to judge), then my response is the following limericks.

*Although Christ said he spoke for some czar,
I’m afraid that he went way too far;
Though he claimed he was judge
Still the truth will not budge:
You’re not judge just by saying you are!*

*Although Jesus did brazenly state
That a heaven or hell we would rate,
What he said was just rot,
For true justice is not
To have tyrants decide on our fate!*

*Although Christ claimed his judicial thing
(And his claim has historical ring),
Yet we're long past the day
When some clown can just say
That he's judge – if he's sent by some king!*

*Although Jesus did solemnly teach
His authority stood way past our reach,
Yet the people have learned
What our heroes have earned:
There's no judge that we all can't impeach!*

*Although Christ claimed a judicial air,
Yet it's clear that he wasn't aware:
Though he claimed to be kind,
All the workers weren't blind –
If you want to be judge then be fair!*

*Although Jesus said we should abstain,
Yet I think we should firmly explain:
No matter how long,
To torture is wrong,
To judge humans you must be humane!*

*Although Christ with God's justice was awed,
There is something that all can applaud:
A new time has come,
Without Christendom,
When the people own justice – not God!*

*Although Jesus caught lawyers attentions,
About justice he never once mentions:
True justice is not
Some god's juggernaut
But attunement of opposite tensions!*

*Although Christ didn't see his own premiss
It's imperative to see what it is:
If people are served
Beyond what's deserved,
It corrupts the essence of 'justice'!*

*If Jesus came back here today,
I'd tell him to take it away:
His heaven and hell,
His justice as well,
They all went their Darwinian way!*

And that's all I can tolerate, Dear. I'm now gonna get some exercise. May I suggest...