



An Answer to

C.S. Lewis'

Mere Christianity

By Bob Johnson

eBook Edition

Copyright © 2010 by World Union of Deists
www.deism.com

Open source book except for commercial use

Published by

Truth Seeker Company

239 Juniper Street

Escondido, California 92025

www.truthseeker.com

ISBN# 978-0-0939040-22-3

Table of Contents

Introduction	iii
Acknowledgments	vi
Chapter One	1
Examining and Answering the Preface of <i>Mere Christianity</i>	
Chapter Two	6
Examining and Answering Book I – Right and Wrong as a Clue to the Meaning of the Universe	
Chapter Three	24
Examining and Answering Book II – What Christians Believe	
Chapter Four	58
Examining and Answering Book III – Christian Behavior	
Chapter Five	120
Examining and Answering Book IV – Beyond Personality: Or First Steps In The Doctrine Of The Trinity	
About the Author	155

**For all sincere people who want to develop a
better understanding of God through a greater
appreciation and use of God's gift to them of
reason and to all who want to combat the su-
perstitions, fears and violence advanced by the
“revealed” religions.**

Introduction

For decades C.S. Lewis' *Mere Christianity* has been considered a classic of Christian apologetics and in 2000 was voted the best book of the twentieth century by *Christianity Today*. *Mere Christianity* has served, and still serves, as a guide for Christians the world over. A guide which they sincerely believe helps them align their faith in Christianity with their God-given reason. For what good is a belief in God if it is rejected by your own God-given reason?

Philosophy instructs us to see things as they really are, not merely as they appear to be. Objectively looking at the way *Mere Christianity* came about it becomes obvious that the primary driving force for it was not really God or humanity's relationship with God or even mere Christianity and what being a Christian means, but, instead, the primary purpose, in all probability, was the British war effort. *Mere Christianity* is a collection of talks Lewis made on the radio between August of 1941 and April of 1944 for the British Broadcasting Corporation. The BBC is controlled by the British Crown and government. At the time Lewis started his radio shows Britain was losing the war it started with National Socialist Germany. Dunkirk, the blitzkrieg battle in which the German military pushed all British and French armies off of the continent of Europe, was a fresh wound the British Crown and government were still licking. They desperately needed to help give their subjects a reinforced "stiff upper lip" the British are so famous for. What better way than to paint the war as a struggle between the good Christians, the British, and the evil Atheists or heathens, the Germans, instead of what it really was, an unnecessary war¹?

Churchill, Hitler, and the Unnecessary War, Patrick J. Buchanan, Crown Publishers, p. 361

Of course, this claim of Christians versus Atheists or heathens was not true. This government lie on behalf of the British government helps make the point that truth really is the first casualty of war. Just as Saddam Hussein and the Iraqi government did not have weapons of mass destruction, so Nazi Germany was not an Atheistic heathen country. In fact, Nazi Storm Troopers wore belt buckles emblazoned with the words “Gott Mit Uns” or “God With Us.” This is not something an Atheist organization or government would ever do.

Also, in August of 1941 when Lewis started his government endorsed radio show which eventually became *Mere Christianity*, there were probably millions of Christians in Britain who were wondering why the British government had allied itself with the the openly Atheist and Communist government of the Soviet Union. By that time the Communists had murdered through executions and starvation in Ukraine alone over 14.5 million people² who were mostly Christians, not to mention millions more who were executed or died in Communist concentration camps. Lewis could placate these unwanted questions and fears for the British government and powers that be with his Christian radio show as well as with the talks/speeches he gave to British soldiers. In fact, the BBC states that Lewis considered this work as his “war work.”³

Beyond Lewis’ Deistic beliefs, the simple belief in an eternal First Cause/Supreme Intelligence and a conscience we’re all privileged to possess, Lewis’ statements and the arguments he uses in *Mere Christianity* to promote Christianity and the Bible completely lack God-given reason while promoting poor critical thinking skills. Perhaps the mindset of the British people at the time of his radio broadcasts, being on a highly regimented war footing which is averse to questioning government approved authority figures, can explain why such poorly crafted arguments for Christianity went virtually unopposed. However, it does not explain why, after the end of the war, he wasn’t taken to task for this book and its profound lack of substance.

The Harvest of Sorrow, Robert Conquest, Oxford University Press, p. 301
http://www.bbc.co.uk/religion/religions/christianity/people/cslewis_1.shtml

Because this book is so highly touted by Christians the world over, many of whom are sincere, I've gone through *Mere Christianity* chapter by chapter, idea by idea, applying God-given reason to each and every major claim, thesis and assumption Lewis makes. Lewis and Christianity fail miserably the test of God-given reason.

As we, the people of the 21st century, are still suffering from the negative affects of ancient "revealed" religions whose fear based superstitions reach through the centuries to poison our world and to injure and kill our children with their nonsensical fear, violence and mayhem, we desperately need to employ our God-given reason. We need to let go of the teachings of the Middle Eastern ancients which go directly against our God-given reason, against our common sense and against reality. Firmly believing that what really matters is not if ideas and statements are offensive, but if they are true, I encourage all people to openly question authority and tradition. This is the only way we can ever achieve true progress and freedom because it's the only way we can ever arrive at or, at least, get closer to truth. And truth is the goal of all sincere people whether they are Atheists, Agnostics, Deists or revealed religionists.

Thomas Paine, a key American Founder, pioneering Deist and author of the Deistical book *The Age of Reason*, believed religion was in desperate need of a revolution. Thomas Paine ignited a revolution in religion with Deism. A driving force of Deism is truth. Paine wrote, "But such is the irresistible nature of truth, that all it asks, and all it wants is the liberty of appearing." By giving an honest and God-given reason based critique of *Mere Christianity*, I hope to give truth "the liberty of appearing" in our thoughts and beliefs concerning God which will further the true and profound revolution in religion.

Bob Johnson
Founder and Director
World Union of Deists
February 17, 2010

Acknowledgments

I'd like to thank my publisher, Bonnie Lange, for her support and for helping me with the title. Sometimes I overlook the obvious and most practical. She guided me to what is most beneficial and what will produce the best results for the book and the ideas it contains.

My wife Linda and step-daughter Traci helped me a great deal with the book. Linda was a great help as a proofreader and Traci was a great help with the cover design.

Sam Warren is greatly appreciated for his skill in formatting the book as well as his patience with all the changes, corrections, etc.! It's a pleasure working with him!

**“It is an affront to truth to treat
falsehood with complaisance.”**
Thomas Paine

Chapter One

Examining and Answering the Preface of *Mere Christianity*

After briefly explaining that the origins of *Mere Christianity* were his radio broadcasts during World War II and a very brief explanation regarding the combining of his writing style with his speaking style in the book, C.S. Lewis makes clear he is not attempting to help anyone decide which Christian denomination they should belong to. He states that he is an “ordinary layman of the Church of England” but that he is not trying to convert anyone to his church. He writes that the purpose for *Mere Christianity* is explaining and defending “the belief that has been common to nearly all Christians at all times.” Of course, Christianity did not exist “at all times” but he makes no mention of this fact.

He then makes the point that Christians should not openly dispute points of theology which they disagree over in front of any person who has not “already come to believe that there is one God and that Jesus Christ is His only Son.” This belief that there is only one God and Jesus is the only son of that God is the main point he hopes to make with *Mere Christianity*. This is the stated purpose of his book. As the book is peppered with statements that can only help the British war effort, it is obvious that he and the British government hope his promotion of mere Christianity during the war will strengthen the idea in the minds of his listeners that they are true Christian soldiers marching off to war against the ungodly heathen enemy. It’s the oldest government trick in the book!

Lewis believed that beyond the belief in one God and the son of that God, Jesus Christ, the points which divide Christians into

virtually countless denominations are “points of high Theology” and should “never be treated except by real experts.” He does not offer anything to back up the claim that there is only one God and that Jesus is his only son, nor does he explain why the “real experts” would have a better understanding of these theological high points. As Thomas Paine so accurately observed and wrote in his monumental book on God, Deism, religion, Christianity and the Bible, *The Age of Reason*, “It has been the scheme of the Christian church, and of all the other invented systems of religion, to hold man in ignorance of the Creator, as it is of Government to hold man in ignorance of his rights. The systems of the one are as false as those of the other, and are calculated for mutual support. The study of theology, as it stands in Christian churches, is the study of nothing; it is founded on nothing; it rests on no principles; it proceeds by no authorities; it has no data; it can demonstrate nothing; and it admits of no conclusion. Not any thing can be studied as a science, without our being in possession of the principles upon which it is founded; and as this is not the case with Christian theology, it is therefore the study of nothing.”

Lewis also completely avoids the fact that Christianity is too ambiguous to even enable a clear definition of who and what a Christian actually is. The fact that some people and groups of people which take the name of Christian are not considered to be Christian by other people and groups of people who claim to be Christian is completely ignored by Lewis. This is a tragically well known fact documented in the blood and guts of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people who have been slaughtered during Christian holy wars such as the Thirty Years War (1618-1648) in which both sides considered themselves to be Christians and which was so full of Christian violence that it reduced the population of Germany by 30 percent! As the Deist Thomas Paine wrote, “The Calvinist, who damns children of a span long to hell to burn forever for the glory of God (and this is called Christianity), and the Universalist who preaches that all shall be saved and none shall be damned (and this also is called Christianity), boasts alike of their holy [revealed] religion and their Christian faith.”

Lewis' desire to unite Christendom by stripping it of all of its divisive articles, dogmas, rituals and superstitions and reducing it

to “mere” Christianity brings him very close to Deism. He writes, “It is at her centre, where her truest children dwell, that each communion is really closest to every other in spirit, if not in doctrine. And this suggests that at the centre of each there is something, or a Someone, who against all divergences of belief, all differences of temperament, all memories of mutual persecution, speaks with the same voice.” If he went one reasonable and liberating step further and let go of the unreasonable belief that Jesus is the son of God, Lewis would have evolved into a Deist. Deism is knowledge and belief in God based on the application of our God-given reason on the designs in Nature. A Deist believes these designs prove a Designer, or Superior Reasoning Power as Albert Einstein said. This beautiful, natural, reasonable and simple belief along with the rejection of all unreasonable claims and beliefs, including those promoted by all of the “revealed” religions, is Deism. In fact, Deism, this simple and unadulterated belief in God, is the cornerstone of all the “revealed” religions. As some people say, Deism is belief in God without all of the man-made baggage.

When Lewis touches on Book III which addresses morals, he states that he did not write about birth control since he is “not a woman nor even a married man.” He continues that he did not think it was his place to take a stand “about pains, dangers and expenses” which he would never incur. It would have been interesting to learn what he thought about the Bible myth at Genesis 3:16 which says, “Unto the woman he (God) said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.” This Biblical myth has given rise to the false belief in “the curse of Eve” which has been the cause of much unnecessary suffering and misery for many women. Many Christian leaders used this Bible-based superstition to oppose the use of chloroform in the 19th century as an anesthetic for women in childbirth,³ believing it was a tool of Satan in his evil efforts to undermine “the word of God.”

Addressing some objections from people to Lewis for using the word “Christian” because they felt he was deciding who was and who was not a Christian, Lewis lamely makes a comparison

The Woman's Encyclopedia of Myths and Secrets, Barbara G. Walker, HarperOne, p. 656

between the word “gentleman” and “Christian.” He notes that originally a gentleman was defined as a man who had a coat of arms and also owned real estate. Over time its meaning changed to mean a polite, caring, courageous and considerate man without regard to a coat of arms or to real estate owned. He mistakenly writes that to call a man a gentleman, using the new definition, is “not a way of giving information about him, but a way of praising him.” It’s obvious that calling a man a gentleman gives information that the man is a good and considerate person.

Lewis goes further and writes that “gentleman” is now a useless word. As shown above, this is false.

Working to make sense of his analogy of “gentleman” and “Christian,” Lewis claims that if the same thing that was done to the word “gentleman” is done to the word “Christian,” it too will speedily become a useless word.” He fails to realize that, as Thomas Paine made clear in many places including the examples above, “Christian” is a virtually useless and meaningless word already. Lewis seemed to fear that it would come to simply mean a good person. In some circles that is probably true. In others, it means a credulous and superstitious person. A person who values ancient superstitions and myths more than their own God-given reason.

Lewis also makes clear that it is not his intent for “mere” Christianity to develop into yet another Christian denomination in the swollen ranks of the various contradictory Christian denominations. Instead, he uses the analogy that *Mere Christianity* is “like a hall out of which doors open into several rooms” which are the various Christian denominations. He writes that some people will wait a long time in the hall until they find the room/denomination for them, while others will find what they want right away. And he instructs “even in the hall, you must begin trying to obey the rules which are common to the whole house.” This seems to mean he wants people who feel they’re Christians but who have not embraced any particular Christian denomination to “obey the rules” of the Bible. Objectively looking at it, this will cause major problems due to the contradictory teachings found in the Bible and because of the insane rules promoted by the Bible. One rule is Leviticus 20:9 which demands death for anyone who curses his father or mother. Another, out of many, is Numbers 15:32-36 which

calls for the execution by stoning of anyone who works on the Sabbath day. Since it is said that Jesus said in Matthew 5:18-19, “Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.” Christians are bound to follow these destructive and unreasonable rules.

Lewis next instructs us in deciding on which Christian denomination is right for us. He writes, “In plain language, the question should never be: ‘Do I like that kind of service?’ but ‘Are these doctrines true: Is holiness here? Does my conscience move me towards this?’”

One of the key doctrines of Christianity concerns eternal salvation. The biggest selling point of Christianity is eternal life after being “saved” through Jesus. However, contrary to the beliefs of many Christians, the New Testament is not clear on just what qualifies you as being saved and worthy of eternal life. Christian doctrine on eternal salvation is at best very ambiguous. For example, the famous John 3:16 reads, “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” Then, further into the same Gospel at John 5:28-29 we read, “Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” This Christian doctrine contradicts the Christian doctrine of John 3:16 and makes salvation and eternal life dependent on our actions, not our faith-based beliefs. And the Christian doctrine found at Matthew 12:37 contradicts both of these by stating, “For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned.” Add to these the further contradiction found in Romans 8:28-30 and 9:11-22 which promotes predestination or the idea that God has already decided who would go to heaven and who would go to hell prior to our birth. There are many other contradictory Christian doctrines on this one topic of salvation which is so important to Christians. Following the advice of C.S. Lewis, in particular, “are these doctrines true” an honest and objective seeker would reject Christianity.

Chapter Two

Examining and Answering Book I – Right and Wrong as a Clue to the Meaning of the Universe

Lewis begins this chapter writing about a universal standard and he uses the act of quarreling as a means of demonstrating its existence. He states that in an argument people appeal to a universal standard to justify their position on an issue. He writes, “It looks, in fact, very much as if both parties had in mind some kind of Law or Rule of fair play or decent behaviour or morality or whatever you like to call it, about which they really agreed.”

The Law of Human Nature is the label Lewis gives this standard of human behavior. He states that unlike laws of Nature such as gravity which everyone and everything is subject to, people have a choice regarding the Law of Human Nature. People can decide for themselves if they are going to follow it or not.

Lewis’ Law of Human Nature seems to be what most people simply refer to as our conscience. It lets the vast majority of us know by a negative feeling of guilt when an action is wrong and gives us a positive feeling of contentment when an action we can take, or actually do take, is in line with our conscience. Conscience seems to be at the core of this quote which is attributed to Abraham Lincoln: “When I do good, I feel good; when I do bad, I feel bad, and that is my religion.”

One of Abraham Lincoln’s heroes, the Deist Thomas Paine, wrote in *The Age of Reason*, “As for morality, the knowledge of it exists in every man’s conscience.” Lewis, like many Christian apologists, takes this idea and makes the unreasonable assumption

that our conscience is from the God of the Bible. As is shown below, this is an impossibility. And the fact remains that the jury is still out on whether our conscience is a product of Nature or nurture.

Trying to use his Law of Human Nature to justify England's declaration of war on National Socialist Germany, Lewis claims that the human idea of decent behavior is obvious to everyone. He writes that if it was not obvious to everyone "then all the things we said about the war were nonsense. What was the sense in saying the enemy were in the wrong unless Right is a real thing which the Nazis at bottom knew as well as we did and ought to have practised? If they had no notion of what we mean by right, then, though we might still have to fight them, we could no more have blamed them for that than for the colour of their hair."

When we look at England's stated reason for starting World War II we see that it was to protect the independence of Poland. The British government claimed it was wrong for German troops to occupy Poland and, being a good Christian nation who only wanted to do what was right, they declared war on Germany when Germany invaded Poland. On the surface this appears to be noble. However, things are rarely as simple as they appear to be on the surface. We need to follow the instruction of philosophy and do our very best to see things as they REALLY are. For examples, Germany was taking back from Poland what was German territory prior to the war to end all wars, WW I, and prior to the Versailles Treaty, a treaty which Albert Einstein condemned as being unjust; 17 days after Germany attacked Poland from the west, the Soviet Union attacked from the east – why didn't righteous England also declare war on the Soviet Union? Weren't the Communists "in the wrong" as much as the Nazis for doing the exact same thing at the same time, invading Poland and depriving the Poles of their independence? Also, the Atheistic Communists of the Soviet Union could not even claim they were taking back land which was unjustly taken from them, as Germany could.

An objective fact that usually doesn't see the light of day is that Adolf Hitler on July 19, 1940 said in a public speech to the German Reichstag, "I feel it to be my duty before my own con-

science to appeal once more to reason and common sense in Great Britain . . . I can see no reason why this war need go on . . . ” This was followed up with diplomatic efforts to Britain through Sweden, the U.S. and the Vatican.⁵ And this appeal for peace was made from a position of strength since the European Continent was completely free of British and French armies at the time the appeal was made. Germany was in complete control. This, among many other facts, makes it very clear that World War II was not necessary. The 50-70 million people who died in World War II did not have to die. Does causing the unnecessary deaths of so many people align with Lewis' Law of Human Nature?

It seems Lewis did not want to talk to his radio listeners or share with his readers that the moral evil he accused Germany of practicing by occupying Poland was also being practiced by England. The British Army was occupying India at that time. Morally they had less right to occupy India than the Germans had in taking back their own former land from Poland.

Ireland is also a problem for Lewis and his Law of Human Nature as moral justification for starting World War II. When England declared war on Germany, England's Prime Minister Chamberlain attempted to entice the Irish Free State to join England in its war with Germany. Chamberlain offered the Irish Free State's President, Eamon de Valera, a united Ireland without British occupation of the northeast counties which England calls Northern Ireland if he would involve Ireland in the war. President de Valera refused. When Churchill replaced Chamberlain as prime minister he also pressured de Valera to throw the Irish Free State into World War II on the side of Britain. It has been reported that de Valera asked Churchill why England declared war on Germany. Churchill responded that it was done because Germany invaded and occupied Poland. President de Valera then told him to remove the British occupation troops from Ireland and then he may talk to him about it! By refusing to involve Ireland in World War II, de Valera saved the lives of at least tens of thousands of his people. He is a true profile in courage.

Hitler's Strategy, F. H. Hinsley, Cambridge University Press, p. 79

Next Lewis tries to do his war work in a subtle way. He makes an effort to show that even though different ages and civilizations have had different moralities, they were not really that different. He starts his list of similarities in morality among different peoples and times with, "Think of a country where people were admired for running away in battle." I'm sure the British War Office was very happy for this sentence!

Lewis makes things messy for himself and Christianity, mere or otherwise, when he writes, "Men have differed as to whether you should have one wife or four. But they have always agreed that you must not simply have any woman you liked." It appears Lewis never read the Bible, or, perhaps, he possessed a memory of convenience. Numbers 31:15-18 has Moses himself castigating the Israeli army for **NOT** slaughtering the women and little boys of a vanquished people. Verses 17 and 18 have Moses ordering the troops, "Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves." Not only does this contradict Lewis' false belief and false teaching of a "Law of Nature" that men have "always agreed that you must not simply have any woman you liked" by showing that Moses and his army of Hebrew terrorists and rapists kept "the women children" alive for their own purposes and pleasures, it also demonstrates without question that Moses and gang were genocidal blood thirsty murdering maniacs who raped and slaughtered helpless and innocent children. This in itself should make any thinking person reject the Bible as a source of meaningful moral guidance. And as far as the grotesque and bloody Bible being "the word of God" only a madman would believe such a claim after being made aware of the senseless and unnecessary violence and wholesale slaughter and rape it promotes and which it pretends was committed on orders from God. As Thomas Paine asked in *The Age of Reason*, "Is it because ye are sunk in the cruelty of superstition, or feel no interest in the honor of your Creator, that ye listen to the horrid tales of the Bible, or hear them with callous indifference?"

After failing to demonstrate there is "a real Right and Wrong," he writes as if he was successful in making that point and even

states that “we are forced to believe” in it. Of course, this is nonsense. It seems the closest we can get to “a real Right and Wrong” is balance of justice and the golden rule – do unto others as you would have them do unto you – ideas which predate Jesus by about 2,000 years when they appeared in the ancient Egyptian story, *The Eloquent Peasant*, during the Middle Kingdom (c. 2040 – 1650 BCE).

However, objectively, even the golden rule falls far short of perfection. As George Bernard Shaw wrote in *Maxims for Revolutionists*, “Do not do unto others as you would that they should do unto you. Their tastes may not be the same.” Add to this Immanuel Kant’s point that based on the golden rule, a criminal could argue that a judge should not punish him or her for their crime. It seems the only real source of right and wrong is our own conscience and reason. Perhaps the closest we can get to a universal rule of behavior is simply to do our best to be kind to each other. From a Deist’s perspective, perhaps this is how our Designer intended things to be. We are each and every one individually responsible for what we do and for what we fail to do. This gives more meaning to our lives and our actions than if we simply followed a set of written rules made up by others.

Next, Lewis seems to be setting us up for Saul’s/Paul’s line in Romans 3:23, “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God” and thus our dependency on the mythical messiah of Christianity who will make our imperfections disappear in the eyes of God, when he writes, “None of us are really keeping the Law of Nature.” By “the Law of Nature” Lewis must mean the “real Right and Wrong” the existence of which he failed to establish.

He writes that “this year, or this month, or, more likely, this very day, we have failed to practise ourselves the kind of behaviour we expect from other people.” This is not necessarily true if we are honest with ourselves and with others by openly acknowledging the simple fact that nobody is perfect. Once we are realistic enough to know that everyone lacks perfection, we stop expecting it from ourselves and from others. However, even though we recognize the reality of human imperfection, we still do our very best to be decent human beings and to treat others with respect and to always improve ourselves.

Lewis goes to great lengths attempting to convince the reader that “the Law of Nature” exists even though by his own definition it does not as his own Judeo-Christian Bible at Numbers 31:15-18, mentioned above, proves. His claim that “the Law of Nature” must be real because when we violate it, by being mean or rude to someone, for example, we feel guilty and often attempt to justify our actions. He claims that by attempting to justify our actions we are making clear that “the Law of Nature” is real, otherwise we would not attempt to justify our actions. Objectively, all that this reveals is our conscience, and the jury is still out regarding the origins of our conscience. Some theories are that our conscience is genetically determined and greatly influence by cultural teachings. This could explain why in some cultures cannibalism is accepted while in most cultures it is taboo. The fact that there are really no universal taboos further negates Lewis’ claim that there really is “the Law of Nature” which impacts everyone.

To further make the point that followers of the Abrahamic “revealed” religions in particular do not have a universal moral code or “the Law of Nature” as Lewis refers to it, again, all we need to do is look at their holy scriptures, their Bible. (Since Muslims claim Abraham as the patriarch of Islam, they include themselves in accepting the Bible as part of “the word of God” though, not the final word of God as they claim the Koran is.)

One act that most societies class as taboo is incest. However, in Genesis 19:36 we read, “Thus were both the daughters of Lot with child by their father.” This isn’t a very good deterrent to incest to have a major “holy man” like Lot, who was Abraham’s nephew, being made drunk with wine and then seduced by his two daughters and impregnating them both. Not only does this demonstrate a lack of a universal taboo on incest by Lot’s daughters, but also by whoever wrote the story and/or the person or people who decided to include it in the Torah and the Bible.

Most societies make killing children a taboo, and if there is a “Law of Nature” as Lewis taught, surely it would be a serious violation of that law to kill innocent babies. However, the Bible has Moses himself ordering the Israeli army to kill all the children of a vanquished people with the exception of the girls who were virgins

who they were going to keep for their own pleasure, which is nothing less than raping them, as shown in the above mentioned quote from Numbers. And Psalms 137:9 which reads, "Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones." It seems from the content of the Bible itself that killing children is not a taboo. This is a serious blow to Lewis' thesis of a universal "Law of Nature." In fact, Bible examples such as these show the Bible to be a void of any meaningful morals and a blow to our conscience.

Still clinging to his delusional false assumption that he was successful in making his point for a "Law of Nature" which everyone wants to obey, he writes, "These, then, are the two points I wanted to make. First, that human beings, all over the earth, have this curious idea that they ought to behave in a certain way, and cannot really get rid of it." His own Bible and the lack of a universal taboo show that this first point is false with the possible exception of our conscience. Again, the jury is still out regarding our conscience being a product of Nature or nurture. And, even if in time it is shown that our conscience is in all probability a product of the Supreme Intelligence, that still has nothing to do with the God of Christianity and the Bible. He continues, "Secondly, that they do not in fact behave in that way. They know the Law of Nature; they break it." This is false, again, as his Bible and the lack of a universal taboo makes clear. You can't "know" about a nonexistent law, nor can you break it. He finishes the paragraph with, "These two facts are the foundation of all clear thinking about ourselves and the universe we live in." Realizing what he refers to as facts are not facts and are proven to be false helps to make the point that his insisting that his thesis of a "Law of Nature" is correct is in reality only a ploy to rope people into Christianity. People are made to feel guilty for what they cannot help: not consistently meeting their own standards. This guilt is a permanent hook for Christianity.

Expounding on his false idea of a universal Moral Law as though it were a reality, Lewis inadvertently makes the point that his Moral Law is not really universal when he writes, "If two instincts are in conflict, and there is nothing in a creature's mind except those two instincts, obviously the stronger of the two must

win. But at those moments when we are most conscious of the Moral Law, it usually seems to be telling us to side with the weaker of the two impulses.” If the Moral Law existed and was universal it would ALWAYS, not USUALLY, be telling us to side with the weaker of the two impulses.

After dealing with the question of whether Lewis’ Moral Law really is a universal reality or whether it’s simply believing what’s right and what’s wrong based on how we’ve been educated to believe, Lewis gets back to his “war work.” He writes, “If no set of moral ideas were truer or better than any other, there would be no sense in preferring civilised morality to savage morality, or Christian morality to Nazi morality. . . . The moment you say that one set of moral ideas can be better than another, you are, in fact, measuring them both by a standard, saying that one of them conforms to that standard more nearly than the other. But the standard that measures two things is something different from either. You are, in fact, comparing them both with some Real Morality, admitting that there is such a thing as a real Right, independent of what people think, and that some people’s ideas get nearer to that real Right than others. Or put it this way. If your moral ideas can be truer, and those of the Nazis less true, there must be something-some Real Morality-for them to be true about.”

Lewis did a good job in the above quote for the British war effort. However, in regards to reality and truth, he failed. He got the propaganda point across that the British Crown and government wanted for their loyal subjects – “Christian morality,” Britain versus “Nazi morality” heathens. Of course, the hypocrisy of this comes to light when we realize that those who were claiming the high Christian moral ground, the British government, were in fact allied with the atheistic Communists of the Soviet Union who had already by that time butchered millions upon millions of mostly Christian people. That same good British Christian government was at that very time subjugating and occupying the populations of India and Ireland. This is a very low standard, indeed. Lewis’ “Real Morality” is nothing more than a propaganda tool for the British government and for Christianity.

In the next paragraph Lewis tackles witches. He writes, “I have met people who exaggerate the differences, because they

have not distinguished between differences of morality and differences of belief about facts. For example, one man said to me, 'Three hundred years ago people in England were putting witches to death. Was that what you call the Rule of Human Nature or Right Conduct?' But surely the reason we do not execute witches is that we do not believe there are such things. If we did-if we really thought that there were people going about who had sold themselves to the devil and received supernatural powers from him in return and were using these powers to kill their neighbours or drive them mad or bring bad weather, surely we would all agree that if anyone deserved the death penalty, then these filthy quislings did. There is no difference of moral principle here: the difference is simply about matter of fact. It may be a great advance in knowledge not to believe in witches: there is no moral advance in not executing them when you do not think they are there. You would not call a man humane for ceasing to set mousetraps if he did so because he believed there were no mice in the house."

It's embarrassing as a former Christian to admit that I used to believe in such Biblical creatures as witches. However, once I was made aware through Thomas Paine and his critically important but much overlooked book, *The Age of Reason*, that the Bible was so full of nonsense like witches, unicorns, talking donkeys, etc., that it could not possibly be "the Word of God," I evolved into a Deist as thousands of other people have done, and, hopefully, billions more will do as Deism becomes much more widely known. What is wrong to do is to say, as C.S. Lewis does, that the Bible is wrong about witches but you should still believe in it as if it were the Word of God. The more we poison our minds with Biblical unreasonableness, the further we get from God because in order to believe the unreasonable claims in the Bible we must turn our backs on our God-given reason. And the more we reject our reason, the more likely our actions will be poisoned, as well. For example, when the Christians who believed the Bible to be the Word of God had the power to do so, they took Exodus 22:18 seriously, which commands "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live" and mistakenly thinking they were following God's commands as revealed in the Bible, God's Word, they burned alive, hanged and tortured at least tens of thousands of innocent people.

When Lewis writes that we don't kill witches anymore because we don't believe in them anymore, he is destroying all of his arguments to believe in the Bible and in mere Christianity. The reason we no longer believe in witches is because we've developed our reason enough to know that they do not exist. This reasonable belief is in direct conflict with what Lewis promotes as the Word of God, the Bible. The Bible says witches exist, our God-given reason says they do not. And the fact that Lewis admits, that witches do not really exist, goes directly against 2 Timothy 3:16 which says, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Based on this Bible quote, it appears the Bible god did not know that witches are fictional characters. This ignorance caused unbearable pain and misery for countless victims even making its way into the New World with the trials and executions of "witches" in Salem, Massachusetts among other places prior to the American Revolution.

It's also interesting to note that Lewis keeps the war in the minds of his listeners and readers by using the term "filthy quislings" to describe witches. "Filthy quislings" is a reference to Vidkun Quisling who was a supporter of Germany over Britain. British propaganda made the word "Quisling" synonymous with "Traitor" since Vidkun Quisling did not support the British plan, Operation Wilfred, to mine Norwegian waters, nor did he support their Plan R 4 which was for the British to occupy Norway. The British government wanted to do this to encircle Germany and to cut off their supply of ore from Sweden which passed through Norway on its way to Germany. They initiated Operation Wilfred on April 8, 1940 but were forced to cancel it the next day due to Germany's invasion of Norway. Being a nationalist and not a monarchist, Quisling supported National Socialist Germany over England and wanted a nationalistic government to replace the Norwegian monarchy.

Next Lewis deals with "the reality of the Law" a law he failed to demonstrate is actually a reality. He writes, "After all, you may say, what I call breaking the Law of Right and Wrong or of Nature, only means that people are not perfect. And why on earth should I expect them to be? That would be a good answer if what I was try-

ing to do was to fix the exact amount of blame which is due to us for not behaving as we expect others to behave. But that is not my job at all. I am not concerned at present with blame; I am trying to find out truth. And from that point of view the very idea of something being imperfect, of its not being what it ought to be, has certain consequences.”

He sadly attempts to side-step the valid argument that the reason no one can live according to his imaginary “Law of Right and Wrong or of Nature” is because no one is perfect, by stating that that argument is not valid because he is not trying to “fix the exact amount of blame which is due to us for not behaving as we expect others to behave.” The fact is that it is a valid argument. Humans have not yet figured out how to live in such a way as to be perfectly polite and considerate to others 100 percent of the time. We are NOT perfect. And, as stated above, the sooner we can take this unnatural burden to be perfect off of our shoulders and off of the shoulders of our fellow people, the sooner we’ll be able to live a happier and more progressive life. Of course, this will further diminish the power and influence of “revealed” religions and their clergy because it will go light years in weakening the guilt these institutions and officials use to control us.

Lewis’ statement that he is “trying to find out truth” is tragically comic because he believes and promotes the teachings in the Bible which are loaded with proven falsehoods. Falsehoods such as a talking snake in the Garden of Eden and original sin to God impregnating a teenage Jewish girl who then gives birth to the Savior whose blood washes away all of our sins including “original sin.” Add these superstitious false teachings and the myriad of others in the Old and New Testaments to the fact that the Jesus story is not unique nor the first “savior” story and has incredible similarities with other myths which predate Christianity, and it becomes logically crystal clear that if your goal is truth, the Bible is not the place to find it.

Still refusing to admit that he did not prove there is a Law of Nature/Law of Right and Wrong which people are supposed to follow, Lewis writes, “The laws of nature, as applied to stones or trees, may only mean ‘what Nature, in fact, does.’ But if you turn

to the Law of Human Nature, the Law of Decent Behaviour, it is a different matter. That law certainly does not mean ‘what human beings, in fact, do’; for as I said before, many of them do not obey this law at all, and none of them obey it completely. The law of gravity tells you what stones do if you drop them; but the Law of Human Nature tells you what human beings ought to do and do not.” Since it’s already been shown that his own Bible violates his own idea of a universal Law of Human Nature with the butchering and raping of women and children, there is no need to continue to address this self-delusion which Lewis stubbornly clings to of such a law actually existing. It is, however, important to note that the standards of perfect behavior which different societies and cultures erect are not perfectly followed by anyone. They are just a guide and a goal to aim at, similar to an athlete who strives for a perfect record. Lewis appears to use this natural imperfection found in everyone as a means to trick people into believing they should be perfect and the only way to be perfect in the eyes of God is to be washed in the blood of Jesus.

Lewis next gives the Atheistic view of the universe by stating that things just happened, that all of us and everything we see in the universe just happened by accident. He then gives what he calls “the religious view” which is, in fact, the Deistic view. He states regarding this view, “what is behind the universe is more like a mind than it is like anything else we know.” That is Deism. Deism is the cornerstone of all of the “revealed” religions. However, this is where Deism starts and ends. As Thomas Paine wrote in his essay, *Of The Religion of Deism Compared With the Christian Religion*, “Every person, of whatever religious denomination he may be, is a DEIST in the first article of his Creed. Deism, from the Latin word Deus, God, is the belief of a God, and this belief is the first article of every man’s creed.

“It is on this article . . . that the Deist builds his church, and here he rests. Whenever we step aside from this article, by mixing it with articles of human invention, we wander into a labyrinth of uncertainty and fable, and become exposed to every kind of imposition by pretenders to revelation.”

Lewis continues with his description of what he calls the religious explanation for the universe by writing further about the Su-

preme Intelligence. He writes, "That is to say, it is conscious, and has purposes, and prefers one thing to another. And on this view it made the universe, partly for purposes we do not know, but partly, at any rate, in order to produce creatures like itself-I mean, like itself to the extent of having minds. Please do not think that one of these views was held a long time ago and that the other has gradually taken its place. Wherever there have been thinking men both views turn up." He then writes something which many Deists disagree with when he writes, "And note this too. You cannot find out which view is the right one by science in the ordinary sense."

The reason many Deists disagree with this idea is that intelligence is required to create code and working code is in our DNA which science has discovered. It is **known** to be a system of symbols for the communication of information and ideas. **We all know that a code requires intelligence.** Morse code, for example, did not happen by accident. When we look at the more complex binary code that is used to write computer programs we see it is done by sequencing the numbers 0, which represents off, and 1, which represents on. The code in DNA can be compared to the binary code but instead of 0 and 1, genetic code uses the letters A, G, C and T which represent chemicals. This very complex code exists and works in DNA. And not only does DNA contain code, the code is duplicated in replication and copied from DNA to RNA in transcription. There is then translation of the message and it's conveyed from RNA to the amino acids and the amino acids are then assembled into proteins. It is therefore logical and reasonable to believe that since code cannot exist without intelligence, let alone be transcribed and translated to produce a result, the code in DNA was created by intelligence. The known existence and workings of code in DNA, like all the laws of Nature, points us to the Supreme Intelligence.

This discovery of working code in DNA is one of the discoveries of science which helped the longtime proponent of Atheism, Dr. Antony Flew, to evolve into a Deist. Dr. Flew said, "My whole life has been guided by the principle of Plato's Socrates: Follow the evidence, wherever it leads." Dr. Flew followed the evidence to Deism. It's important to make clear that Dr. Flew was a Deist and not a Christian nor any type of "revealed" religionist. Of course, C.S.

Lewis was not aware of the working code in DNA when he wrote *Mere Christianity*.

Lewis continues the promotion of his false idea that we are “under a moral law” which we did not make and which we know we should obey.

Next he writes, “We want to know whether the universe simply happens to be what it is for no reason or whether there is a power behind it that makes it what it is. Since that power, if it exists, would be not one of the observable facts but a reality which makes them, no mere observation of the facts can find it.” This is not correct as the above mentioned facts about the intelligence dependent working code in DNA make evident. It’s interesting that Lewis uses Deistic terms to refer to God, such as a Power, a Director and a Guide.

He then makes the point that he is “not yet within a hundred miles of the God of Christian theology.” He then mentions “Life-Force philosophy, or Creative Evolution, or Emergent Evolution.” He writes that people such as Bernard Shaw believed in this type of philosophy and idea of the universe. Lewis writes, “People who hold this view say that the small variations by which life on this planet ‘evolved’ from the lowest forms to Man were not due to chance but to the ‘striving’ or ‘purposiveness’ of a Life-Force. When people say this we must ask them whether by Life-Force they mean something with a mind or not. If they do, the ‘a mind bringing life into existence and leading it to perfection’ is really a God, and their view is thus identical with the Religious.” Actually, he’s simply describing Deism again. He continues with an attack on a belief in the Life-Force/Deism with, “When you are feeling fit and the sun is shining and you do not want to believe that the whole universe is a mere mechanical dance of atoms, it is nice to be able to think of this great mysterious Force rolling on through the centuries and carrying you on its crest. If, on the other hand, you want to do something rather shabby, the Life-Force, being only a blind force, with no morals and no mind, will never interfere with you like that troublesome God we learned about when we were children.” This is a common fallacy about Deism and about “revealed” religions.

First it assumes that Deists and those who believe in a “Life-Force” don’t have any moral standards. This is false. Deists, Atheists, Agnostics and all freethinkers do our very best to do what is right. For example, common sense tells us it’s not right to be mean to others, so we do our very best not to be mean to others.

Second, Lewis is making the assumption that the God of the Bible, “that troublesome God we learned about when we were children” is a reality. The God of the Bible is a myth. And if you try to follow the teachings attributed to the God of the Bible to lead a good life, you will fail. For example, the famous 10 Commandments instruct people not to be jealous of their neighbor’s slaves instead of outlawing slavery. So, based on the 10 Commandments, it’s OK to have slaves. And for a slave, the Bible teaches at Ephesians 6:5, “Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ.” This is very immoral and disgusting.

Third, what if your “troublesome God” you learned about when you were a child is the God of the Koran, or a God of the Hindus? If that is the case, then you will violate Lewis’ belief that Jesus is the only Son of God.

Lewis then writes, “We all want progress.” This desire for progress is contrary to the Bible in general and to the Old Testament in particular. As the father of the war mongering neoconservatives, Leo Strauss, wrote in a speech entitled, *Progress or Return? The Contemporary Crisis in Western Civilization*, “Judaism is a concern with return; it is not a concern with progress. ‘Return’ can easily be expressed in biblical Hebrew; ‘progress’ cannot.”

Next Lewis writes that to this point in his book we’ve only gotten to a “Somebody” or “Something” and not to the Christian God. He makes a huge assumption by stating that this “Somebody” or “Something” is “behind the Moral Law.” As shown numerous times above, he has not shown that there is such a thing as “the Moral Law.” The closest we can come to a universal moral law is our conscience, and it has not been proven one way or the other whether our conscience is the result of Nature or of nurture or of both.

He then writes, “We are not taking anything from the Bible or the Churches, we are trying to see what we can find out about this Somebody on our own steam. And I want to make it quite clear that what we find out on our own steam is something that gives us a shock. We have two bits of evidence about the Somebody. One is the universe He has made. If we used that as our only clue, then I think we should have to conclude that He was a great artist (for the universe is a very beautiful place), but also that He is quite merciless and no friend to man (for the universe is a very dangerous and terrifying place).”

How Lewis can say that the Source of our very lives is “quite merciless and no friend to man” is very difficult to understand. I would agree with Lewis on this point if our Creator had not given us the tools and the ability to make our way in the world. In a sense, it could be Lewis’ Christian mindset that made him describe God in such a way. The Christian teachings that God will do everything for us and that “whatsoever ye ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive” (Matthew 21:22) twist the mind to desire a life of laziness and leisure instead of a life of challenges, learning and of progress. As the Deist Leonardo da Vinci wrote, “Thou, O God, dost sell unto us all good things at the price of labor.”

Objectively, if humanity had refused to subject itself to the superstitions and myths of the various “revealed” religions throughout history, and had instead only embraced our God-given reason, we would have conquered many more diseases than we have to date, and we would probably be technologically advanced enough to start colonizing space, which we must do if we want to continue the existence of humanity.

After writing some more about his unproven “Moral Law” as if he had proven it is a reality, he makes notice that we all fall short of obeying it. He writes, “It is after you have realised that there is a real Moral Law, and a Power behind the law, and that you have broken that law and put yourself wrong with that Power-it is after all this, and not a moment sooner, that Christianity begins to talk. When you know you are sick, you will listen to the doctor. When you have realised that our position is nearly desperate you will begin to understand what the Christians are talking about.”

This is pure rubbish. As already stated above several times, Lewis has not once proven this “Moral Law” he bases his argument on. Still, he persists in writing as if he has proven it is a reality. This is delusional. Even if there was a universal moral law that God created, wouldn’t it be reasonable to believe that God would have designed us to be perfect so we would not violate this law of his/hers? (It’s interesting to note that Lewis uses an analogy of a doctor when we realize that Christianity teaches to heal the sick through faith-healing and that too many Christians believe in faith-healing to the point of allowing their innocent children to die through this false Bible promise.)

Lewis rambles on, “They offer an explanation of how we got into our present state of both hating goodness and loving it. They offer an explanation of how God can be this impersonal mind at the back of the Moral Law and yet also a Person.” This ludicrous statement is best answered by Thomas Paine who wrote regarding Jesus as God and dying on the cross for our sins, “If a God, he could not suffer death, for immortality cannot die, and as a man his death could be no more than the death of any other person.”

Again, he continues his religious ramblings about Christianity. “They tell you how the demands of this law, which you and I cannot meet, have been met on our behalf, how God Himself becomes a man to save man from the disapproval of God.” This makes God look like a cruel and ignorant being who suffers from a split personality. Why would God in the first place make a law for us that He knows we cannot obey? Then, after He creates this problem, we’re supposed to be thankful that He solved it by turning Himself into a man and had Himself tortured and crucified because He wanted us to follow a law He created which He knew we could not follow? This goes directly and very strongly against our God-given reason!

Lewis has the gall to write, “All I am doing is to ask people to face the facts – to understand the questions which Christianity claims to answer. And they are very terrifying facts.” Anyone who objectively looks at it realizes there are no proven facts involved. The only questions are meaningless questions about Christian superstitions, doctrines and dogmas. It reminds me of the American

Revolutionary leader and fighter, Ethan Allen. He was a Deist and had a cousin who was a Christian clergyman. He wrote his cousin saying he did not believe in original sin. His clergyman cousin wrote back saying that without original sin there is no need for Christianity. Ethan Allen wrote him back saying that he agreed, there is no need for Christianity!

Next Lewis does some more of his “war work” by writing, “I wish it was possible to say something more agreeable. But I must say what I think true. Of course, I quite agree that the Christian religion is, in the long run, a thing of unspeakable comfort. But it does not begin in comfort; it begins in the dismay I have been describing, and it is no use at all trying to go on to that comfort without first going through that dismay. In religion, as in war and everything else, comfort is the one thing you cannot get by looking for it. If you look for truth, you may find comfort in the end: if you look for comfort you will not get either comfort or truth – only soft soap and wishful thinking to begin with and, in the end, despair. Most of us have got over the prewar wishful thinking about international politics. It is time we did the same about religion.”

Just as it’s been shown that World War II, the war Lewis is referring to, was not necessary, so Christianity and “revealed” religions are not necessary. Our God-given reason makes both of them unnecessary.

Chapter Three

Examining and Answering Book II – What Christians Believe

Book two starts with the rival conceptions of God. Lewis writes that he had been asked to tell his listeners/readers what Christians believe and states that he's going to start by telling them about "one thing that Christians do not need to believe." He writes that Christians don't have to believe that all the other religions are completely wrong, and he contrasts that with Atheists who do have to believe that the main point of all religions on the planet is "one huge mistake." Lewis writes, "If you are a Christian, you are free to think that all these religions, even the queerest ones, contain at least some hint of the truth." This "hint of the truth" all religions contain is Deism, that is, the simple belief in God. However, he qualifies this with a statement which enables religious violence and wars, not only between Christians and other "revealed" religions, but between warring factions of Christians, too. He writes, "But, of course, being a Christian does mean thinking that where Christianity differs from other religions, Christianity is right and they are wrong."

Lewis points out that the majority of people through the ages have believed in God or gods and that Atheists have always been in the minority.

He then divides those who do believe in God into two groups. One group is Pantheists who believe God is beyond good and evil and that God and the Universe are one. And the other group are the Abrahamic "revealed" religions; Judaism, Christianity and Islam. He makes it clear that the Pantheists believe God and the Universe

are so much the same that one could not exist without the other, while Christians believe God is outside of the Universe and that the Universe is a creation of God. This belief makes the Universe dependent on God but God remains completely independent. He stresses that Pantheists don't believe anything in the Universe is truly bad while Christians make a distinction between what they see as good and bad and that they take it very seriously. To make the point of the difference he writes, "Confronted with a cancer or a slum the Pantheist can say, 'If you could only see it from the divine point of view, you would realise that this also is God.' The Christian replies, 'Don't talk damned nonsense.'" He shows his Christian superstition when he explains why he used the word "damned." He explains that the Pantheists' idea is damned because it is "under God's curse, and will (apart from God's grace) lead those who believe it to eternal death." Although C.S. Lewis is promoted as an intellectual, this statement and other superstitious statements like it demonstrate his deeply held unreasonable/nonintellectual ideas and beliefs.

His next paragraph starts with a sentence which is probably intended to promote the English government's and Crown's war interests. It is, "For Christianity is a fighting religion." The paragraph goes on to say that Christians believe that the world and Universe are products of God's creativity and that "a great many things have gone wrong with the world that God made and that God insists, and insists very loudly, on our putting them right again."

After this "war work" of his for the government and Crown, Lewis explains that when he was an Atheist he used as an argument against the belief in God the fact that things "seemed so cruel and unjust" in the Universe. He then questions how he developed a standard that told him that things are cruel and unjust. As expected, he falls back on his idea of a universal Rule of Right and Wrong which has already been proven false in the previous chapter.

In what appears to be an attempt to show a need for complexity in religious/spiritual matters, in a probable effort to make it easier to accept Christianity's complex and convoluted design, Lewis dismisses Atheism as being too simple instead of being illogical. The reason many rational people believe Atheism is incorrect is

not because it's too simple, but because it ignores the intelligence that is a real part of the Universe.

As he did previously when he wrote as if he had proven his point about a universal Law of Right and Wrong actually existing when in fact he did not, so he does with Atheism by writing in a very arrogant and dismissive manner, "Very well then, atheism is too simple." He then goes on to show he does indeed want us to accept his idea that things involving religion must not be simple but are complex and difficult to understand. He writes, "And I will tell you another view that is also too simple. It is the view I call Christianity-and-water, the view which simply says there is a good God in Heaven and everything is all right-leaving out all the difficult and terrible doctrines about sin and hell and the devil, and the redemption. Both these are boys' philosophies." It appears Lewis is deceiving himself and others into believing man-made superstitions and doctrines which, if believed, make Christianity absolutely essential.

His next paragraph attempts to promote his idea that religious things must not be simple and are in reality very hard to understand and to grasp. He writes, "It is no good asking for a simple religion." He should have qualified that with "revealed religion" since the natural religion/philosophy of Deism is very simple. He continues, "After all, real things are not simple. They look simple, but they are not. The table I am sitting at looks simple." The first objection to his line of reasoning is that religion is a man-made thing, not a natural thing. While a table is a man-made thing, he claims its complexity is in its atomic structure, which is nature based. The second objection is that you'd expect him to go on to explain why the table is not simple, but instead he starts off doing that but ends up describing how vision works! He continues, "but ask a scientist to tell you what it is really made of-all about the atoms and how the light waves rebound from them and hit my eye and what they do to the optic nerve and what it does to my brain-and, of course, you find that what we call "seeing a table" lands you in mysteries and complications which you can hardly get to the end of." For the wants and needs of an average person, a table is very simple. To the physicist who spent time studying the designs in Nature, the atoms that make up the table are very simple.

Even though it is true that many things in Nature are complex, such as DNA, there is no need for unnecessary complexity. And there is no need to compare apples and oranges as Lewis is attempting to do here.

Next, Lewis complains that enemies of Christianity attempt to destroy it by making it out to be too simple. He writes, “Such people put up a version of Christianity suitable for a child of six and make that the object of their attack.” Inadvertently Lewis is contradicting what the Bible at Mark 10:15 says that Jesus said, “Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.” It’s obvious why the Bible writers attribute these words to Jesus: it discourages people from using their God-given reason and asking tough questions of the Christian clergy. It encourages us to accept Christian teachings as a child who hasn’t yet reached the age of reason would, unquestioningly.

He continues in the same paragraph, “When you try to explain the Christian doctrine as it is really held by an instructed adult, they then complain that you are making their heads turn round and that it is all too complicated and that if there really were a God they are sure He would have made ‘religion’ simple, because simplicity is so beautiful, etc.” This sentence is a big problem for Lewis and for those Christians who depend so much on *Mere Christianity* as a guide and a support for their Christian faith. The big problem is what exactly is “the Christian doctrine.” Christians have been killing each other for centuries about this. After secular governments took away their ability to wage physical war against one another over matters of “Christian doctrine” they have become content to now simply damn each other to Hell over matters of what the true Christian doctrine really is. As is made clear in Chapter 1, the Christian doctrine of what is required for salvation of a believer’s soul is not even clear.

Lewis admonishes his listeners and readers to “be on your guard against these people” who believe that if God did give us a religion, that religion would be simple. He finishes the paragraph with a statement that makes clear how much he has distanced himself from his God-given reason when he writes, “as if ‘religion’

were something God invented, and not His statement to us of certain quite unalterable facts about His own nature.” Which religion? It’s probably safe to assume that he means the Christian Abrahamic “revealed” religion. And it’s probably safe to assume that what Lewis sees as God’s statement about His own nature is the Bible, both Old and New Testaments. If this is true then God is a very violent, unjust and jealous entity, and he’s not very bright, either. He kills millions of unborn babies and infants in the Bible story of the flood; he hardened Pharaoh’s heart many times so Pharaoh would not let the Hebrews leave Egypt and then God personally slaughtered the first-born of all the Egyptians and their animals because Pharaoh did not do what the Bible god made impossible for him to do; his name is “Jealous” for the simple (here is a Biblical account of simplicity which contradicts Lewis’ statement that nothing is simple) reason that he’s so jealous (Exodus 34:14); and he’s so stupid he allows one of his own creations, Satan, to trick him into a corner where the only way out is for him to become a person and die. Read objectively, if the Bible is really God’s statement to us of his unalterable nature, as Lewis claims, then the Bible god is not someone/something a sane rational kind person would want anything to do with!

Next, when Lewis embarrasses himself and all Christians with the statement, “when you have grasped that the earth and the other planets all go round the sun . . .” it makes thinking people angry that a Christian would dare to use such an example! The Christians have blood on their hands, the blood of free-thought heroes like Giordano Bruno who were tortured and burned alive by the Christians for stating the scientific fact that Lewis so foolishly and hypocritically uses to support Christianity! The idea of a heliocentric solar system goes so strongly against the raw ignorance found in the Bible, in Judaism and in Christianity that Copernicus did not dare to have his ideas in support of this scientific and natural fact published until after he died. When Bruno espoused this fact, he was tortured and burned alive. After Bruno, Galileo Galilei had the courage to defy the Bible and the Catholic Inquisition by proclaiming a heliocentric solar system and was arrested and forced to call the truth a lie in order to save his life and avoid Bruno’s horrific excruciatingly painful fate. How Lewis has the gall to do this is be-

yond reason and shows his lack of class. The remainder of this paragraph is only Christian apologetic sophistry.

Lewis begins his next paragraph with, “Reality, in fact, is usually something you could not have guessed.” This sentence inadvertently makes clear why the scientific process of experimentation is so important – it removes the need to guess. It is the best road to travel which leads to reality. It’s what allowed mankind to reach the moon and which allows us to rely on engineering, medicine, computers, etc. so thoroughly.

He continues with, “That is one reason I believe in Christianity. It is a religion you could not have guessed. If it offered us the kind of universe we had always expected, I should feel we were making it up. But, in fact, it is not the sort of thing anyone would have made up.” Although Lewis could not have known, in 2008 evidence has been discovered that in the first century B.C.E. a Jewish messiah named Simon is said to have been “the Son of God” lived, died and was resurrected.⁶ The myth of Simon pre-dates the myth of Jesus.

The paragraph is ended by Lewis appearing to condition our minds for the complex absurdity that is Christianity with its built-in need for the clergy. He writes, “It has just that queer twist about it that real things have. So let us leave behind all these boys’ philosophies-these over-simple answers. The problem is not simple and the answer is not going to be simple either.”

In the next paragraph he takes right up with, “What is the problem? A universe that contains much that is obviously bad and apparently meaningless, but containing creatures like ourselves who know that it is bad and meaningless.” This is a huge assumption on Lewis’ part that is not backed up with facts! Lewis seems to long for the Abrahamic, with the exception of Judaism which puts most importance on the here and now, ideal of complete lack of struggles and challenges that are promised in an afterlife. The Biblical heaven and the Paradise of the Koran are places with no struggles or challenges. Believers in the Christian idea of heaven

⁶*The Messiah Before Jesus: The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Israel Knohl, University of California Press, p. 25

believe they will have mansions and plenty of rest. Islamic believers believe they will have virgins to satisfy them and that everything they wanted while alive they will have in Paradise. In short, both seem to promise whatever you want and an existence free of challenges. This is a big selling point for both Abrahamic “revealed” religions here on Earth!

Lewis’ assumption that we “know that it is bad and meaningless” assumes that everyone hates a challenge and that challenges are bad. It assumes that we know all. And I think he assumes the Universe is meaningless because he’s afraid of challenges and the effort it takes to make real progress.

Henry David Thoreau wrote about “the steady progress of the Universe” an idea embraced by most Deists. It seems that recent studies in genetics and DNA have given credence to this idea of Thoreau’s. The working code in DNA works in a semantic fashion, that is it uses symbols to communicate meaning. This would strongly indicate that Lewis’ statement that the Universe is without meaning is incorrect. Of course, when Lewis wrote this incorrect statement, no one at that time had the knowledge we now have about DNA and its purpose driven working code.

He goes on to write, “There are only two views that face all the facts. One is the Christian view that this is a good world that has gone wrong, but still retains the memory of what it ought to have been. The other is the view called Dualism. Dualism means the belief that there are two equal and independent powers at the back of everything, one of them good and the other bad, and that this universe is the battlefield in which they fight out an endless war. I personally think that next to Christianity Dualism is the manliest and most sensible creed on the market. But it has a catch in it.” His statement that “there are only two views that face all the facts” is misleading. It fails to recognize that we don’t have all the facts, so how can we face them all? Every day new facts are discovered and new information is learned. Also, what is a fact one day can be thrown out the next as new information is discovered. For example, we used to believe the Sun went around the Earth. Now, however, we know this is false and that the Earth orbits the Sun.

Regarding the “catch” he found in Dualism, it appears to be a valid one. His main point is that if one Force of Dualism is considered good, and the other Force is considered bad, then that means there is another power “further back” which determined what is good and what is bad. That power is God. However, he attempts to use the bad Force of Dualism to show that the devil of Christianity is a “fallen angel.” He believes bad things, in this case, the Devil of the Bible, are real and that they get their power from God or goodness. He writes, “The powers which enable evil to carry on are powers given it by goodness.” This is why he rejects Dualism.

In his next paragraph he attempts to do more of his “war work” but in a more subtle way. He writes, “Enemy occupied territory—that is what this world is. Christianity is the story of how the rightful king has landed, you might say landed in disguise, and is calling us all to take part in a great campaign of sabotage. When you go to church you are really listening-in to the secret wireless from our friends: that is why the enemy is so anxious to prevent us from going.” This is probably a metaphor to strengthen his listeners’ belief that Christian England is on God’s side “in a great campaign” to drive out the evil Germans who then occupied the continent of Europe. (It is possible that at the time of its broadcast it was a coded message for British and French agents behind enemy lines.) He forgets, however, that the Germans were holding Christian church services all across Germany and Europe, too.

By using the term “the enemy,” Lewis is talking about the Devil. Of course, at the time and place of the broadcast, the Devil was intended to mesh in the minds of his listeners with “Germans.” He plainly said/wrote when asked if by using the term “the enemy” did he mean the Devil, “Yes, I do.” So this “intellectual,” Lewis, believes in the Devil as a real entity and not a made up character for the purpose of scaring people into conformity. He even ends the paragraph with the ominous statement, “If anybody really wants to know him better I would say to that person, ‘Don’t worry. If you really want to, you will. Whether you’ll like it when you do is another question.’”

In the next paragraph Lewis states that Christians believe that an evil power, the Devil, “has made himself for the present the

Prince of this World.” He addresses the question of how an all powerful God could have allowed this to happen by saying it is due to free will. We all have free will to do whatever we desire. Sometimes it does wrong and sometimes good. He writes, “free will though it makes evil possible, is also the only thing that makes possible any love or goodness or joy worth having.” This neglects to recognize the fact that Christianity itself makes unconditional love of God impossible. Christianity promises it will give Christians eternal life in the hereafter, while in the here and now it will give them the power to heal the sick and anything they ask for in prayer, believing. This entices people to accept Christianity not because they love God, but because they can get things from God. The Christian’s love of God is conditioned upon these promises and others like them found in the Bible.

He goes on with, “The happiness which God designs for His higher creatures is the happiness of being freely, voluntarily united to Him and to each other in an ecstasy of love and delight compared with which the most rapturous love between a man and a woman on this earth is mere milk and water.” It’s not a free and voluntary relationship if one party tells the other that rejection will cause them to suffer and burn in Hell for eternity! How could that ever be seen as a voluntary relationship??? It’s similar to gangsters selling protection to business owners. If you don’t do business with them, you will suffer.

Before reading Lewis’ next statement it may be best to have fresh in your mind a couple of Biblical claims, out of a vast number that are available, that are directly in opposition to our God-given reason. For example the talking donkey at Numbers 22:28-30. Or how about a flat planet Earth as is depicted at: Isaiah 40:22; Daniel 4:10-11; Matthew 4:8 among several other places in the Bible?

Now, with talking donkeys and a flat Earth in mind we read what both an intellectual and proponent of the Bible as the “Word of God,” C.S. Lewis, writes next: “But there is a difficulty about disagreeing with God. He is the source from which all your reasoning power comes: you cannot be right and He wrong any more than a stream can rise higher than its own source.” We should not

be too surprised by this. This is standard operating procedure for Christian apologists. They never consistently rely on reason. They only rely on it when it's convenient for them to do so. And most of the time, even then, they twist it beyond recognition. He continues to dig his hole, and Christianity's, and in fact, a hole for all unreasonable "revealed" religions much deeper by writing, "When you are arguing against Him," (that is, defying your God-given reason) "you are arguing against the very power that makes you able to argue at all: it is like cutting off the branch you are sitting on." Does he mean that by rejecting unreasonable claims found in Christianity and the Bible we are in agreement with "the source" of our reasoning powers, God? If so, then this is Deistic thinking Lewis is promoting and not mere Christianity.

The American Revolutionary War hero and Deist Ethan Allen addressed this issue of reason over religion when he wrote in his thought provoking book, *Reason: The Only Oracle of Man*, "Those who invalidate reason, ought seriously to consider, *Whether they argue against reason with or without reason; if with reason, then they establish the principle, that they are laboring to dethrone*, but if they argue without reason, (which, in order to be consistent with themselves, they must do) they are out of the reach of rational conviction, nor do they deserve a rational argument." In the above paragraph, Lewis has established the importance of reason and the source of reason as being God.

At the end of the paragraph Lewis does make a good point, although it's not proven beyond a doubt. That point is about free will. He writes, "If God thinks this state of war in the universe a price worth paying for free will-that is, for making a live world in which creatures can do real good or harm and something of real importance can happen, instead of a toy world which only moves when He pulls the strings-then we may take it it is worth paying." To me, this makes sense. However, it does not seem to align with the Christian teaching that salvation depends upon a person's acceptance of Jesus as their personal Savior because the alternative to accepting this Christian teaching is eternal torment in a lake of fire. It's akin to walking up to a person with \$10,000.00 in one hand and a blow-torch in the other and asking them if they want the money or to be roasted with the blow-torch. Perhaps this is

why life on Earth is designed so no one KNOWS what, if anything, happens to us after our body dies.

Next Lewis asks, "How did the Dark Power go wrong?" By "Dark Power" he means the fictional character of Satan, the Devil, Lucifer, etc. He might as well ask, "How did the bogeyman go wrong?" All are fictional, intended to be used by the clergy and authority figures to keep their credulous flocks in line with fear. To make clear Lewis' lack of credibility we see that at the end of that paragraph he blames all of the world's problems on the Devil, similar to the old comedy line, "The Devil made me do it!" He claims, "What Satan put into the heads of our remote ancestors was that they could 'be like the gods'-could set up their own as if they had created themselves-be their own masters-invent some sort of happiness for themselves outside God, apart from God. And out of that hopeless attempt has come nearly all that we call human history-money, poverty, ambition, war, prostitution, classes, empires, slavery-the long terrible story of man trying to find something other than God which will make him happy."

His next paragraph attempts to equate God with religion. He claims that there is no way people can be happy "without bothering about religion. God cannot give us a happiness and peace apart from Himself, because it is not there. There is no such thing." This terrible assumption of Lewis', that God and religion are one and you can't have happiness without religion, is the cause of much violence and misery over the millenniums. Look at the current deadly mess in the Middle East. It is based on religion. The Jews claim they are the chosen people of God and that the land of Israel, whose borders are still to be decided, is a gift from God to them. The Palestinians say the Jews are not God's chosen people and the land belongs to them. In addition to this, the religion of Islam tells them to fight non-believers, or those who do not believe the Koran and in Islam. The Jews and Muslims both falsely believe by following their man-made "revealed" religion, that they are following God. There doesn't appear to be much happiness in either Judaism or Islam in the Middle East.

In the next paragraph this "intellectual" plays the blame game on Satan again. He writes, "That is the key to history. Terrific en-

ergy is expended-civilizations are built up-excellent institutions devised; but each time something goes wrong. Some fatal flaw always brings the selfish and cruel people to the top and it all slides back into misery and ruin. In fact, the machine conks. It seems to start up all right and runs a few yards, and then it breaks down. They are trying to run it on the wrong juice. That is what Satan has done to us humans.” How can people be expected to make real progress when they are told they’re not responsible, Satan is? The reason “selfish and cruel people” make it to the top is because good people don’t get involved and do nothing. Or, if they attempt to do something, the minute they meet resistance, they quit trying. This is not the non-existent Satan’s fault, it’s our own fault.

In addition to being foolish for attempting to blame a non-existent creature for our own faults, Lewis seems to be suggesting that we need a religion based government to avoid these flaws in civilizations. Of course, history has shown us theocracies never work. In fact, theocracies are worse than a bad democracy or republic. We frequently hear of people in Islamic nations being put to death for blasphemy or some other act that should be considered progress instead of criminal. We shouldn’t forget the misery Christianity brought to the world through its Inquisition and witch hunts.

His next paragraph could have been written in the Israeli Knesset. He writes that God “selected one particular people and spent several centuries hammering into their heads the sort of God He was – that there was only one of Him and that He cared about right conduct. Those people were the Jews, and the Old Testament gives an account of the hammering process.” First off, how do we know God selected “one particular people” and educated them about the “sort of God He was” ?? This is making a dangerous assumption that the Bible is the word of God. There is no more evidence that the Bible is the word of God than there is that the Koran or *Alice in Wonderland* are “words of God.”

The phrase, “that there was only one of Him” assumes the ancient Hebrews were the only ones who believed in only one God. However, as Thomas Paine points out in *The Age of Reason*, this is not so. Paine notes that in Jonah 1:14 the Gentile sailors on whose

ship Jonah was sailing prayed to one Supreme Being, that they might be able to save Jonah and not throw him overboard into the sea as the lot indicated should be done. Paine wrote, "The address of this prayer shows that the Gentiles worshiped one Supreme Being, and that they were not idolaters, as the Jews represented them to be."

As the great French Deist Voltaire pointed out, it is strange indeed that God would have chosen the Hebrews/Jews as his favorite people. Voltaire wrote in an entertaining and thought provoking essay, *Adam*, "It is certain that the Jews had written and read very little; that they were profoundly ignorant of astronomy, geometry, geography, and physics; that they knew nothing of the history of other nations; and that it was only in Alexandria that they at last began to acquire some learning. Their language was a barbarous mixture of ancient Phoenician and corrupted Chaldee; it was so poor that several moods were wanting in the conjugation of their verbs."

One very important point that most Christians, including C.S. Lewis, did not and do not seem to grasp is, as the Jewish American comic Lewis Black pointed out in his DVD *Red, White and Screwed*, the Old Testament has nothing to do with Christians, it belongs to the Jews. Black brought to our attention that he gets upset when he sees on television a Christian preacher explaining the Old Testament because it is not intended for Christians. He noticed that you never turn on the television and see a rabbi explaining the New Testament, because the New Testament is not for Jews, it's for Christians. Even the Ten Commandments are specifically addressed to the Hebrews, not to Christians or anyone else as is evident by the intro found at Exodus 20:2 and Deuteronomy 5:6 which has God saying, "I am the LORD thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage." This is clearly addressed to the Hebrews/Jews and to no one else.

Many Christians believe that the Old Testament contains prophecies of Jesus. This simply is not true. All of the Old Testament prophecies the Christian clergy claim are in reference to Jesus have been proven false by, among many others, Thomas Paine in his monumental work *The Age of Reason, The Complete Edition*.

Lewis' statement that God selected the Jews, actually the Hebrews, to be educated directly by God probably comes from Deuteronomy 7:6 which says God chose the ancient Hebrews "above all people that are upon the face of the earth." Of course, the reason the Bible makes this claim is because the writers of it were the ancient Hebrews! You wouldn't expect them to say the Egyptians were chosen by God above all people, nor any other people who they were in competition with. This claim is just an ancient psychological warfare technique. It killed two birds with one stone. First, it filled the Hebrews with a sense of superiority to all of their neighbors and set them apart from the rest of humanity with this false sense of superiority. It really strengthened the "them against us" unifying mindset the clergy and politicians find so useful. Secondly, it put fear in the hearts of their enemies who were steeped in superstition. It was, and is, a very useful tool for religious Hebrews/Jews and for the Jewish state of Israel.

When Lewis writes that God taught the Jews/Hebrews about "the sort of God he was" he's opening himself, Judaism and Christianity up for some severe and well deserved criticism.

Looking at the Old Testament we can still learn just what kind of God the Bible god is. It's not a pretty picture!

To start with, the Bible god, contrary to the belief of many Christians, turns out to be a good example for abortionists. In the Bible story of Noah and the flood found at Genesis 7, we learn that all life on Earth, with the exception of Noah and his family and the animals in the ark, was killed by the flood which the Bible claims was brought by God. This would mean that millions of unborn babies were also killed, along with their mothers, fathers, brothers and sisters, grandparents, etc. This disgusting Bible story makes God out to be, if not the first, then one of the first abortionists in world history! And when the Bible god killed the unborn child, the mortality rate for the mother was 100 percent! The Bible does not offer very good moral ground for people to take a stand on.

You can tell what sort of a person someone is by their traits. For example, if you're looking for someone to be in a deep and meaningful relationship with, you would not try to find someone who is extremely jealous. However, this is one of the first things

the Bible god let the Hebrews know about himself, that he was jealous. In fact, the Bible god is so jealous that his actual name is Jealous! Exodus 34:14 teaches us this with, "For thou shalt worship no other god; for the LORD, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God." Since jealousy is a sign of insecurity and is an imperfection, it seems Lewis' Bible god misses the mark of perfection, too. (Also, I thought the Hebrews believed in only one God. If this is true, then how could they worship any other God??? It wouldn't be possible.)

When we look at the Middle East we see it is one of the most violent areas on Earth. This can probably be traced to Judaism and the sort of god the Bible and Koran are based on. For example, at 1 Samuel 15:2-3 we see the Bible says that God gave the order to the Jews to commit genocide. It reads, "Thus saith the LORD of hosts, I remember that which Amalek did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way, when he came up from Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass." This makes clear another trait of the Bible god that Lewis promotes in *Mere Christianity*, a violent genocidal streak which causes the Bible god to order the slaughtering of men, women, infants and sucklings. Perhaps this also served a government purpose during World War II in regards to the allied carpet and fire bombings of German civilian and refugee populations in cities like Hamburg and Dresden. After all, if God Himself ordered the mass butchering of "infants and sucklings" then there is nothing wrong with such behavior.

Another fact about the Old Testament which Lewis neglects to mention is that according to the Old Testament one of God's primary concerns seems to be establishing Israel as master of the world. This goal is also promoted in the neoconservative movement today. The man considered as the founder of the neoconservative movement is the Jewish professor Leo Strauss. Strauss thought that society should be based on the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. In the editor's introduction to a collection of Strauss' writings, *Jewish Philosophy and the Crisis of Modernity*, Kenneth Hart Green writes, "Strauss learned from Maimonides that religion is essential to any healthy political society, and cer-

tainly for the moral life of human beings. Over and above this, Maimonides convinced Strauss that Jewish religion, based on the Hebrew Bible, is most essential to ground a ‘genuine’ morality for almost every human being.”

This cornerstone idea, that the Jewish religion through the Hebrew Bible should be used to control the people, is what motivates and holds together the Jewish and Christian neocons. It is the driving force that sparks increasing and unquestioned US support for Israel, no matter what the cost is to the US and to the rest of the world. Unlike the Christian part of the Bible, the New Testament, which focuses on the hereafter, the Old Testament is much more focused on the well-being of the Jewish people and Israel in the here and now.

The neocon/Straussian idea of basing society on the Hebrew Bible is working amazingly well. Of key importance in the Hebrew Bible is Israel’s well-being. In the book of Isaiah 60:10-12 we read what God allegedly said regarding Israel: “And the sons of strangers shall build up thy walls, and their kings shall minister unto thee: for in my wrath I smote thee, but in my favour have I had mercy on thee. Therefore thy gates shall be open continually; they shall not be shut day nor night; that men may bring unto thee the forces of the Gentiles, and that their kings may be brought. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.” If believed, this is a direct threat from God to Gentiles that if they do not serve Israel, they will be destroyed!

The Shema is considered the most important Jewish prayer. When you simply superficially read about it, it actually sounds kind of nice. It promotes loving God with all of your heart and soul. This is very Deistic/reasonable. However, it also says that if you don’t follow God’s commandments you will suffer. Remember, the Bible god has a hair-trigger temper! And of course, this prayer is not for everyone as is obvious by its opening phrase, “Hear O *Israel*, the Lord is *our* God . . .” (Emphasis added)

This prayer is taken from text in Deuteronomy 6. If you take the time to read what is above the chosen text and what is below it, you will see it is for the earthly conquest of the neighbors of Israel.

In fact, the very first verse makes this clear. It reads, “Now these are the commandments, the statutes, and the judgments, which the LORD your God commanded to teach you, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go to possess it:”

To paint an even worse picture of God, this Bible chapter has God telling the Hebrews that they will be able to have great things, everything from cities to wells, that they stole from their neighbors! Verses 6:10-11 disgustingly reads, “And it shall be, when the LORD thy God shall have brought thee into the land which he sware unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, to give thee great and goodly cities, which thou buildedst not, and houses full of all good things, which thou filledst not, and wells digged, which thou diggedst not, vineyards and olive trees, which thou plantedst not; when thou shalt have eaten and be full;” How disgusting is that??? This is not a good motivation to say your prayers! It’s a sick and twisted mindset that needs to be done away with.

The way this Bible quote makes clear that the Jews won’t have to build cities or dig wells, etc., reminded me of the point Thomas Paine made about the lack of creating that possessed the ancient Jews. Thomas Paine wrote in his thought provoking and enlightening essay *The Origins of Freemasonry* regarding Solomon’s Temple, “We do not read in the history of the Jews whether in the Bible or elsewhere, that they were the inventors or the improvers of any one art or science. Even in the building of this temple, the Jews did not know how to square and frame the timber for beginning and carrying on the work, and Solomon was obliged to send to Hiram, King of Tyre (Zidon), to procure workmen; ‘for thou knowest’ (says Solomon to Hiram, I Kings v, 6), ‘that there is not among us any that can skill to hew timber like unto the Zidonians.’

“This temple was more properly Hiram’s Temple than Solomon’s, and if the Masons derive anything from the building of it, they owe it to the Zidonians and not to the Jews.”

All of the above clearly demonstrates that Lewis was wrong when he said God wanted the ancient Jews to know that He “cared about right conduct.” There is nothing morally right in all of the cases taken from the Old Testament found above. And these are

just a very small sampling. Entire volumes can be written on the lack of morality and of any type of Universal Rule of Right and Wrong found in the Old Testament/Hebrew Bible.

In the next paragraph, Lewis gets over dramatic when he writes, "Then comes the real shock. Among these Jews there suddenly turns up a man who goes about talking as if He was God. He claims to forgive sins. He says He has always existed. He says He is coming to judge the world at the end of time. Now let us get this clear. Among Pantheists, like the Indians, anyone might say that he was a part of God, or one with God: there would be nothing very odd about it. But this man, since He was a Jew, could not mean that kind of God. God, in their language, meant the Being outside the world Who had made it and was infinitely different from anything else. And when you have grasped that, you will see that what this man said was, quite simply, the most shocking thing that has ever been uttered by human lips." Actually, as shown above, after the death of C.S. Lewis, discovery was made concerning a Jew who believed he was the Son of God and is known as "the Messiah of Qumran." The Messiah of Qumran preceded Jesus. The Jesus myth is not unique. Plus, anyone can say anything. Talk is cheap, and what Lewis is being so overly dramatic about here is only that, mere talk.

Lewis' next paragraph makes you wonder either just how naive and gullible Lewis is, or just how naive and gullible he believes his listeners and readers are. He writes, "One part of the claim tends to slip past us unnoticed because we have heard it so often that we no longer see what it amounts to. I mean the claim to forgive sins: any sins. Now unless the speaker is God, this is really so preposterous as to be comic." Since there is absolutely no evidence that Jesus was God, the claim that he can forgive sins is comic! Lewis continues, "We can all understand how a man forgives offences against himself. You tread on my toe and I forgive you, you steal my money and I forgive you. But what should we make of a man, himself unrobbed and untrodden on, who announces that he forgave you or treading on other men's toes and stealing other men's money?" The only thing we can make of him is that at best he has no understanding of forgiveness, that one person cannot forgive the crimes or hurtful actions perpetrated against

another. At worse, the person making the claim is insane. Lewis rambles on, "Asinine fatuity is the kindest description we should give of his conduct. Yet this is what Jesus did. He told people that their sins were forgiven, and never waited to consult all the other people whom their sins had undoubtedly injured. He unhesitatingly behaved as if He was the party chiefly concerned, the person chiefly offended in all offenses. This makes sense only if He really was the God whose laws are broken and whose love is wounded in every sin. In the mouth of any speaker who is not God, these words would imply what I can only regard as a silliness and conceit unrivaled by any other character in history." When Lewis writes that these claims the Bible attributes to Jesus "makes sense" only if made by God is probably true. However, there is no evidence at all that Jesus was God. And, Jesus is far from the first or the last person to make, or who is said to have made, such claims.

In his next paragraph Lewis makes a huge erroneous assumption when he writes, "Yet (and this is the strange, significant thing) even His enemies, when they read the Gospels, do not usually get the impression of silliness and conceit." He assumes that those who are enemies of Jesus, or who simply don't believe in Jesus, "do not usually get the impression of silliness and conceit." Just because someone doesn't say something does not mean they are not thinking it. Many people have been programmed to never discuss religion, let alone to openly ridicule religion and religious figures such as Moses, Jesus and Mohammed. There is absolutely nothing "strange" or "significant" about it. He continues in the same paragraph, "Still less do unprejudiced readers. Christ says that He is 'humble and meek' and we believe Him; not noticing that, if He were merely a man, humility and meekness are the very last characteristics we could attribute to some of His sayings." An "unprejudiced" or unbiased reader would not come to the Bible subjectively believing it. An unprejudiced reader would be completely objective. When they would read such things as Jesus is the only son of God, they would look for evidence to back it up. Since there is no evidence for this unreasonable claim, they would reject it. When Lewis writes, "Christ says that He is 'humble and meek'" it sounds something akin to a Monty Python skit. How can a humble and meek person brag about being humble and meek? When he

writes that we believe it when the Bible says that Jesus said he is humble and meek he's making another inaccurate assumption. The majority of people, based on the fact that Christianity does not include the majority of people on Earth, do not believe this. It is possible that the majority of *his* listeners and readers believe it, but even a large portion of them may not. Certainly, not every one of them would believe it. And he closes the paragraph with the assumption that Jesus was God, therefore, in spite of his sayings which strongly indicate the opposite, he was humble and meek. This is all mere assumption.

In his next paragraph Lewis inadvertently helps the free-thought movement. For too long, too many people who know better have been giving too much leeway to Christianity and to the other unreasonable "revealed" religions. As Thomas Paine wrote, "It is an affront to truth to treat falsehood with complaisance." Lewis makes a great point about people who try to say Jesus was a great moral teacher, but they don't accept him as the son of God. He writes that "that is the one thing we must not say. A man who was merely a man and said the sort of things Jesus said would not be a great moral teacher. He would either be a lunatic-on a level with the man who says he is a poached egg-or else he would be the Devil of Hell. You must make your choice." Lewis is correct with the exception of talking and writing about the fictional character, "the Devil of Hell" as if it was a real entity. The truth of his statement prior to bringing the Devil into it is proven by the fact that when people today make the same claims that the Bible attributes to Jesus, the vast majority of people write them off as having severe mental problems. Lewis then continues in an attempt to pressure his listeners and readers, the vast majority of who were raised to venerate Jesus, into saying Jesus was either the son of God, a mad-man or Satan. In his over dramatic style Lewis writes regarding Jesus, "You can shut Him up for a fool, you can spit at Him and kill Him as a demon; or you can fall at His feet and call Him Lord and God. But let us not come with any patronising nonsense about His being a great human teacher. He has not left that open to us. He did not intend to." One option that Lewis must have been attempting to hide from his audience is the most probable, that

Jesus was merely a myth of the Jews that they then sold to the Gentiles.

His next paragraph is one giant unreasonable assumption sprinkled with his “war work.” He writes, “We are faced, then, with a frightening alternative.” Fear is a cornerstone of all the various “revealed” religions, including Christianity. He continues, “This man we are talking about either was (and is) just what He said or else a lunatic, or something worse. Now it seems to me obvious that He was neither a lunatic or a fiend.” Lewis does not say why Jesus does not appear to him to be a lunatic. And again he fails to address the alternative that has a lot of God-given reason on its side, that Jesus was not actually a real person, that he was and is an ancient Jewish myth that was sold to and bought by many Gentiles. As to why he doesn’t think Jesus a “fiend” does not matter since by “fiend” based on what he wrote above regarding “the Devil of Hell,” etc., he means a mythical creature. He next makes the mother of all assumptions and writes, “and consequently, however strange or terrifying or unlikely it may seem, I have to accept the view that He was and is God.” Why he has to accept this nonsensical idea is beyond God-given reason. He then ends the paragraph with some of his subtle “war work” when he writes, “God has landed on this enemy-occupied world in human form.”

In his next paragraph he states that most Christians believe God came to Earth as Jesus “to suffer and be killed.”

His next paragraph states, “The central Christian belief is that Christ’s death has somehow put us right with God and given us a fresh start. Theories as to how it did this are another matter. A good many different theories have been held as to how it works; what all Christians are agreed on is that it works.” Unfortunately for Lewis and for many Christians, this is not true. There are many Bible verses which agree with Lewis. However, there are many that do not. For example, Matthew 5:20 has Jesus saying, “Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.” There are several other Bible teachings in Matthew which make the same point, as there are throughout the Bible. He ends the paragraph with more meaningless sophistry.

In his next paragraph he writes something that, if true, would mean our God-given reason should take a back seat to the man-made and, as shown above, contradictory New Testament. He writes, “We believe that the death of Christ is just that point in history at which something absolutely unimaginable from outside shows through into our own world.” By mentioning history, he brings up a headache for Christian apologists. For why would God wait so long to turn Himself into a man to be sacrificed for all of humanity’s salvation? Lewis continues with “. . . if we found that we could fully understand it, that very fact would show it was not what it professes to be—the inconceivable, the uncreated, the thing from beyond nature, striking down into nature like lightning. You may ask what good will it be to us if we do not understand it. But that is easily answered. A man can eat his dinner without understanding exactly how food nourishes him. A man can accept what Christ has done without knowing how it works: indeed, he certainly would not know how it works until he has accepted it.” This Christian tripe is insulting to our God-given reason. It uses shallow and empty Christian apologetics to answer a real and important question. Peter Byrne addresses these problems of history and reason on page 12 of his important book, *Natural Religion and the Nature of Religion, The Legacy of Deism*, when he writes, “We have already seen from within Christian theology it is customary to acknowledge the existence of some form of natural theology. Yet this natural knowledge of God presents both a dilemma and a problem to the Christian vision of history. The dilemma takes the following form. The more natural knowledge is played down, the more Christianity appears to be an abrupt intervention into human religious history. If no preparation for Christ’s proclamation is allowed in the general history of thought, the more it appears to be a new and local disclosure and the more arbitrary and capricious the God behind it appears to be. Yet if its message is made more reasonable by being likened to ancient and long-known truths, it will seem far from unique. It will appear an unnecessary repetition of what the best minds have already taught. The accompanying problem is that Christianity seems bound to suffer by comparison with a naturally available knowledge of God and morality. For if God were going to effect the salvation of the whole of mankind, it

would seem *a priori* much more reasonable to do so by way of a universal and naturally available knowledge of his character and existence than by way of anything so local and recent as the life of Jesus. Once the knowledge and service of God is brought under the perspective of a universal and caring providence, then a religion produced by natural reason seems infinitely preferable to one tied to specific historical events. This argument from God's perfect providence and justice was to seem to Enlightenment thinkers the most obvious and convincing for the superiority of natural religion over revealed. Those who laid the basis for Christian apologetics were thus faced with a complex task in defending both the uniqueness of the revelation they articulated and its justice."

In Lewis' next paragraph he writes the indefensible, "We are told that Christ was killed for us, that His death has washed out our sins, and that by dying He disabled death itself. That is the formula. This is Christianity. That is what has to be believed." And that is nonsense! It goes directly and unrelentingly against our God-given reason. First, to say someone or something was "killed" you mean they or it exists no more. But, as the story goes, Jesus wasn't really killed, he came back to life.⁷ There is no reason to believe that his temporary death "washed out our sins." Even the New Testament contradicts itself on this point as shown above. Jesus' temporary alleged death did not disable death because every living thing eventually dies. We know this for a fact. If there is some spiritual death it is intended for, we do not know about it. Christians BELIEVE this to be the case, they do not KNOW it to be the case. By killing your God-given reason you can make yourself believe this ancient myth. But why do that?

In the next paragraph Lewis attempts to paint humanity as owing a debt to God and that Jesus/God became man, was killed and through his death paid our debt to himself. In *The Age of Rea-*

⁷The Bible teaches in Matthew 27:52-53 that Jesus wasn't the only one to come back from the dead at that time. It teaches that when Jesus died, "The tombs broke open and the bodies of many holy people who had died were raised to life. They came out of the tombs, and after Jesus' resurrection they went into the holy city and appeared to many people." Christianity doesn't say what happened to these zombies after coming back from the dead, hanging out in the graveyard for a few days and then strolling into Jerusalem. If this really happened you would think the Romans would have taken notice and recorded such an unusual, historic and unnatural event!

son, *The Complete Edition*, Thomas Paine shows why this analogy fails as well as why the Christian idea of redemption is not even necessary. He writes, "If I owe a person money, and cannot pay him, and he threatens to put me in prison, another person can take the debt upon himself, and pay it for me; but if I have committed a crime, every circumstance of the case is changed; moral justice cannot take the innocent for the guilty, even if the innocent would offer itself. To suppose justice to do this, is to destroy the principle of its existence, which is the thing itself; it is then no longer justice, it is indiscriminate revenge. This single reflection will show, that the doctrine of redemption is founded on a mere pecuniary idea corresponding to that of a debt which another person might pay; and as this pecuniary idea corresponds again with the system of second redemption, obtained through the means of money given to the Church for pardons, the probability is that the same persons fabricated both the one and the other of those theories; and that, in truth there is no such thing as redemption - that it is fabulous, and that man stands in the same relative condition with his Maker as he ever did stand since man existed, and that it is his greatest consolation to think so. Let him believe this, and he will live more consistently and morally than by any other system; it is by his being taught to contemplate himself as an outlaw, as an outcast, as a beggar, as a mumper, as one thrown, as it were, on a dunghill at an immense distance from his Creator, and who must make his approaches by creeping and cringing to intermediate beings, that he conceives either a contemptuous disregard for everything under the name of religion, or becomes indifferent, or turns what he calls devout."

In the same paragraph Lewis claims we've "fallen into a hole" because we attempted to "set up" on our own and we act as though we belong to ourselves. He says this made us rebels against God and he stresses that we need to "surrender" to God, or do what Christians call "repentance." In reality, since the clergy are the ones who wrote the Bible and the only ones in Christianity who claim they know God's will, when people "surrender" they are NOT surrendering to God, but to the Christian clergy. Lewis states that part of repentance is "unlearning all the self-conceit and self-will that we have been training ourselves into for thousands of

years.” The last time a civilization and society did this en masse we fell into the hole known as the Dark Ages.

Lewis claims that repentance and “this willing submission to humiliation” is how we go back to God. Since there is no book in existence that is proven to be the word of God, Lewis has nothing to back this claim. Again, all it amounts to in reality and practice is submitting yourself to the will of the clergy.

Next, in the same paragraph, he pokes himself in the eye with reason when he writes, “He lends us a little of His reasoning powers and that is how we think.” There is no way to align our God-given reason with the nonsense found in the Bible. Once Lewis connects our reason with God, he destroys his entire argument due to the unreasonableness which permeates the Bible and Christianity.

He continues in the same paragraph stating that God can’t help us repent and surrender because that is not in God’s nature. This is a very lame attempt at setting us up for the “reason” God had to become a man, because a man is capable of surrender and humiliation. Lewis claims that if God turned himself into a man he would then be able to “surrender his will, and suffer and die, because He was a man; and He could do it perfectly because He was God. You and I can go through this process only if God does it in us; but God can do it only if He becomes man. Our attempts at this dying will succeed only if we men share in God’s dying, just as our thinking can succeed only because it is a drop out of the ocean of His intelligence: but we cannot share God’s dying unless God dies and He cannot die except by being a man. That is the sense in which He pays our debt, and suffers for us what He Himself need not suffer at all.” This is nonsense of the worse type. Lewis should have been ashamed to promote it, especially in the same paragraph in which he openly states our reason is from God. Thomas Paine addressed the issue of God becoming a man and “dying” when he wrote in *The Age of Reason, The Complete Edition*, “According to that account he was crucified and buried on the Friday, and rose again in good health on the Sunday morning, for we do not hear that he was sick. This cannot be called dying, and is rather making fun of death than suffering it.

“There are thousands of men and women also, who if they could know they should come back again in good health in about thirty-six hours, would prefer such kind of death for the sake of the experiment, and to know what the other side of the grave was. Why then should that which would be only a voyage of curious amusement to us, be magnified into merit and suffering in him? If a God, he could not suffer death, for immortality cannot die, and as a man his death could be no more than the death of any other person.” When our thinking succeeds, we reject the claims of the Abrahamic “revealed” religions, including mere Christianity.

In the next paragraph Lewis states that some people say that if Jesus was God then it was easy for him to suffer and to die. Lewis admits this is true but says it doesn’t mean people should reject being saved because it was easy for Jesus to do as God. He compares people rejecting Christianity on this account to a child who refuses to learn handwriting from an adult because for the adult handwriting is easy. This diminishes the suffering that Christians enjoy applying to Jesus. Just take a look at Mel Gibson’s film, *Passion of the Christ*. Also, as both a former Catholic and Evangelical Christian, I know the suffering of Jesus was always paramount in the teachings of both Christian sects.

Next Lewis explains that there “are three things which spread the Christ life to us: baptism, belief and that mysterious action which different Christians call by different names-Holy Communion, the Mass, the Lord’s Supper.” It’s interesting to note that the Last Supper or Lord’s Supper which it is said Jesus took part in was the Jewish celebration of God slaughtering the first-born of the Egyptians and their animals. The reason for this unnecessary butchering of the first-born throughout Egypt was because, as mentioned previously, the Bible god “hardened Pharaoh’s heart” as Exodus 4:21 and ten other Biblical passages make clear. This is more than twice the number of passages which says Pharaoh hardened his own heart! The first passage which says God hardened Pharaoh’s heart is Exodus 4:21. It reads, “And the LORD said unto Moses, When thou goest to return into Egypt, see that thou do all those wonders before Pharaoh, which I have put in thine hand: but I will harden his heart, that he shall not let the people go.” Why would Jesus, allegedly a man of peace, attend an activity which

promotes such horrific violence? It's also important to realize that there is no historical evidence for large numbers of Hebrews being held as slaves by the Egyptians.

Lewis goes on to say he doesn't know why these three things, baptism, belief and Holy Communion are required to spread "the Christ life to us." Since, as shown previously, the Bible itself is very ambiguous regarding what is needed to be a Christian and to receive salvation, Lewis states that some Christians place more importance on one of these three things than the others. He closes the paragraph stating, "Anyone who professes to teach you Christian doctrine will, in fact, tell you to use all three, and that is enough for our present purpose." This is not true.

In his next paragraph he writes, "I cannot myself see why these things should be the conductors of the new kind of life. But then, if one did not happen to know, I should never have seen any connection between a particular physical pleasure and the appearance of a new human being in the world." The first sentence makes sense, but the second sentence seems to indicate that Lewis thought he was mentally slow as it shouldn't take too long to figure out that a woman and a man having sex produces children. His next statement shows he mistakenly believes he's proven the Bible and the Jesus myth to be realities. He writes, "We have to take reality as it comes to us: there is no good jabbering about what it ought to be like or what we should have expected it to be like." In reality, there is not much, if anything, real about the myths in the Bible, including the myth of Jesus.

Lewis continues in the same paragraph, "But though I cannot see why it should be so, I can tell you why I believe it is so. I have explained why I have to believe that Jesus was (and is) God. And it seems plain as a matter of history that He taught His followers that the new life was communicated in this way. In other words, I believe it on His authority." In order to do justice to these statements of Lewis' we need to understand where the Bible itself came from and by what authority it was produced.

Most Bible believers sincerely believe that the Bible is either the inerrant word of God given directly to the men who wrote the Bible by God Himself, while others believe it is the "inspired word

of God” meaning that although God did not verbally dictate the contents of the Bible to the Bible writers, God did directly inspire them to write what they wrote in the Bible. As we will see, neither one is true.

Theodoret, born around C.E. 393 and died around C.E. 457, was the Christian Bishop of Cyrus and a key theologian for the early Christians. His major work is the *Ecclesiastical History of the Christian Church*. In this writing he sheds some light on the ungodly origin of what we know today as the Bible.

Theodoret’s writings in his *Ecclesiastical History of the Church*, Chapter XV – *The Epistle of Constantine concerning the preparation of copies of the Holy Scriptures* reveals that the Roman Emperor Constantine, who ruled what was left of the Roman Empire from C.E. 324 to C.E. 337, in C.E. 331 ordered the Christian leader Eusebius to prepare 50 copies of the “Holy Scriptures” for his inspection and approval. For doing so, Constantine paid the Christian leaders for the 50 copies of the Christian “Holy Scriptures.” Scholars believe that the ancient Bibles *Codex Vaticanus*, *Codex Sinaiticus*, *Codex Alexandrinus* and the *Peshitta* are examples of these 50 Emperor ordered copies of the “Holy Scriptures.” God had nothing to do with placing the order or for paying for it! Lewis implies that what is in the Bible, or at least the New Testament, is there on the authority of Jesus, who Lewis believes is God. Theodoret makes clear this is not true as Emperor Constantine did not order and pay for the Christian canon until about 300 years after the alleged death of Jesus. Jesus did not write anything himself. The contents of the first official Christian Bible was only decided to be “the word of God” in 331 when Christian clergymen made the decision after being prompted and paid to do so by the politician/Emperor Constantine. The Catholic Church did not declare the canon closed until the Council of Trent between 1545 through 1563.

Lewis continues with, “Do not be scared by the word authority. Believing things on authority only means believing them because you have been told by someone you think trustworthy.” This was very useful for the British war effort, to encourage people to trust the authority figures who got them into the war. However, it

does not square well with great progressive minds like Leonardo da Vinci who wrote, "Anyone who conducts an argument by appealing to authority is not using his intelligence; he is just using his memory." Lewis goes on to say that "Ninety-nine per cent of the things you believe are believed on authority." He does not say that we should always question authority and what we think we know, including "holy" books like the Bible and the Koran. When we do that we see the authority they claim is not real because they do not stand the test of our God-given reason. Also, Lewis ignores the obvious question of why we should believe the Bible based on authority but not the Koran, for belief in the Koran also depends on believing authority figures. I'm thankful one of Lewis' associates at Oxford University, Antony Flew, always questioned authority and followed the Socratic principle of following the evidence. This is what allowed Dr. Flew to evolve into a Deist.

Next, Lewis starts a new paragraph by attempting to plug-in good works. He writes, "Do not think I am setting up baptism and belief and the Holy Communion as things that will do instead of your own attempts to copy Christ." In other words, Lewis believes that good works are also a requirement for Christians. Maybe the ambiguity of the Bible on the important issue of salvation confused Lewis. As mentioned above, some Bible teachings say that salvation is not by faith alone, that doing good is also a requirement. But other verses say that faith alone is all that is required. Acts 16:30-31 even says that one Christian in a house will save the rest of the household. It reads, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house."

In the next paragraph Lewis uses his selective memory again. He states, "That is why the Christian is in a different position from other people who are trying to do good. They hope, by being good, to please God if there is one; or-if they think there is not-at least they hope to deserve approval from good men. But the Christian thinks any good he does comes from the Christ-life inside him. He does not think God will love us because we are good, but that God will make us good because He loves us." First, this is insulting to altruistic people. Lewis completely ignores the reality of altruism. In Lewis' mind, people who are not Christians do good either to

please God or to win approval of their peers. I know people whose actions prove Lewis wrong.

In Lewis' statement that any good Christians do comes from the "Christ-life" inside them sounds like something from a cult. It diminishes the individual and makes their actions meaningless. It turns the individual into a robot. Plus, Lewis completely ignores the selfish reasons Jesus allegedly gave for doing good. A great example of the greed mindset of Christianity is Matthew 6:1-6 where we read that Jesus allegedly said, "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, . . . otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven." Alms are donations to the poor and needy. Why doesn't the Bible say that Jesus said to help the poor and others because it is the right thing to do, that you will be making their lives better? Why does Christianity promote the greedy idea of helping others because you will get a reward out of it? Can you imagine how much more progress would be made in the lives of people and in the world if people could learn to let go of the greed factor and do good things for others simply for the sake of doing good, no reward required? What a beautiful world that will be! And his statement that "God will make us good because He loves us" is dangerous because it implies we don't have to do anything beyond suppressing our God-given reason enough to accept the Jesus myth, God will do all the rest for us and to us.

Lewis continues his Christians as robots for Christ idea in the next paragraph. He writes, "And let me make it quite clear that when Christians say the Christ-life is in them, they do not mean simply something mental or moral. When they speak of being 'in Christ' or of Christ being 'in them,' this is not simply a way of saying that they are thinking about Christ or copying Him. They mean that Christ is actually operating through them; that the whole mass of Christians are the physical organism through which Christ acts—that we are His fingers and muscles, the cells of His body." If this were true, it would totally negate the actions of every Christian who was so possessed. Just as, if you actually believed the nonsense of the Devil and demons, you could not blame the actions of someone who was possessed by Satan for doing harm because Satan is making them commit their actions, so you can't credit Christians who are possessed by Jesus for anything they do. In both

cases the individuals are being manipulated by a superior power. They are only robots. You couldn't reasonably blame or credit them any more than you could rightfully praise the hammer of a sculptor for making a beautiful statue or blame the hammer when used by a murderer to kill an innocent person. Christianity makes tools out of people. Also, something that seems to have escaped Lewis is all the evil Christians have done over the last 2,000 years. By what Lewis wrote above, it would appear that Christians/Jesus are responsible for slaughtering at least tens of thousands of innocent people over the years. From the Crusades to the Inquisition to witch hunts, and even to such instances of unrestrained Judeo-Christian hatred and violence as the massacres of Palestinian refugees in the Sabra and Shatila refugee camps by Christian Lebanese Forces militia group which was aided by the Israeli military in 1982, it seems the body of Christ along with the self-proclaimed "chosen ones of God" are busy butchering the innocents.

Lewis goes on embarrassing himself in the same paragraph by again getting it wrong concerning what is required for this new "Christ-life." He continues, "It explains why this new life is spread not only by purely mental acts like belief, but by bodily acts like baptism and Holy Communion." A great place to do research on the Bible, and on the Koran and Book of Mormon as well, is Skeptics Annotated Bible at <http://www.skepticsannotatedbible.com>. According to a documented list offered there, there are 14 Bible teachings which teach that salvation is by faith alone, although one of these, Mark 16:16, also requires baptism. There are 22 Bible teachings which teach that salvation is NOT by faith alone. To add even more confusion to what is required for eternal life and salvation according to the Bible read John 6:47-58. These Bible verses say that Jesus said you had to eat his body and drink his blood in order to have eternal life. This is most popular among the Christians known as Catholics. Lewis should have read his Bible more for then he would have learned just how self-contradicting and nonsensical it really is.

Ending the same paragraph, still holding firm to his apparent desire for self-embarrassment, Lewis proclaims an absurd idea. In an attempt to make sense of what he had just said/written about

how to have the new “Christ-life” within us he foolishly writes, “It is not merely the spreading of an idea; it is more like evolution—a biological or super-biological fact. There is no good trying to be more spiritual than God. God never meant man to be a purely spiritual creature. That is why He uses material things like bread and wine to put the new life into us. We may think this rather crude and unspiritual. God does not: He invented eating. He likes matter. He invented it.” How retarding our God-given reason enough to believe that belief in an unreasonable myth coupled with being dunked in water and eating bread and drinking wine while pretending they are the body and blood of the main character in the Jesus myth will cause God/Jesus to live inside of us and to control our actions is beyond God-given reason. It is foolish. It is raw ignorance. To attempt to compare it with natural progress producing evolution is insane. And to pretend you know the mind of God as Lewis does only adds yet more foolishness to the mess.

In his next paragraph Lewis again states beliefs and assumptions as facts in an attempt to answer the legitimate question of what happens to people who never heard of Jesus. He writes, “Here is another thing that used to puzzle me. Is it not frightfully unfair that this new life should be confined to people who have heard of Christ and been able to believe in Him? But the truth is God has not told us what His arrangements about the other people are. We do know that no man can be saved except through Christ; we do not know that only those who know Him can be saved through Him.” How can “We do know that no man can be saved except through Christ” be made to agree with “we do not know that only those who know Him can be saved through Him.” If being saved requires belief in the Jesus myth, not to mention baptism and Holy Communion, how can someone, a man or a woman, believe in a myth they’ve never heard of? How can they perform rituals based on the teachings of a myth they are ignorant of? Lewis continues, “But in the meantime, if you are worried about the people outside, the most unreasonable thing you can do is to remain outside yourself. Christians are Christ’s body, the organism through which He works. Every addition to that body enables Him to do more.” This makes Jesus/God dependent on how many people believe the Jesus myth. Kind of like a politician who is depend-

ent on how many people believe what he says and agrees with it. This shows the Bible is as Thomas Paine described it in *The Age of Reason, The Complete Edition*, an invention of men that is “dishonorable to the wisdom and power of the Almighty.” Lewis finishes out this ridiculous paragraph with, “If you want to help those outside you must add your own little cell to the body of Christ who alone can help them. Cutting off a man’s fingers would be an odd way of getting him to do more work.” How becoming or remaining a Christian will help “save” the billions of people who’ve never heard of Jesus or Christianity from the Christian myth of the “fall of man” until today is unexplainable. From this statement by Lewis we learn that the power of the Christian god, Jesus, is dependent upon how many people buy into the myth.

In his last paragraph of this chapter he seems to be taking up his “war work” again. He writes, “Why is God landing in this enemy-occupied world in disguise and starting a sort of secret society to undermine the devil?” This sentence alone should let everyone know that C.S. Lewis was not really an intellectual for anyone who uses their intellect would never believe in “the devil.” He continues, “Why is He not landing in force, invading it? . . . Well, Christians think He is going to land in force; we do not know when.” At the time Lewis said this on his government radio show, this would have given the enemies of Germany hope. Continuing he says/writes, “But we can guess why He is delaying. He wants to give us a chance of joining His side freely.” This is ridiculous. If this were true, why would the Christian god ever come back? By not coming back he is giving more and more people the chance to join his side. But then, by not returning he won’t be able to defeat the imaginary Satan. The Christian god is in a real mess! Lewis goes on with, “I do not suppose you and I would have thought much of a Frenchman who waited till the Allies were marching into Germany and then announced he was on our side. God will invade. But I wonder whether people who ask God to interfere openly and directly in our world quite realise what it will be like when He does. When that happens, it is the end of the world. When the author walks on to the stage the play is over. God is going to invade, all right: but what is the good of saying you are on His side then, when you see the whole natural universe melting away like a

dream and something else-something it never entered your head to conceive-comes crashing in; something so beautiful to some of us and so terrible to others that none of us will have any choice left? For this time it will be God without disguise; something so overwhelming that it will strike either irresistible love or irresistible horror into every creature. It will be too late then to choose your side. There is no use saying you choose to lie down when it has become impossible to stand up. That will not be the time for choosing: it will be the time when we discover which side we really have chosen, whether we realised it before or not. Now, today, this moment, is our chance to choose the right side. God is holding back to give us that chance. It will not last for ever. We must take it or leave it.” Billy Graham couldn’t have made a better alter call, though Graham never claimed the title of intellectual.

Chapter Four

Examining and Answering Book III – Christian Behavior

Lewis starts out with a story of a schoolboy who was asked what he thought God was like. He answered that he thought God was “the sort of person who is always snooping round to see if anyone is enjoying himself and then trying to stop it.” Lewis then switches from the topic of God to the topic of morality. Instead of talking/writing about God as he started out, he writes immediately after the quote from the boy, “And I am afraid that is the sort of idea that the word Morality raises in a good many people’s minds: something that interferes, something that stops you having a good time. In reality, moral rules are directions for running the human machine.” This switch from God to morality and moral rules helps to illustrate a major underlying problem with “revealed” religions and religionists. They mistake God for their religion. God is **NOT** religion. God is **NOT** moral rules. All of the religions we have and all of the moral rules we have are far from perfect because they are **ALL, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, MAN-MADE**. This imperfection is made evident by the fact that all of the “revealed” religions have many, many sects and sub-sects within them. There is nothing universal or divine about any of them. That is a key reason why there is so much senseless and unnecessary religious violence and warfare in the world. Lewis’ slick assumption which blurs the real line between God and religion and religious “morality” is a technique common among revealed religionists.

Next Lewis discusses moral ideals, moral rules, moral idealism and moral obedience. He states that it is true that moral perfection is an ideal because we cannot achieve it. He writes that it

would be “dangerous to think of oneself as a person ‘of high ideals’ because one is trying to tell no lies at all (instead of only a few lies) . . .” He ends the paragraph with, “By talking about rules and obedience instead of ‘ideals’ and ‘idealism’ we help to remind ourselves of these facts.” But he does not say whose rules we’re supposed to be obedient to. Of course, he’s making the false assumption that they are God’s rules because he’s made the false assumption that the Bible is the word of God and his moral rules come from the Bible.

He next uses the analogies of a fleet of ships and a musical band to show how important it is to have harmony among people and within people. He makes the point that it’s important that the ships don’t drift apart or get too close to each other that they smash into each other, and that the internal workings of each ship is in good working order. In addition, he makes the point that it’s important that the ships know their destination and course, and that the band plays the correct music. He then states in the next paragraph, “Morality, then, seems to be concerned with three things. Firstly, with fair play and harmony between individuals. Secondly, with what might be called tidying up or harmonising the things inside each individual. Thirdly, with the general purpose of human life as a whole: what man was made for: what course the whole fleet ought to be on: what tune the conductor of the band wants it to play.”

In his next paragraph he notes that most people focus on the first of the above three points. He stresses that it is important not to just stop at the first point and to move on to the other two.

He then goes on to say in the next paragraph, “What is the good of telling the ships how to steer so as to avoid collisions if, in fact, they are such crazy old tubs that they cannot be steered at all? What is the good of drawing up, on paper, rules for social behaviour, if we know that, in fact, our greed, cowardice, ill temper, and self-conceit are going to prevent us from keeping them? I do not mean for a moment that we ought not to think, and think hard, about improvements in our social and economic system. What I do mean is that all that thinking will be mere moonshine unless we realise that nothing but the courage and unselfishness of individu-

als is ever going to make any system work properly.” Since Christianity is based on selfishness, the desire to secure eternal life in heaven for oneself, as well as to be able to pray for anything and to receive it (John 15:7), etc., etc., is Christianity the best way to improve human society?

In his next paragraph Lewis really opens himself, Christianity and all of the various “revealed” religions up for something they are not capable of withstanding – God-given reason! He writes, “We are now getting to the point at which different beliefs about the universe lead to different behaviour. And it would seem, at first sight, very sensible to stop before we got there, and just carry on with those parts of morality that all sensible people agree about. But can we? Remember that religion involves a series of statements about facts, which must be either true or false. If they are true, one set of conclusions will follow about the right sailing of the human fleet: if they are false, quite a different set.” WOW! The majority of the teachings in the Bible are false, such as both Creation stories (Genesis 1:1 and Genesis 2:4), talking snakes and donkeys, four legged fowl, etc., etc., etc. Also, there are so many teachings in the Bible that are grotesquely immoral, such as the genocide of the Old Testament, the “moral codes” which demand the stoning to death of disobedient children and of people who do not observe the Sabbath Day (it’s fun to notice that the Sabbath Day is different for Jews and most Christians), the killing of “witches” and the list goes painfully on and on. The fact that the Bible says that Jesus said he did not come to override the Old Testament laws at Matthew 5:17 and the fact that Jesus was allegedly celebrating the story of God slaughtering all the first-born in Egypt at the last supper, which was a celebration of the Passover horror story, shows that these bad teachings and false statements of the Old Testament have been met with approval in the New Testament. So, based on Lewis’ own statement, we need something other than Christianity, the Bible and/or any other “revealed” religion and their accompanying “holy” scriptures to sail our “human fleet.” We need something that aligns with our God-given reason and Nature.

The next paragraph opens with Lewis assuming the Christian belief that we live forever is true. He goes on with, “Now there are a good many things which would not be worth bothering about if I

were going to live only seventy years, but which I had better bother about very seriously if I am going to live for ever.” The Christian tool, and, in fact, a tool for all “revealed” religions, fear, and not morality, is now used by Lewis. He goes on and makes an amusing statement. He writes, “Perhaps my bad temper or my jealousy are gradually getting worse – so gradually that the increase in seventy years will not be very noticeable. But it might be absolute hell in a million years: in fact, if Christianity is true, Hell is the precisely correct technical term for what it would be.” Not only is he using fear to influence people, he uses jealousy as a sin, or as a fault. It probably escaped him that Jealous is the Bible god’s name according to Exodus 34:14! This passage of “holy” scripture reads, “For thou shalt worship no other god: for the LORD, whose name is Jealous, is a jealous God.” Lewis goes on in the same paragraph inadvertently giving one of the reasons for the fall of the Roman Empire when he writes, “And immortality makes this other difference, which, by the by, has a connection with the difference between totalitarianism and democracy. If individuals live only seventy years, then a state, or a nation, or a civilization, which may last for a thousand years, is more important than an individual. But if Christianity is true, then the individual is not only more important but incomparably more important, for he is everlasting and the life of a state or a civilization, compared with his, is only a moment.” This train of thought is what got the Romans who converted to Christianity wasting their time concerning themselves with the idea of an afterlife instead of making things right in the here and now.

Lewis ends his next paragraph with the giant assumption and statement, “For the rest of this book I am going to assume that Christian point of view, and look at the whole picture as it will be if Christianity is true.” It is a terrible mistake to make assumptions based on an idea which is known to be faulty. This mistake will not be made in this book.

He next goes into the four Cardinal Virtues of Prudence, Temperance, Justice and Fortitude.

It seems the first virtue, prudence, would spell the end of Christianity and all of the “revealed” religions. Lewis writes, “Pru-

dence means practical common sense, taking the trouble to think out what you are doing and what is likely to come of it.” As shown throughout this book, real prudence or common sense rejects the nonsensical claims and teachings of the Bible. It’s very telling when one of the central virtues of a religion would, if utilized, spell the end of that same religion. In Lewis’ attempts to reconcile the use of common sense or prudence with Christianity, he again digs his hole deeper. His attempt would disenfranchise many Christians who seem to take pride in the fact that they are not bothered with reason and common sense in their “relationship” with Jesus and in their Christian walk. Lewis writes, “Christ never meant that we were to remain children in intelligence: on the contrary, He told us to be not only ‘as harmless as doves,’ but also ‘as wise as serpents.’” Of course, serpents are not wise, so maybe there is still some hope for the Christians who insist on rejection of their God-given reason. When the Bible says that Jesus said to “be wise” he is in fact asking us to do the impossible. You cannot truly value wisdom and apply objective reason to the Bible, or to any of the “revealed” religions, and still endorse and believe in Christianity or the “revealed” religions. It’s completely impossible because of the unreasonable and unwise teachings and claims they are overloaded with. This is just one more of many Biblical/Christian absurdities. Lewis finishes the paragraph expounding on this impossibility, as if it is possible to unite reason with unreasonableness.

Temperance is the next virtue Lewis tackles. He states that temperance has come to mean “teetotalism” but originally it meant balance in pleasures in all pleasures, not to go to excess. Since, as shown already in this book, Christianity has many different meanings, some Christians believe teetotalism is what God wants, while others, like Lewis, disagree. Lewis writes, “It is a mistake to think that Christians ought all to be teetotalers; Mohammedanism, not Christianity, is the teetotal religion.”

The next virtue Lewis covers is justice. Lewis writes, “Justice means much more than the sort of thing that goes on in law courts. It is the old name for everything we should now call ‘fairness’; it includes honesty, give and take, truthfulness, keeping promises, and all that side of life.” What would you think if Lewis’ god, the

Bible god, is shown to be a deceiver? That would knock out three of Lewis' examples of justice: honesty, truthfulness and keeping promises. There are at least six examples in the Bible itself that depict God as a deceiver. They are: 1 Kings 22:23 which reads, "Now, therefore, behold, the Lord hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee." 2 Chronicles 18:22 which reads, "Now therefore, behold, the Lord hath put lying spirits in the mouth of these thy prophets." Jeremiah 4:10 which reads, "Ah, Lord GOD! Surely thou hast greatly deceived this people." Jeremiah 20:7 which reads, "O Lord, thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived." Ezekiel 14:9 which reads, "And if a prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet" and 2 Thessalonians 2:11 which reads, "For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie." Based on the Bible, it doesn't seem God, the Bible god, is too interested in honesty and justice. This is not a very good moral example for people to follow. Perhaps verses like these allow liars to justify their actions. After all, if God himself is not honest, why should anyone else be? And, as usual, there are at least four contradictory Bible verses to the ones listed above regarding God and deception.

Next Lewis makes the observation that a person who persistently does the right thing develops a "certain quality of character." Lewis writes that "it is that quality rather than the particular actions which we mean when we talk of 'virtue.'" He says this is an important distinction and then goes on to list three reasons why this is so.

The first reason given is, "We might think that, provided you did the right thing, it did not matter how or why you did it – whether you did it willingly or unwillingly, sulkily or cheerfully, through fear of public opinion or for its own sake. But the truth is that right actions done for the wrong reason do not help to build the internal quality or character called a 'virtue,' and it is this quality or character that really matters." What he writes is true. However, he discredits Christianity by saying so. For the very core motivation of becoming a Christian is to escape burning in Hell forever. It is fear that drives people to accept the myth of Jesus.

And Christians are taught to do good in order to receive rewards. This cannot help them to build virtue.

For the second reason he makes the assumption that he knows the mind of God and what God wants. He writes, "We might think that God wanted simply obedience to a set of rules: whereas He really wants people of a particular sort." How he knows this he does not reveal.

In his third reason he makes wild speculations about why we should develop virtues while we're still living here on Earth. Again, the Christian trait of selfishness raises its head. He states that virtues like courage and justice will probably not be needed in Heaven. He then writes, ". . . the point is that if people have not got at least the beginnings of those qualities inside them, then no possible external conditions could make a 'Heaven' for them – that is, could make them happy with the deep, strong, unshakeable kind of happiness God intends for us." So, instead of being just and courageous here on Earth because that is the right thing to do, Lewis says if you don't develop those traits here on Earth, when you get to Heaven you won't benefit from Heaven as much as you would if you had developed character while living on Earth!

Next Lewis moves to social morality. He states that Christianity promotes the idea of treating others as you want to be treated which is nonsense. For example, most people do not want to be literally owned by other people. They do not want to be slaves. They do not want their family and friends to be slaves. Yet, nowhere in the Bible is slavery forbidden. In 1 Peter 2:18 we read the Christian instructions for slaves: "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward." There are several other similarly sick Christian instructions for slaves in the Bible. The vast majority of people have a moral compass which already puts them light years ahead of so-called Christian morality in that they know slavery is wrong while Christian "morality" obviously lacks this important quality. Lewis then goes on to say that Christianity does not have a detailed political program for applying the Golden Rule to "a particular society at a particular moment. It could not have. It is meant for all men at all times and the particular programme which suited one place or time

would not suit another.” How he could honestly believe that Christianity is “meant for all men at all times” is beyond reason. For that to be true, Christianity would have had to have been the first religion of all time. It could not have been intended for people who died prior to the birth of Christianity. He then rambles on about Christianity and writes, “It was never intended to replace or supersede the ordinary human arts and sciences: it is rather a director which will set them all to the right jobs, and a source of energy which will give them all new life, if only they will put themselves at its disposal.” What complete and utter nonsense! One glaring example of just how foolish and cruel a statement this is can be found in the ashes of Giordano Bruno! Bruno dared to openly state as false the belief in transubstantiation, the turning of the communion bread and wine into the actual body and blood of Jesus inside the communicant. He also boldly stated, among other things, the Christian belief that the Sun revolves around the Earth is wrong. These honest and accurate observations the Church considered heresy. If Christianity is the director that will set the ordinary human arts and sciences to their right jobs as Lewis states, why did they torture and burn Bruno alive, along with thousands of other people, for stating facts??? Giordano Bruno and the other victims of Christian fear and ignorance were right and Christianity was and is, wrong.

In the next paragraph Lewis calls for a Christian takeover of society and government. He writes, “People say, ‘The Church ought to give us a lead.’ That is true if they mean it in the right way, but false if they mean it in the wrong way. By the Church they ought to mean the whole body of practising Christians. And when they say that the Church should give us a lead, they ought to mean that some Christians – those who happen to have the right talents – should be economists and statesmen, and that all economists and statesmen should be Christians, and that their whole efforts in politics and economics should be directed to putting ‘Do as you would be done by’ into action. If that happened, and if we others were really ready to take it, then we should find the Christian solution for our own social problems pretty quickly.” This would be disastrous for free thought and progress. It would potentially outlaw voting since the Bible tells us at Romans 13:1-7, “Let every

soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour." Based on this Bible teaching, the powers that be and the authorities are in their positions because God put them there. It is therefore our duty to obey them with fear! Based on this twisted Christian "logic" who are we to vote out someone who was put there by God Almighty? This also makes clear that according to this Bible teaching, America's Founders and everyone who took part in the American Revolution are now suffering "damnation" for not only resisting the established government, but for violently overthrowing it. This Bible teaching really puts a damper on the Fourth of July!

Christian clergy should also be cautious of Lewis' call for a Christian government. If that actually comes about, the clergy would probably lose their tax exemptions unless they work out a deal with the Christian politicians. As the above Bible quote states, we should all pay taxes to the government and governmental authorities: "Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour." (Reason tells us that people and institutions who rely on fear do not deserve honor. The Bible tells us they do.) The clergy also need to be concerned with what the Bible says that Jesus said regarding taxes. In Matthew 22:21 the Bible has Jesus saying, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Also, in Matthew 17:27 the Bible says that Jesus not only told Peter to pay his taxes, but he

actually did pay both his own taxes and Peter's. It reads, "Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them," (the tax collectors) "go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for me and thee." Of course, most of us if not all of us, probably the clergy included, have a much more difficult time getting our money together to pay our taxes than simply catching a fish that has enough money in its mouth to pay our tax bill!

In Lewis' next statement he makes clear that clergy are not necessary. He writes, "But, of course, when they ask for a lead from the Church most people mean they want the clergy to put out a political programme. That is silly. The clergy are those particular people within the whole Church who have been specially trained and set aside to look after what concerns us as creatures who are going to live for ever; and we are asking them to do a quite different job for which they have not been trained." In order to be trained in anything, the person doing the training must know what they are talking about and training others for. To my knowledge, no one **KNOWS** what the afterlife is like or if there even is one. How can someone be a teacher of things not known?

The fact that in reality no one knows even if there is an afterlife helps to make a profoundly important difference between Christianity along with all of the "revealed" religions which promise their followers a ticket to Heaven or Paradise for their belief and Deism. Deism makes no such empty promise. In Deism, people do not fear God. Instead, Deists look at God as their Creator and Best Friend. They do not know if there is an afterlife, but they are not concerned about it. They know they have a lot of work to do in the here and now, and they do it. They also know that whatever the answer is regarding an afterlife and what happens to us when our body dies, if anything, is all part of our Designer's design and Deists are very happy and content knowing that. This brings a wonderful sense of peace and contentment. Many Deists believe God, our Designer, intended it to be this way. This real lack of knowledge regarding an afterlife allows Deists to love God unconditionally.

Lewis finishes the paragraph by calling on Christians to promote Christianity in their jobs and careers. This is what is happening today in the United States. Christians are pushing their beliefs largely in politics, but also in everyday work places. This has brought about everything from the rewriting of history in school textbooks to organized prayer groups at the work place. It has put a politician who is a protege of the dangerously superstitious millionaire Christian preacher and oil man Pat Robertson in the governor's office for the state of Virginia. Of course all of this works hand in hand with the neoconservatives and their push for wars which will make the Jewish state of Israel more secure and eventually restore it to its Biblical borders as Pat Robertson made clear in his article, *The Land of Israel, A Gift From God*. Based on Robertson's ideas, American youth, and the youth of any country that is foolish enough to be sucked into taking part in these neocon wars, better be prepared for much more sacrifice and dying. The borders of Israel in 950 BC, as Robertson states, "go all the way up north to the Euphrates River which encompasses the better part of modern-day Syria. Solomon's empire went up to the Euphrates River. And Tyre and Sidon and Megiddo. And they had the Via Maris which went from Damascus all the way down to Cairo. It went as far as the area down in Gaza." This promotion of Israel is appealing to many Christians because they believe it is what God wants based on the Bible. For example Deuteronomy 28:1 has God saying in regards to Israel, "the LORD thy God will set thee on high above all nations of the earth." And verse 28:10 says of Israel, "And all people of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of the LORD; and they shall be afraid of thee." Fear is big in both politics and religion.

In the next paragraph Lewis tells us what society based on the Bible will be like. He said/wrote that "the New Testament, without going into details, gives us a pretty clear hint of what a fully Christian society would be like. Perhaps it gives us more than we can take. It tells us that there are to be no passengers or parasites: if man does not work, he ought not to eat. Every one is to work with his own hands, and what is more, every one's work is to produce something good: there will be no manufacture of silly luxuries and then of sillier advertisements to persuade us to buy them. And

there is to be no ‘swank’ or ‘side,’ no putting on airs. To that extent a Christian society would be what we now call Leftist. On the other hand, it is always insisting on obedience – obedience (and outward marks of respect) from all of us to properly appointed magistrates, from children to parents, and (I am afraid this is going to be very unpopular) from wives to husbands. Thirdly, it is to be a cheerful society: full of singing and rejoicing, and regarding worry or anxiety as wrong. Courtesy is one of the Christian virtues; and the New Testament hates what it calls ‘busybodies.’” If this doesn’t describe a cult, I don’t know what does! It sounds too much like Jonestown where 918 followers of the Christian clergyman Jim Jones committed mass suicide and/or were murdered by their church’s “Magistrates” and leadership. All cults demand obedience, the surrender of your will and common sense to the clergy/leaders. The only true protection from cults is to never stop using your God-given reason. Of course, if we do that we will stop believing, or never start believing, the ludicrous teachings of the “revealed” religions. After all, Judaism, Christianity and Islam are all cults that just happen to be either believed by or tolerated by the majority of people. To show how true this is, think of someone coming up to you today who is Chinese and they tell you that God has chosen them, the Chinese people, “above all people that are upon the face of the Earth.” Would you believe him or her? Or how about a pregnant teenager telling you she’s pregnant with the son of God, or an Arab showing you a manuscript that he claims an angel brought to him directly from God, would you believe them? Of course not! Your God-given reason won’t let you. And if you objectively apply that same reason to the “revealed” religions, you won’t believe them, either.

Regarding obedience from children to their parents, I suppose Lewis would agree with the Bible teachings that disobedient children should be put to death by the cult/community, such as Leviticus 20:9 which says, “For every one that curseth his father or his mother shall be surely put to death: he hath cursed his father or his mother; his blood shall be upon him.” And Jesus backs this up in Matthew 15:4-6 by calling the Jews “hypocrites” for not following through with this cruel, insane and deadly teaching.

It is also apparent from this paragraph that Lewis buys into the inferior position into which the Bible places women. He promotes the idea that wives should be obedient to their husbands and “show outward marks of respect” to them. It’s not clear if he’s calling on them to bow before their superior husbands or just to genuflect before them as “an outward mark of respect.”

When Lewis states that such a Christian society would be “a cheerful society,” I can’t believe the cheerfulness could possibly be genuine or deep. It would probably be more along the lines of the empty and hollow smiling Moonies.

In his next paragraph Lewis states that not everyone would like a Christian society, that at best we’d only like bits and pieces of it. He claims this is because, “We have all departed from that total plan in different ways, and each of us wants to make out that his own modification of the original plan is the plan itself. You will find this again and again about anything that is really Christian: every one is attracted by bits of it and wants to pick out those bits and leave the rest. That is why we do not get much further: and that is why people who are fighting for quite opposite things can both say they are fighting for Christianity.” When you shine the light of reason on this statement you realize it is not true. The real proven reason “why people who are fighting for quite opposite things can both say they are fighting for Christianity” is due completely to Christianity’s fault of being so ambiguous. A great example of this is the American Civil War. Both sides said they had the Christian god on their side! As shown above, the Bible does not speak out against slavery and it actually instructs slaves to be fearful and obedient to their masters. This would give strength to the stand of the Confederates while Romans 13:1-7, mentioned above, would give strength to the Union since it teaches people to be obedient and fearful of government authorities and the “powers that be.”

Lewis starts out his next paragraph with an historical error of substance. He writes, “Now another point. There is one bit of advice given to us by the ancient heathen Greeks, and by the Jews in the Old Testament, and by the great Christian teachers of the Middle Ages, which the modern economic system has completely dis-

obeyed. All these people told us not to lend money at interest: and lending money at interest – what we call investment – is the basis of our whole system.” This is simply a false statement at least in regards to the Jews of the Old Testament. Deuteronomy 23:20 plainly and clearly instructs Hebrews/Jews not to lend money at usury to fellow Jews, but it’s alright to practice usury against Gentiles. It reads, “Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury; but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury.” This Hebrews/Jews over all mentality in the Bible also applies to slavery. In Leviticus 25:44-46 the Jews are taught, “Both thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever: but over your brethren the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigour.” This is racial supremacy at its worse! This does, however, offer some insight into the mindset of the Jews in Israel which allows them to be so cold-hearted and cruel toward the Palestinians.

Lewis finishes this paragraph with a false sense of honesty when he writes, “But I should not have been honest if I had not told you that three great civilisations had agreed (or so it seems at first sight) in condemning the very thing on which we have based our whole life.” As shown above, the Hebrews/Jews only outlawed usury against fellow Hebrews/Jews, not against Gentiles. And Lewis’ claim that the Hebrews were a “great civilisation” could not be further from the truth and from reality. As Thomas Paine points out in *The Age of Reason, The Complete Edition*, “We do not read in the history of the Jews whether in the Bible or elsewhere, that they were the inventors or the improvers of any one art or science. Even in the building of this temple, the Jews did not know how to square and frame the timber for beginning and carrying on the work, and Solomon was obliged to send to Hiram, King of Tyre (Zidon), to procure workmen; ‘for thou knowest’ (says Solomon to

Hiram, I Kings v, 6), 'that there is not among us any that can skill to hew timber like unto the Zidonians.'

"This temple was more properly Hiram's Temple than Solomon's, and if the Masons derive anything from the building of it, they owe it to the Zidonians and not to the Jews."

The French Deist Voltaire would also be in conflict with Lewis classifying the Hebrews as being creators of a great civilization. Voltaire wrote in an essay called "Adam:" "It is certain that the Jews had written and read very little; that they were profoundly ignorant of astronomy, geometry, geography, and physics; that they knew nothing of the history of other nations; and that it was only in Alexandria that they at last began to acquire some learning. Their language was a barbarous mixture of ancient Phoenician and corrupted Chaldee; it was so poor that several moods were wanting in the conjugation of their verbs."

Lewis unintentionally comically writes, "This is where we want the Christian economist." A Christian economist who had political power would almost certainly require that everyone tithe ten percent of their income to a Christian church. Since this is a Christian society/government Lewis is fantasizing about, I don't know if the money would go to the government since the government itself would be Christian, or if it would go to a Christian church. Perhaps it would be similar to the 13 American Colonies prior to the American Revolution. In that case people would be taxed as they currently are, plus they would have a church tax added to their tax burden. Since Lewis doesn't elaborate on which type of Christianity would rule, we don't know if the ruling sect would allow other Christian sects to exist. If they did, then those unofficial Christian sects would probably expect their members to tithe directly to them. It appears that Lewis has forgotten what history has clearly shown us, that whenever Church and State are mixed violence soon follows. Each sect, who "knows" that their particular brand of Christianity is the right brand, will wage war against the heretics of the other Christian sects. C.S. Lewis is setting us up for a world that is a mirror image of the bloody Middle East.

In the next paragraph Lewis inadvertently and indirectly brings up the Bible's ambiguity regarding salvation by writing,

“Charity – giving to the poor – is an essential part of Christian morality: in the frightening parable of the sheep and the goats it seems to be the point on which everything turns.” He’s referring to Matthew 25:31-46 which tells the story of people who helped their fellow humans by giving them food, giving them drink, in short, being charitable, being rewarded with Heaven while those who refused to help their fellow human beings were punished with Hell. This is one of those Bible verses which teaches that salvation is not by faith, or believing, alone. According to this Bible teaching, faith and believing have nothing to do with salvation, only good works for our fellow human beings in need will get us to Heaven. In *The Age of Reason, The Complete Edition*, Thomas Paine makes some profound observations on this Bible teaching. He writes, “But The Gospel according to Matthew makes Jesus Christ preach a direct contrary doctrine to The Gospel according to Mark;” (Mark 16:16) “for it makes salvation, or the future happiness of man, to depend entirely on good works; and those good works are not works done to God, for He needs them not, but good works done to man.

“The passage referred to in Matthew is the account there given of what is called the last day, or the day of judgment, where the whole world is represented to be divided into two parts, the righteous and the unrighteous, metaphorically called the sheep and the goats. To the one part called the righteous, or the sheep, it says, ‘Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world: for I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.’

“Then shall the righteous answer him, saying, Lord, when saw we thee an hungered, and fed thee? or thirsty, and gave thee drink? When saw thee a stranger, and took thee in? or naked, and clothed thee? Or when saw we thee sick, or in prison, and came unto thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.’

“Here is nothing about believing in Christ – nothing about that phantom of the imagination called Faith. The works here spoken of

are works of humanity and benevolence, or, in other words, an endeavor to make God's creation happy.

"Here is nothing about preaching and making long prayers, as if God must be dictated to by man; nor about building churches and meetings, nor hiring priests to pray and preach in them. Here is nothing about predestination, that lust which some men have for damning one another.

"Here is nothing about baptism, whether by sprinkling or plunging, nor about any of those ceremonies for which the Christian Church has been fighting, persecuting, and burning each other ever since the Christian Church began."

Even though this Bible teaching can be said to be good because it encourages people to help one another, it is bad because it teaches to do good out of fear of being burned in Hell for eternity. Christianity and all of the "revealed" religions lack altruism.

In the rest of the paragraph Lewis makes the point that our charitable giving should be done to the point of pinching and hampering us. He writes, "In other words, if our expenditure on comforts, luxuries, amusements, etc., is up to the standard common among those with the same income as our own, we are probably giving away too little." This is a great point! We need to experience some financial discomfort in our giving to charities and to causes we believe in if we really want to make a positive difference.

In his next paragraph he writes, "A Christian society is not going to arrive until most of us really want it: and we are not going to want it until we become fully Christian. I may repeat 'Do as you would be done by' till I'm black in the face, but I cannot really carry it out till I love my neighbour as myself: and I cannot learn to love my neighbour as myself till I learn to love God: and I cannot learn to love God except by learning to obey Him." In reality, to obey God is very subjective. Christians obey God by following what they can of the Bible. Muslims obey God by following what they can of the Koran. Jews obey God by following what they can of the Torah and Talmud. And among each of these three Abrahamic "revealed" religions there are sects which disagree with each other, often violently, as to how to obey "God." This is be-

cause none of the “holy” books of “revealed” religions are divinely made or inspired. Every one of them is man-made, and the men that made them probably did not have good intentions. They probably wrote and developed them to prey on the superstitions and fears of their fellow men to exploit them for their own benefit and the benefit of their own class or people.

Lewis’ desire for a Christian society would never work in the United States. When America’s Founders created the Republic they intentionally made it impossible for one religion to dominate by writing in the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.” Lewis’ dream of a Christian government/society will not be realized in the United States unless Christians can do away with the First Amendment. A Christian nation, as history shows us, would also have to do away with the Constitutionally guaranteed rights of free speech and a free press.

Next Lewis dives into psychoanalysis. I have very little knowledge of psychoanalysis. However, I do know that Lewis is incorrect when he writes, “But psychoanalysis itself, apart from all the philosophical additions that Freud and others have made to it, is not in the least contradictory to Christianity.” Lewis is wrong because in the Bible people with mental problems were falsely believed to have a devil or a demon inside of them which was causing them to act unnaturally. We now know, in contradiction to the Bible, that devils and demons are not real and that psychoanalysis does not involve treating people for these nonexistent Bible creatures. In fact, psychoanalysis may be used to help people like Lewis who are delusional to the point of actually believing that devils and demons are a part of reality.

Lewis goes on to discuss natural impulses and states that psychoanalysis can help people who act on unnatural impulses. He writes, “Thus fear of things that are really dangerous would be an example of the first kind: an irrational fear of cats or spiders would be an example of the second kind. The desire of a man for a woman would be of the first kind: the perverted desire of a man for a man would be of the second. Now what psychoanalysis under-

takes to do is to remove the abnormal feelings, this is, to give the man better raw material for his acts of choice: morality is concerned with the acts of choice themselves.” Regarding his examples of sexual desire and homosexuality, Lewis has some problems. First off, the Bible says at Matthew 5:27-28 that Jesus said, “Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery: But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” One of the definitions of lust is “strong desire” in the *Webster's Desk Dictionary*. This would make the natural desires of many men and women a sin in Christianity. Regarding his statements that homosexual desires are “perverted” and “abnormal,” this is not known for certain. Currently there is some evidence that homosexuality is caused by genes, though it is not conclusive. It is obvious, however, from looking at the anatomy of a male and of a female that Nature intended them to mate and to reproduce. Homosexuality goes directly against this obvious intent in design. But if the cause of homosexuality can be traced to a genetic source, then it would not be perverted for the individual homosexual person, but it would be an abnormality. In a sense it would show that homosexuality is a form of being sexually handicapped. Also, homosexuality shows how Lewis' earlier statement that psychoanalysis and Christianity go hand in hand is false. The Old Testament is loaded with instructions to kill homosexuals, such as Leviticus 20:13. Also, the Christian New Testament at Romans 1:26-32 says that homosexuality for both men and women, along with “Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful” are all “worthy of death.” This does not just show Christianity and psychoanalysis have absolutely nothing to do with one another, it also makes even more confusing just what is actually required for salvation in Christianity.

Lewis cautions his listeners/readers not to judge others who many may consider as “fiends.” These “fiends” may have a terrible

background, been victims of abuse, etc., which causes them to act the way they do. He falsely states, "That is why Christians are told not to judge." Again, the truth of the matter is that the Bible is very ambiguous on judging as it is on all other matters of importance. The Bible says in several places that Jesus warned against judging others as in Matthew 7:1 which says that Jesus said, "Judge not that ye be not judged." But in other places, such as in the Old Testament in particular, it not only calls for judging, it calls for violently executing those who have been judged as not living up to the religious standards of Jealous, the Bible god. The Old Testament even talks of stoning people to death without being judged. Even the New Testament, in spite of claiming that Jesus said not to judge, instructs believers to judge "righteously" as in John 7:24 which reads, "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." The New Testament brings its approval of judging into the Christian hereafter in 1 Corinthians 6:1-3 which states, "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints? Do ye not know that *the saints shall judge the world?* and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that *we shall judge angels?* how much more things that pertain to this life?" This Christian instruction is for those in the Christian cult to stop taking legal matters to the "unjust," or in other words, to the public legal system. Paul, aka Saul, wanted the Christians to ignore the Roman system and create their own Judeo-Christian system. This is a common practice of cults, to separate their individual members from anyone and anything that is not subservient to the cult and its leadership. The rest of the quote is just Christian gibberish about how the "saints," those who've bought into the Christian myth, will one day, when Jesus comes back, judge not only the world, but will also judge angels! After 2,000 years people are still waiting, suppressing their God-given reason and believing this Biblical nonsense!

In his next paragraph Lewis again opens with a false statement. He writes, "We see only the results which a man's choices make out of his raw material. But God does not judge him on the raw material at all, but on what he has done with it." This makes it seem that salvation is based on our actions, but, as already shown

several times above, the Bible is not clear if God's judgment of us/our salvation rests on our actions or our beliefs or on both.

In his next paragraph he attempts to negate the Bible's ambiguity regarding salvation. He states, "People often think of Christian morality as a kind of bargain in which God says, 'If you keep a lot of rules I'll reward you, and if you don't I'll do the other thing.' I do not think that is the best way of looking at it." Unfortunately for Lewis and for all believing Christians, this is the objective honest way of looking at it because this is what the Bible itself teaches. And "the other thing" Lewis has a hard time recognizing is the Bible god's decision to burn for eternity in a lake of fire everyone who uses their God-given reason and, therefore, rejects the Jesus myth. Perhaps C.S. Lewis really was an intellectual. Maybe he was constantly trying to suppress his intellect and God-given reason in order to believe the Bible and Christianity, or at least to give that appearance. If he was a true believer he would probably not have had to write "the other thing" in place of the threat from the Bible god of horrific eternal suffering and burning of non-believers.

Lewis goes on in the same paragraph with, "I would much rather say that every time you make a choice you are turning the central part of you, the part of you that chooses, into something a little different from what it was before. And taking your life as a whole, with all your innumerable choices, all your life long you are slowly turning this central thing either into a heavenly creature or into a hellish creature: either into a creature that is in harmony with God, and with other creatures, and with itself, or else into one that is in a state of war and hatred with God, and with its fellow-creatures, and with itself." Even though he "would much rather say" that our choices are important and make us what we are, he can't believe that and say that as a Christian. Christianity's carrot and stick approach is so firmly documented it cannot be dismissed by wishful thinking. What Lewis wrote makes much more sense than what the Bible actually teaches. It is impossible to align sound thinking and observations with the nonsense which the Bible is overflowing with. Lewis cannot objectively do it, nor can anyone else.

Lewis continues in a new paragraph with, “That explains what always used to puzzle me about Christian writers; they seem to be so very strict at one moment and so very free and easy at another. They talk about mere sins of thought as if they were immensely important: and then they talk about the most frightful murders and treacheries as if you had only got to repent and all would be forgiven. But I have come to see that they are right. What they are always thinking of is the mark which the action leaves on that tiny central self which no one sees in this life but which each of us will have to endure-or enjoy-for ever.” It seems by what Lewis wrote that Christianity has it backwards. Christianity seems to put more importance on what people think than on what they do. This could be due to the cult of Christianity’s founders and leaders wanting to have more control over people. It’s common knowledge that most people have thoughts that are negative and could, IF ACTED UPON, cause real irreparable harm. By placing more importance on thoughts instead of actions, the Christian founders and clergy can utilize emotions such as guilt much easier than if they simply focused on actions, for most people probably have negative or harmful thoughts they would never act upon. If the clergy just attached guilt to actions they would be cutting their power and influence over their believers since most people do not commit seriously bad acts. The fact that in Christianity “the most frightful murders and treacheries” are not as important as the thoughts people have due to the Christian belief in forgiveness of sins through the Jesus myth is very dangerous and callous. As Lewis writes, terrible acts only have to be repented of for all to be forgiven. This is a dangerous superstition for people to be under the influence of. Thomas Paine made some very important points about this Christian myth of redemption in *The Age of Reason, The Complete Edition* which were mentioned earlier but which are well worth repeating here. He wrote, “If I owe a person money, and cannot pay him, and he threatens to put me in prison, another person can take the debt upon himself, and pay it for me; but if I have committed a crime, every circumstance of the case is changed; moral justice cannot take the innocent for the guilty, even if the innocent would offer itself. To suppose justice to do this, is to destroy the principle of its existence, which is the thing itself; it is then no lon-

ger justice, it is indiscriminate revenge. This single reflection will show, that the doctrine of redemption is founded on a mere pecuniary idea corresponding to that of a debt which another person might pay; and as this pecuniary idea corresponds again with the system of second redemption, obtained through the means of money given to the Church for pardons, the probability is that the same persons fabricated both the one and the other of those theories; and that, in truth there is no such thing as redemption - that it is fabulous, and that man stands in the same relative condition with his Maker as he ever did stand since man existed, and that it is his greatest consolation to think so.

“Let him believe this, and he will live more consistently and morally than by any other system; it is by his being taught to contemplate himself as an outlaw, as an outcast, as a beggar, as a mumper, as one thrown, as it were, on a dunghill at an immense distance from his Creator, and who must make his approaches by creeping and cringing to intermediate beings, that he conceives either a contemptuous disregard for everything under the name of religion, or becomes indifferent, or turns what he calls devout.”

Lewis seems very confused when he writes that the Christian writers are right because, “What they are always thinking of is the mark which the action leaves on that tiny central self which no one sees in this life but which each of us will have to endure – or enjoy – for ever.” This does not make sense when taken with what he wrote previous to this sentence. Previously he wrote that they are more concerned about “mere sins of thought” instead of actions such as “the most frightful murders and treacheries” because all that needs to be done about such vile actions is to repent and be redeemed. Shouldn't Lewis, to be consistent with his previous statement have written, “What they are always thinking of is the mark which the *thought* leaves” instead of “which the *action* leaves.” And instead of being concerned with the perpetrator of crimes, shouldn't concern be shown to the victims of crimes? Lewis also fails to explain why a *temporary* thought or action should give us either *eternal* punishment or *eternal* bliss?

Lewis' next paragraph inadvertently turns Christianity on its empty head. He writes, “Remember that, as I said, the right direc-

tion leads not only to peace but to knowledge. When a man is getting better he understands more and more clearly the evil that is still left in him. When a man is getting worse, he understands his own badness less and less. A moderately bad man knows he is not very good: a thoroughly bad man thinks he is all right. This is common sense, really. You understand sleep when you are awake, not while you are sleeping. You can see mistakes in arithmetic when your mind is working properly: while you are making them you cannot see them. You can understand the nature of drunkenness when you are sober, not when you are drunk. Good people know about both good and evil: bad people do not know about either.” If bad people do not know about good and evil, how can they be blamed for their actions? Wouldn’t people who do not know about good and evil be like Adam and Eve prior to their fall which was, according to the Bible, due to their listening to the talking snake and eating of the tree of knowledge of good and evil? Genesis 2:17 reads, “But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” And why Lewis would rely on “common sense” (though faulty) now, and not apply common sense to the entire Bible and to all of Christianity is beyond mere common sense.

In the next paragraph Lewis expounds on Christian morality as it regards sex, or what he says is the Christian virtue of chastity. He attempts to differentiate between the rule of chastity and the social rule of modesty, propriety and decency. He writes, “The Christian rule of chastity must not be confused with the social rule of ‘modesty’ (in one sense of that word); i.e. propriety, or decency. The social rule of propriety lays down how much of the human body should be displayed and what subjects can be referred to, and in what words, according to the customs of a given social circle. Thus, while the rule of chastity is the same for all Christians at all times, the rule of propriety changes. A girl in the Pacific islands wearing hardly any clothes and a Victorian lady completely covered in clothes might both be equally ‘modest,’ proper, or decent, according to the standards of their own societies: and both, for all we could tell by their dress, might be equally chaste (or equally unchaste). Some of the language which chaste women used in Shakespeare’s time would have been used in the nineteenth century

only by a woman completely abandoned. When people break the rule of propriety current in their own time and place, if they do so in order to excite lust in themselves or others, then they are offending against chastity. But if they break it through ignorance or carelessness they are guilty only of bad manners.” This doesn’t agree with what the Bible says. For example, 1 Timothy 2:9 instructs women regarding what they should wear. It states, “women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array.” It doesn’t specify that women who live in certain areas are exempt from this Biblical teaching. And the Christian dress code applies to men, too. 1 Corinthians 11:14-15 instructs, “Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, *if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him?* But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.” This is amusing since most paintings of Jesus show him with long hair. Since there is not evidence of his existence, no harm is done except to this Christian teaching about how it is wrong for men to have long hair. How the Bible writer and those Christian leaders who voted this to be the word of God in the fourth century could agree that nature teaches us that it is a shame for men to have long hair is very difficult at best to understand. One animal that comes to mind is the lion. The male lion has a long thick mane and is referred to as the king of the jungle. This Bible teaching, like at least 90 percent of Bible teachings, does not make any sense at all. And the statement that a woman’s hair is given to her as a covering reeks of unnatural prudishness as well as exposes the lack of reason in the teaching. For if hair was intended to be a covering for women, wouldn’t their bodies be covered with more hair than a man’s is? **Both** men and women can grow their hair on their heads as long as they want. This would not be true if it was meant to be a covering for women. The Bible abounds with foolishness.

In his next paragraph Lewis starts out with what is probably a truth. He writes, “Chastity is the most unpopular of the Christian virtues. There is no getting away from it: the old Christian rule is, ‘Either marriage, with complete faithfulness to your partner, or else total abstinence.’ Now this is so difficult and so contrary to our instincts, that obviously either Christianity is wrong or our sex-

ual instinct, as it now is, has gone wrong. One or the other. Of course, being a Christian, I think it is the instinct which has gone wrong.” It makes sense that Christianity is wrong. “Revealed” religions and cults like Christianity have as their primary goal the control of people. An efficient way to control people is to have great influence in the parts of their lives that are essential for survival. All three Abrahamic “revealed” religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam try to control food and sex, both of which are essential to a healthy and happy life. For example, the Catholic Church wants Catholics to abstain from eating meat on Fridays as an act of penance. Jews and Muslims are forbidden to eat food that is not “kosher” for the former and not “halal” for the latter. All three Abrahamic “revealed” religions put many restrictions on sex.

In his next paragraph Lewis attempts to persuade us that the fact there are strip tease shows demonstrates the point that people think about sex too much. He makes the ridiculous comparison of a strip tease show based on a beautiful woman to that of a strip tease show which replaces the woman with food. He says that since no one would attend the food strip tease show that this makes clear we have an unnaturally strong sex drive. He attempts to answer a valid question: could the popularity of strip tease shows be caused by sexual starvation? Of course, Lewis does not believe this to be the reason. He writes that “we should have to look for evidence that there is in fact more sexual abstinence in our age than in those ages when things like the strip-tease were unknown.” What age would that be? Thomas Otway’s *The Soldier’s Fortune* published in 1681 mentions “stripping whores.” The Bible itself in Matthew 14:6 and Mark 6:22 relates the story of Herod’s niece dancing for his pleasure on his birthday. This could very well have been a type of strip tease. Even the *Kama Sutra* from ancient India mentions dances of sexual seduction.

Lewis’ next paragraph tries to tackle sexual perversion. He says/writes, “Here is a third point. You find very few people who want to eat things that really are not food or to do other things with food instead of eating it. In other words, perversions of the food appetite are rare. But perversions of the sex instinct are numerous, hard to cure, and frightful.” I wonder if he’s talking about the Christian clergy, in particular Catholic priests? A 2009 report, the

Murphy Report, from Ireland, clearly and painfully shows the Catholic clergy, including nuns, have been raping and sexually molesting and abusing helpless orphans and other defenseless children in Ireland for decades going back to the 1930s. Based on the rampant sexual attacks on children by Roman Catholic clergy as well as by clergy from other “faiths” and from nations around the world, Christianity and “revealed” religions have nothing to offer people regarding sexual conduct. Lewis again goes on to dig a much deeper hole for himself and his fellow revealed religionists. “I am sorry to have to go into all these details, but I must. The reason why I must is that you and I, for the last twenty years, have been fed all day long on good solid lies about sex. We have been told, till one is sick of hearing it, that sexual desire is in the same state as any of our other natural desires and that if only we abandon the silly old Victorian idea of hushing it up, everything in the garden will be lovely. It is not true. The moment you look at the facts, and away from the propaganda, you see that it is not.” Though the cases of sexual abuse by Christian clergy against innocent children were not publicly discussed in Lewis’ day as they are today, the facts remain the same: Christian clergy have been sexually abusing children for, at the very least, decades, and not talking about it actually aids the pedophiles and does great harm to their young innocent victims.

In the next paragraph Lewis continues his big dig, exposing his apparent ignorance of the book he calls the Word of God, the Bible. He writes, “Christianity is almost the only one of the great religions which thoroughly approves of the body-which believes that matter is good, that God Himself once took on a human body, that some kind of body is going to be given to us even in Heaven and is going to be an essential part of our happiness, our beauty, and our energy. Christianity has glorified marriage more than any other religion: and nearly all the greatest love poetry in the world has been produced by Christians.” First off, none of the “revealed” religions are “great religions” for they are all full of fear producing lies and superstitions. And if this is true that Christianity approves of the human body, why would it be written in the Bible as documented above that women have hair for a covering and that “shamefacedness” is somehow a virtue for women? The claim in

Christianity as in many other ancient “revealed” religions, that God took on a human body does not necessarily mean the particular “revealed” religion appreciates and approves of the human body. For example, in Philippians 3:20-21 we read, “For our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself.” No one who admires and appreciates the human body would refer to it as “vile.” Lewis’ inaccurate parroting of the Christian superstition that Christians will have bodies in Heaven is laughable. To be correct he should have said not “some kind of body” but “our own body” will be rematerialized and reanimated on Earth and will fly up to Heaven as Christianity teaches Jesus did. In I Corinthians 15:20-23 we learn that our dead bodies will be resurrected when Jesus comes back to Earth. It reads, “But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” Thomas Paine makes some important humorous points regarding this myth of our dead bodies being resurrected in *The Age of Reason, The Complete Edition*. He wrote, “The doctrine he sets out to prove by argument is the resurrection of the same body, and he advances this as an evidence of immortality. But so much will men differ in their manner of thinking, and in the conclusions they draw from the same premises, that this doctrine of the resurrection of the same body, so far from being an evidence of immortality, appears to me to furnish an evidence against it; for if I have already died in this body, and am raised again in the same body in which I have lived, it is a presumptive evidence that I shall die again.

“That resurrection no more secures me against the repetition of dying, than an ague-fit, when passed, secures me against another. To believe, therefore, in immortality, I must have a more elevated idea than is contained in the gloomy doctrine of the resurrection.

“Besides, as a matter of choice, as well as of hope, I had rather have a better body and a more convenient form than the present. Every animal in the creation excels us in something. The winged

insects, without mentioning doves or eagles, can pass over more space and with greater ease in a few minutes than man can in an hour. The glide of the smallest fish, in proportion to its bulk, exceeds us in motion almost beyond comparison, and without weariness.

“Even the sluggish snail can ascend from the bottom of a dungeon, where a man, by the want of that ability, would perish; and a spider can launch itself from the top, as a playful amusement. The personal powers of man are so limited, and his heavy frame so little constructed to extensive enjoyment, that there is nothing to induce us to wish the opinion of Paul to be true. It is too little for the magnitude of the scene – too mean for the sublimity of the subject.”

When Lewis writes that “Christianity has glorified marriage more than any other religion” he is way off base. The Patriarch of Judaism, Christianity and Islam, Abraham married his half-sister and then pimped her to the Egyptians out of fear and greed according to Genesis 12:10-16! How does this glorify marriage? Why doesn't the Bible teach that Jesus spoke out against this crime? Add to this the fact that the Bible claims at Genesis 25:6 that the father of all the Big Three “revealed” religions, Abraham, had concubines with whom he had children, and Lewis' statement about marriage doesn't mean much. There are many other Bible verses which show total disrespect for marriage.

Leviticus 15:18 seems to contradict Lewis' claim that Christianity glorifies marriage and is accepting of heterosexual sex. It reads, “The woman also with whom man shall lie with seed of copulation, they shall both bathe themselves in water, and be unclean until the even.” Of course, no one in their right mind in full possession and use of their God-given reason would accept this teaching.

As to Lewis' statement that “nearly all the greatest love poetry in the world has been produced by Christians” history seems to show he is incorrect in this statement as well. When we consider all the civilizations from around the world that existed prior to the appearance of Christianity and which produced love poetry, Christian love poetry doesn't come close.

In the next paragraph Lewis continues to make his most frequent mistake, assuming he *knows*, first, that God will judge us, and second, how God will judge us. Lewis writes, “God knows our situation; He will not judge us as if we had no difficulties to overcome. What matters is the sincerity and perseverance of our will to overcome them.” The Bible makes no such claim. As stated many times above, the Bible is not clear as to whether God will judge us entirely based on our belief in the Jesus myth, on our good actions, or on a combination of both. It mentions nothing about the sincerity of our efforts to overcome obstacles to what Christianity teaches is right behavior in relation to salvation.

Lewis writes about people who don’t even try Christian chastity because they think it’s impossible. He writes as if it is a requirement for salvation when he writes, “It is wonderful what you can do when you have to.” As shown many times above, the Bible is not clear on what exactly is required for salvation. However, it does seem to indicate in Revelation 14:1-5 that men who remain virgins will be “saved.” It reads, “ And I looked, and, lo, a Lamb stood on the mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father’s name written in their foreheads. And I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of a great thunder: and I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps: And they sung as it were a new song before the throne, and before the four beasts, and the elders: and no man could learn that song but the hundred and forty and four thousand, which were redeemed from the earth. *These are they which were not defiled with women*; for they are virgins. These are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth. These were redeemed from among men, being the firstfruits unto God and to the Lamb. And in their mouth was found no guile: for they are without fault before the throne of God.” This fantastically foolish nonsense degrades one of the best natural gifts given to us, sex. It is only made dirty by Christianity and the other “revealed” religions as a means of the clergy to have more control over the people. Everyone was designed by our Designer to have sexual desires, that is how we produce children. Since everyone, or virtually everyone, has a strong sexual desire, if con-artists can convince them that in most cases it is a sin against God and they will be punished by God for

it, they immediately have control over many people. “Revealed” religions all defile Nature by teaching such ignorance and associating it with God who is the Designer of sex and the pleasures it brings.

In his next paragraph Lewis uses the Christian hook which unfortunately hooks people into Christianity for a long time, sometimes even for the rest of their lives. He says that we can’t expect to reach perfection in Christian chastity or the other Christian virtues. However, we must always pray for help because “we cannot trust ourselves even in our best moments” but we don’t need to despair because we are forgiven. He closes the paragraph with the Christian hook, “The only fatal thing is to sit down content with anything less than perfection.” This keeps the devout devout. Since it is impossible for perfection in anything, especially in unnatural things such as denying your natural sex drive, this idea of never accepting anything less than perfection coupled with not trusting ourselves keeps many who consider themselves Christians in the pews.

Lewis’ next paragraph makes the accurate point that there is a difference between “repressed” sexual desires and “suppressed” or “denied” sexual desires. A repressed thought or sexual desire is removed to the person’s sub-conscious mind. To deny your sexual desires you make a conscious effort to resist your desire. This is a part of self-discipline and is an important quality to have. In a normal rational person it is activated by reason and has nothing to do with “revealed” religion. However, since our reason is God-given, it does have to do with God. The philosophy of Stoicism which originated in the third century BCE teaches that self-control, self-discipline and other virtues make for a truly happy and productive life. Famous Stoics like Cicero, Seneca, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius offer great insight into the importance of reason and the other natural virtues.

Next Lewis covers Christian marriage. He states, rightly so, that Christian doctrines on marriage are “extremely unpopular.” This is for valid reasons. Christian doctrines on marriage are almost completely void of common sense and are misogynistic. This is due to the Jewish roots of Christianity. Women in Judaism are

clearly second-rate compared to men. For example, in Leviticus 27:3-7 we are told that God put an estimated financial value on people. In God's estimation, according to these "holy" scriptures, women and girls are always valued much less than men and boys. Men between the ages of 20 and 60 are valued at 60 shekels while women of the same age are only valued at 30 shekels. A little boy between the age of one month to five years is valued at five shekels of silver while a little girl of the same age is only valued at three. It doesn't appear that the Bible god values newborns at all since he didn't even bother to price them! This lower value the Bible says that God put on girls and women makes it very clear that women in Jewish society and through the eyes of Jealous, the Hebrew/Jewish god, do not amount to much. For that matter, neither do the men! But women are clearly believed to be of less value and importance.

This twisted thinking is found in the New Testament as well. And well it should be since both the Old and New Testaments are the products of ancient Hebrew/Jewish minds. What the Bible says that Jesus said regarding marriage is in direct contradiction to the picture Lewis attempts to paint. Matthew 19:3-12 has Jesus saying that marriage makes a man and a woman one and that it is therefore wrong to allow divorces. Verse 6 says that Jesus said, "What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." It goes on to say that Jesus said it was due to the hardness of the hearts of the Jews that Moses allowed them to divorce their wives. It then says that Jesus said in verse 9, "And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." So based on this teaching attributed to Jesus himself, it is a sin to divorce your wife and that anyone who marries the divorced woman is also guilty of adultery. This shows that the Christian denominations which allow divorce are in violation of this Bible teaching. Jesus is reported to have then given a very negative picture of marriage when he answered the question if marriage is good. Verses 11 and 12 say that Jesus said, "But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eu-

nuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." This seems to be a promotion of the idea of doing as the Heaven's Gate cult members did and castrating yourself for "the kingdom of heaven." And, as always in the Bible, the teachings are based on male superiority. It talks of a man divorcing his wife, not the wife divorcing her husband. It talks of men castrating themselves for the kingdom of heaven, but not of women being circumcised for the kingdom of heaven.

Lewis does not admit that the Bible regarding marriage is as it is with other subjects, very ambiguous and contradictory. For example, Hebrews 13:4 says that "Marriage is honorable in all" while I Corinthians 7:1 says "It is good for a man not to touch a woman." It goes on to say in the next two verses that marriage is good as a means for people to avoid fornication. That is not a very good endorsement of marriage! In a real sense, the Christian mindset of marriage boils down to either castration, fornication or marriage.

Lewis makes some good points in this section about how it's a mistake to try to base a marriage on a *feeling* of love. Feelings are only emotions and are very fleeting. This is a very Stoic and realistic way of thinking and acting. Marriages should be based on a much deeper type of unconditional love. However, people should stick with reality and realize that their marriage may last or it may not. And whether it does or not may not be within their own control.

Lewis also states that he is against governments trying to make it more difficult for all people to get a divorce. However, when he called for a Christian society and government above, he needs to be careful if it would be a Christian sect running things that believed divorce was prohibited in the Bible or not. If it was a Christian sect that believed the Bible condemns divorce, then it would have to make laws which outlaw divorce which all people would have to obey. This goes to the heart of why theocracies are wrong and are a very poor idea.

Next Lewis tries to make sense of the Christian doctrine that wives must obey their husbands. He makes some ignorant and

shallow chauvinistic remarks about wives bossing their husbands around being unnatural and that men are more just in relations with people outside the family than women are. It's interesting and revealing to note that Lewis does not make reference to any particular Bible scriptures here. That is probably because they are so openly, disgustingly and unreasonably anti-women. They inflict a cruel hierarchy that put women at an unfair disadvantage and which stifles the intelligence and creativity many women have to offer. For example, I Corinthians 11:3 states, "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God." (It seems the Christian God has a split personality since if God and Jesus Christ are one, how could one be "the head" of the other?) I Corinthians 14:34-35 reads, "*Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak*; but they are commanded to be under obedience as also saith the law. And *if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home*: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church." There are several other verses which are just as demeaning to women as these. And to keep with its one consistency, ambiguity, the Bible is ambiguous about this, too. For example, Galatians 3:28 reads, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." If there is "neither male nor female" then why do women have to be subservient to men?

Lewis moves from degrading women to Christian forgiveness. He states that the Christian rule to love your neighbor as yourself includes your enemies. And since we must, according to Lewis' interpretation of this Christian rule, love our enemies that also includes forgiving them. He wrote and spoke this part after the war. This must have made it easier for Lewis since at the time he his encouraging his listeners and readers to love and forgive their enemies, they are not simultaneously carpet bombing and fire bombing them.

In his next paragraph Lewis again makes the often repeated mistake that the Bible is clear about salvation. He claims he is simply telling his listeners and readers "what Christianity is" and that he did not invent it. He then writes/says, "And there, right in the middle of it, I find 'Forgive us our sins as we forgive those that sin

against us.' There is no slightest suggestion that we are offered forgiveness on any other terms. It is made perfectly clear that if we do not forgive we shall not be forgiven. There are no two ways about it. What are we to do?" This erroneous statement by Lewis makes it clear he is not really objectively familiar with the Bible. As stated and documented many times above, the Bible is not clear about the requirements for eternal salvation. Some Bible teachings say it is only faith or believing in Jesus being the son of God who died for our sins that will get you to heaven. However, other Bible teachings say it's good works and others say it's a combination of both faith in the Jesus myth and good works.

The next paragraph has Lewis teaching us to start small with forgiveness. He says instead of trying to forgive the Gestapo we should forgive those close to us like our spouse, children, parents, etc. He ends the paragraph with the question, "Well, how exactly do I love myself?"

The next paragraph makes one feel sorry for C.S. Lewis. He writes, "Now that I come to think of it, I have not exactly got a feeling of fondness or affection for myself, and I do not even always enjoy my own society." That is sad. Perhaps he should have spent more time reading and studying Deism and the Stoics instead of guilt and fear based Christianity. Unfortunately, Lewis makes an assumption in his next sentence that everyone, or at least the majority of people, have the same negative self-image he has. He says/writes, "So apparently 'Love your neighbour' does not mean 'feel fond of him' or 'find him attractive.'" It's sad that Lewis misses what seems to be the point, the truth that we must love ourselves before we can love anyone else. What exactly do Christians mean by love? Some Christian teachings claim that to love someone else means you want for them the same things you want for yourself and that you want them to be treated the same way you want to be treated. It's essentially simply applying the golden rule. This is not unique to Christianity and as shown above, the Golden Rule predates Christianity. The next sentence and remainder of the paragraph makes Lewis' pathetic self-loathing obvious. He continues, "I ought to have seen that before, because, of course, you cannot feel fond of a person by trying. Do I think well of myself, think myself a nice chap? Well, I am afraid I sometimes do and those

are, no doubt, my worst moments but that is not why I love myself. In fact it is the other way round: my self-love makes me think myself nice, but thinking myself nice is not why I love myself. So loving my enemies does not apparently mean thinking them nice either. That is an enormous relief. For a good many people imagine that forgiving your enemies means making out that they are really not such bad fellows after all, when it is quite plain that they are. Go a step further. In my most clear-sighted moments not only do I not think myself a nice man, but I know that I am a very nasty one. I can look at some of the things I have done with horror and loathing. So apparently I am allowed to loathe and hate some of the things my enemies do. Now that I come to think of it, I remember Christian teachers telling me long ago that I must hate a bad man's actions, but not hate the bad man: or, as they would say, hate the sin but not the sinner." Lewis' self-loathing and negative self-image is typical of the damage Christianity and most of the "revealed" religions do to their followers. It is what Christianity is based on – unwarranted guilt. For without guilt, without the destructive myth of the "fall of man" which Christianity is dependent upon, there is absolutely no reason for Christianity's existence. It's a real crime and a real sin to teach our truly innocent little children that they are born stained with sin because of this ignorant damaging myth. This twisted unnatural and unrealistic guilt shows itself in his statement regarding his worst moments being when he thinks positively about himself. Thomas Paine was right when he wrote in *The Age of Reason*, "Were man impressed as fully and as strongly as he ought to be with the belief of a God, his moral life would be regulated by the force of that belief; he would stand in awe of God and of himself, and would not do the thing that could not be concealed from either. To give this belief the full opportunity of force, it is necessary that it acts alone. This is Deism."

In his next paragraph Lewis expounds on the idea of hating the sin but not the sinner. In Deism we hate the superstition but not the superstitious. At the end of this paragraph he falsely implies that humans should be perfect when he writes that we should hope that sinners "can be cured and made human again."

The next paragraph has Lewis explaining why it's not good to subjectively think bad things about your enemies. He states that

this will only lead to more and more hatred. This is true. However, the more objective we can be in all things, including religion, the better we will be and the better the world will be.

Lewis' next paragraph is about punishment for those who do wrong. He states that punishment is necessary and right and says that if someone had committed a murder "the right Christian thing to do would be to give yourself up to the police and be hanged." He goes on and writes, "It is, therefore, in my opinion, perfectly right for a Christian judge to sentence a man to death or a Christian soldier to kill an enemy." In an effort to back this up he states that when Jesus quotes the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" the word used for "kill" is more accurately translated into "murder." He continues on and says, "When soldiers came to St. John the Baptist asking what to do, he never remotely suggested that they ought to leave the army: nor did Christ when He met a Roman sergeant-major-what they called a centurion. The idea of the knight-the Christian in arms for the defence of a good cause-is one of the great Christian ideas." It appears Lewis was not too familiar with the Christian Crusades and all the butchering, misery and slaughter they brought upon the world. All in the name of Christianity. And what about when Christian soldiers kill Christian soldiers and Christian civilians of another Christian sect? Is that also "one of the great Christian ideas" ?? He goes on to justify Christian war by writing, "War is a dreadful thing, and I can respect an honest pacifist, though I think he is entirely mistaken. What I cannot understand is this sort of semipacifism you get nowadays which gives people the idea that though you have to fight, you ought to do it with a long face and as if you were ashamed of it. It is that feeling that robs lots of magnificent young Christians in the Services of something they have a right to, something which is the natural accompaniment of courage – a kind of gaiety and whole-heartedness." Would this hold true for the Christian German soldiers who invaded Poland in an effort to take back land that was Germany's prior to the Versailles Treaty? Would it hold true for British soldiers who killed in an attempt to stop the creation of the United States, or who killed to keep Ireland and India under British rule? The bottom line is Lewis wants to glorify Christian war and to make it appear romantic.

His next paragraph helps to demonstrate how the idea in the “revealed” religions of an afterlife, a Heaven or Paradise, help to hinder our thinking and actions in the here and now. Lewis writes, “I have often thought to myself how it would have been if, when I served in the first world war, I and some young German had killed each other simultaneously and found ourselves together a moment after death. I cannot imagine that either of us would have felt any resentment or even any embarrassment. I think we might have laughed over it.” What Lewis does not address is how his death and the death of the German soldier would effect their parents, spouses, children, friends, etc. And in the bigger picture, what good they each could have brought to the world if they were not wasting their time and lives in war, not to mention ending their lives in war.

In his next paragraph he continues to strengthen the realization that Christianity’s focus on the hereafter harms the here and now. He states, “I imagine somebody will say, ‘Well, if one is allowed to condemn the enemy’s acts, and punish him, and kill him, what difference is left between Christian morality and the ordinary view?’ All the difference in the world. Remember, we Christians think man lives for ever. Therefore, what really matters is those little marks or twists on the central, inside part of the soul which are going to turn it, in the long run, into a heavenly or a hellish creature.” This kind of faulty reasoning is a major cause of war and all the unnecessary suffering it brings. Basing your actions on the *ASSUMPTION* that we will live forever demonstrates lack of ability to think critically which produces the raw ignorance required for such a statement and belief. It is one of the ways Islamic suicide bombers are recruited. Their belief in an eternal Paradise outweighs the reality of the here and now. He goes on to say that Christians “may kill if necessary, but we must not hate and enjoy hating.” This statement is as void of reason and as dangerous as the Bible and the Koran are.

In his last paragraph on the topic of forgiveness he again tries to lump everyone together as being as self-loathing as he appears to be. He writes, “I admit that this means loving people who have nothing lovable about them. But then, has oneself anything lovable

about it? You love it simply because it is yourself, God intends us to love all selves in the same way and for the same reason: but He has given us the sum ready worked out on our own case to show us how it works. We have then to go on and apply the rule to all the other selves. Perhaps it makes it easier if we remember that that is how He loves us. Not for any nice, attractive qualities we think we have, but just because we are the things called selves. For really there is nothing else in us to love: creatures like us who actually find hatred such a pleasure that to give it up is like giving up beer or tobacco.” Lewis is clearly a master of assumptions! He assumes that no one has anything nice about them, any quality that makes them lovable. How completely sad that is. He even seems to believe that all people love to hate.

His next topic he calls, “The Great Sin” which he says is pride. He claims it is the worst fault anyone can have. He says it leads to all other vices, which obviously is not true. For example, the Christian virtue of chastity can be violated with absolutely no pride involved. Lewis even claims that it was pride that caused the devil to become the devil!

In the paragraph after the one stating that pride created the devil, he inadvertently reveals that what he really means by pride is ego. He writes, “I pointed out a moment ago that the more pride one had, the more one disliked pride in others. In fact, if you want to find out how proud you are the easiest way is to ask yourself, ‘How much do I dislike it when other people snub me, or refuse to take any notice of me, or shove their oar in, or patronise me, or show off?’ The point is that each person’s pride is in competition with every one else’s pride.” Some of the examples he gives are not pride or unbalanced ego at all. For example, no one likes to be snubbed. But that is not because of pride or ego, it is simple self-respect. No one wants to have disrespect shown to them. It’s not because you’re too proud that you don’t like it, it’s because you’re a person who deserves to be respected just as you show respect to others. This is a major fault of Christianity and most of the various “revealed” religions; they act as though we’re all dirty wretches who can only have value and deserve respect if we accept their particular religious superstitions. When Lewis talks about someone wanting to be “the big noise at the party” he’s talking

about the first definition of pride in *Webster's Desk Dictionary* which is "too high an opinion of one's importance or superiority." This also describes someone who suffers from a "big ego." His examples of not wanting to be patronized or snubbed would be more accurately described by the second definition which is "dignified self-respect." "Revealed" religions and other cults don't usually want their followers to have or to exercise self-respect. Lewis goes on to list unbalanced and inflated ego/pride problems such as wanting to have more than your neighbors, etc. He also makes the good point that unnecessary competitiveness is a form of unbalanced pride. Of course, he doesn't use the word "unbalanced" as he seems to think that all pride and, apparently, all competitiveness are bad. However, our common sense tells us that a balanced amount of both pride and competition are good.

Lewis next jumps to the conclusion that pride is the basic cause "of misery in every nation and every family since the world began." Again, he neglects to differentiate between good natural pride and unbalanced egotistical pride.

In the next paragraph he writes about proud people not being able to know God because God is "immeasurably superior" to them. He pontificates, which makes Lewis seem like he suffers from unbalanced pride, "Unless you know God as that – and, therefore, know yourself as nothing in comparison – you do not know God at all." Doesn't the Bible say that God made us in His image? Wouldn't that make us at least something, even in Lewis' mind and in the minds of other Christians? Deists, and other freethinkers who believe in God, don't believe the Bible's claim at Genesis 1:27 that God said, "Let us make man in our own image." Deists and other freethinkers who do believe in God, however, do not look at God as an entity that is to be feared, that suffers from jealousy to the point of actually having the name of Jealous, or that orders the genocide of groups of people. Instead, we look at God as our Designer, Creator and Friend completely empty of fear and overflowing with love. Of course, you can't simultaneously fear and love someone. Even the Bible admits this fact. At I John 4:18 we read, "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love." This verse is in direct contradiction to at least 50 other

verses in the Bible that all call on us to be fearful of God. Verses such as Job 28:28 which instructs, "The fear of the LORD, that is wisdom" as well as Hebrews 10:31 which despicably says, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Deists could think of nothing better!

His next paragraph starts with the question, "How is it that people who are quite obviously eaten up with Pride can say they believe in God and appear to themselves very religious?" He's not specific enough to let us know if he's including almost all of the Christian clergy who cling to pompous and egotistical titles such as "Reverend," "Most Reverend," "Holy Father," "His Holiness," etc., etc. Lewis continues, "I suppose it was of those people Christ was thinking when He said that some would preach about Him and cast out devils in His name, only to be told at the end of the world that He had never known them. And any of us may at any moment be in this death-trap. Luckily, we have a test. Whenever we find that our religious life is making us feel that we are good-above all, that we are better than someone else-I think we may be sure that we are being acted on, not by God, but by the devil. The real test of being in the presence of God is that you either forget about yourself altogether or see yourself as a small, dirty object. It is better to forget about yourself altogether." Believing in an actual devil shows Lewis' intellectual abilities to be very weak. At the very least they are weaker than his negative non-productive imagination, as opposed to the productive imagination which Albert Einstein relied upon. His consistent practice of destroying self-worth in people by promoting falsehoods such as individuals being dirty objects, by claiming that anyone who does not like being disrespected suffers from the deadly sin of pride, can only serve to make mental and emotional slaves out of people. Slaves, not to God, but to the clergy. In fact, the thought provoking book, *Psychological Evolution and the Creation of Evil: A Scientific Exposition* by Henry Jones, M.D. plainly states on page 157, "The purpose of religion is to produce slaves." Lewis' statements that are degrading to people, that attempt to steal their God-given self-worth is evidence of this fact. "Revealed" religions instill a slave psychology and mentality into the individual which makes them reject their

God-given reason and self-worth and allows the authority figures within the “revealed” religions to manipulate them.

Lewis’ next paragraph sounds much more like something you would expect to hear at an emotionally charged and God-given reason neglecting Christian fundamentalist camp meeting rather than from someone who is considered by many to be an intellectual. He continues with his topic of pride and says/writes, “It is a terrible thing that the worst of all the vices can smuggle itself into the very centre of our religious life. But you can see why. The other, and less bad, vices come from the devil working on us through our animal nature. But this does not come through our animal nature at all. It comes direct from Hell.” Our intellect, our reason, will not let us believe in such things as devils, witches, Hell, etc. These are only props intended for the clergy to scare people into submission. They have absolutely no basis in reality. Like the Bible and Koran from which they come, they cannot withstand the test of God-given reason. Lewis continues to embarrass himself in the same paragraph with, “It is purely spiritual: consequently it is far more subtle and deadly. For the same reason, Pride can often be used to beat down the simpler vices. Teachers, in fact, often appeal to a boy’s Pride, or, as they call it, his self-respect, to make him behave decently: many a man has overcome cowardice, or lust, or ill-temper by learning to think that they are beneath his dignity—that is, by Pride. The devil laughs. He is perfectly content to see you becoming chaste and brave and self-controlled provided, all the time, he is setting up in you the Dictatorship of Pride—just as he would be quite content to see your chilblains cured if he was allowed, in return, to give you cancer. For Pride is spiritual cancer: it eats up the very possibility of love, or contentment, or even common sense.” What complete and utter nonsense! Again, Lewis confuses an unbalanced ego with self-respect. Those egotistical manipulators who enjoy titles such as “Most Reverend” or “His Holiness” need to beat down self-respect in their followers in order to boost their own artificially inflated egos and to ensure conformity to their teachings, dogmas, and doctrines. Christianity in particular infects the youth by teaching them they are born evil and sinful and the only way God could save them from their evil is to become a man and suffer horribly and die in order to wash away

their evil and sins. This instills a deep and terrible artificial guilt in beautiful innocent children. Instead of teaching them the profound beauty and design of Nature of which they are a living part, as well as their virtually limitless potential for good, they are poisoned with this potentially crippling Christian lie. How Lewis knows that “the devil laughs” whenever someone uses their self-respect to improve themselves he does not say. Perhaps he talked to the devil the way televangelist Pat Robertson says he talks audibly to God. What Lewis mistakes for the sin of pride is self-respect. Someone without self-respect cannot enjoy “love, contentment, or even common sense.” It takes a lot of gall for Lewis to speak such foolishness and then end with a mention of common sense as if common sense is a good thing. If Lewis really thought common sense was good, he would not believe in the Bible and the Jesus myth.

Next Lewis tries to clarify, or, perhaps to backpedal in regards to his statements on pride. He says that having pleasure from pleasing others is not the sin of pride. He writes that the “trouble begins when you pass from thinking, ‘I have pleased him; all is well,’ to thinking, ‘What a fine person I must be to have done it.’” It does sound somewhat egotistical to think about yourself in that way. However, when you take into consideration that Lewis teaches we should see ourselves as “small dirty objects,” etc., we know he is not being completely honest here.

In his next paragraph he writes that having pride in a family member or military organization, etc. is not the sin of pride. He says that it might, however, give a person airs because of his famous relative or military organization. Lewis looks at this as a fault, but not as the sin of pride. He claims it is better than being proud of yourself. Again, the deprecation of the individual is paramount in Christianity and in the other “revealed” religions. He does, however, in my opinion make a valid point by stating it’s important that we love and admire God more than anyone or anything else. This makes sense because without God/the Supreme Intelligence/the Eternal Cause/ our Designer/Nature’s God – not the god of the Bible, Koran, Torah, etc., – we and Nature which we are all a part of would not exist.

Lewis attempts to show in the next paragraph that God does not forbid pride because it offends him or that he requires humility from us because of his own dignity, “as if God Himself was proud.” The Old Testament god seems to have suffered from unbalanced egotistical pride. He repeatedly demands that the Hebrews should worship and fear him as in I Chronicles 16:25, among many other verses, which reads, “For great is the LORD, and greatly to be praised: he also is to be feared above all gods.” This Bible teaching not only shows the Bible god wants the Hebrews to praise and to worship him, he also wants them to fear him. And it also teaches that the Bible god is not the only god for the Bible god is to be feared “above all gods.” This sounds like the Bible god is both egotistically proud, violent and insecure and delusional. Lewis goes on in the same paragraph showing that he believes he knows the mind of God, which would have to make Lewis a sufferer of pride, by saying, “He is not in the least worried about His dignity.” How Lewis knows this he does not reveal. As he continues he seems to contradict his statement that we are “small dirty objects” and writes, “The point is, He wants you to know Him; wants to give you Himself. And He and you are two things of such a kind that if you really get into any kind of touch with Him you will, in fact, be humble-delightedly humble, feeling the infinite relief of having for once got rid of all the silly nonsense about your own dignity which has made you restless and unhappy all your life.” If Lewis still thought that we are “small dirty objects” and other such despicable entities when he wrote these last sentences then he must believe that God is a small dirty object as well since he says, “He and you are two things of such a kind.” Of course, here he’s merely trying to sucker in and trap his listeners and readers into Christianity through emotions. Emotional images conjured up by words such as, “He wants you to know Him; wants to give you Himself” especially when the “Him” in this case is none other than God Almighty, are emotionally powerful and can have a strong influence on anyone. People who are suffering from loneliness or who have suffered a loss or are under some other kind of emotional distress are the most vulnerable to this type of entrapment. Feeling humble in relationship to God is natural and has nothing to do with Christianity or any of the other “revealed” reli-

gions. Albert Einstein expressed it well when he wrote, "My religion consists of a humble admiration of the illimitable superior spirit who reveals himself in the slight details we are able to perceive with our frail and feeble minds. That deeply emotional conviction of the presence of a superior reasoning power, which is revealed in the incomprehensible universe, forms my idea of God." Similarly he also wrote, "The scientist is possessed by the sense of universal causation. His religious feeling takes the form of a rapturous amazement at the harmony of natural law, which reveals an intelligence of such superiority that, compared with it, all the systematic thinking and acting of human beings is an utterly insignificant reflection." Instead of clinging to an unrealistic idea of God through Christianity, Judaism or some other "revealed" religion, Albert Einstein held a Deistic idea of God as his above quotes make clear. Lewis makes another huge assumption when he closes with the phrase, "feeling the infinite relief of having for once got rid of all the silly nonsense about your own dignity which has made you restless and unhappy all your life." This is similar to a fortune teller making vague statements. How does Lewis know the listener or reader had an ego problem that caused their concern for their own dignity to get blown out of proportion? It appears he's probably trying to make the false point that all concern people have to safeguard their dignity is "silly nonsense."

In his last paragraph on the sin of pride, Lewis throws his net very wide. He tries to brand everyone as being guilty of the sin of pride. He writes, "If anyone would like to acquire humility, I can, I think, tell him the first step. The first step is to realise that one is proud. And a biggish step, too. At least, nothing whatever can be done before it. If you think you are not conceited, it means you are very conceited indeed." This is pure nonsense. Many people who are not conceited know that fact about themselves. People who are honest and objective with themselves know both their own faults as well as their own good points.

Lewis now moves on to charity. He states that forgiveness is a part of charity and charity is now known to simply mean giving to the poor and he notes that giving to the poor used to be known simply as "alms." He writes, "Charity means 'Love, in the Christian sense.' But love, in the Christian sense, does not mean simply

an emotion. It is a state not of the feelings but of the will; the state of the will which we have naturally about ourselves, and must learn to have about other people.” He makes a great point about love not being simply an emotion, but actually being a part of the will. However, being objective, his talk about love and having that love for ourselves and finding it for other people loses its appeal when you realize the bloody hate-filled history of Christianity unleashed. At least hundreds of thousands of innocent people were brutalized, tortured and burned alive by Christians when they had the power to do so. And all the misery and horrific behavior and actions on the part of the Christians was based on their beliefs which they derived from the Bible. It seems we can do much better than that.

In the next few paragraphs Lewis makes the point that we should not wait until we “feel” a warm feeling towards someone to be charitable to them. He correctly believes we should act as though we already have warm feelings for them. He writes, “Do not waste time bothering whether you ‘love’ your neighbour; act as if you did.” That is great advice and can only make the world a much better place.

Next Lewis gets a little “holier than thou” by being critical of Germany’s treatment of Jews while not even mentioning England’s history of brutality. In fact, it was England that invented the “concentration camp” during the Second Boer War. They used the camps to imprison Dutch/Boer civilian children, women and elderly in an effort to force their husbands, sons and fathers to surrender to British power. And all this was going on in occupied lands in Africa. But, at least the British didn’t get Biblical with the Boer women and children and slaughter and rape them like Hebrews/Jews did to the Midianite people in Numbers 31:17-18.

In his next paragraph he makes a good and important point with, “Good and evil both increase at compound interest. That is why the little decisions you and I make every day are of such infinite importance. The smallest good act today is the capture of a strategic point from which, a few months later, you may be able to go on to victories you never dreamed of.” However, his last sentence of this paragraph seems to imply that the Devil/“the enemy”

may be influencing us. He writes, "An apparently trivial indulgence in lust or anger today is the loss of a ridge or railway line or bridgehead from which the enemy may launch an attack otherwise impossible." Our actions are the results of our own decisions. As the Deist Thomas Jefferson wrote, "A departure from principle in one instance becomes a precedent for another." This is a universal fact which imaginary creatures like the Devil or the bogeyman, or if you're a Muslim, jinn/genies, have nothing to do with.

Lewis' next paragraph claims that Christian charity also involves love between God and man and man and God. He instructs his listeners/readers not to worry if they don't feel love for God. As he suggested regarding love for other people, he instructs people to act as if they love God whether they have the feeling or not. This can be good advice provided the person receiving it does not take the Bible literally. If she or he does, they may end up killing someone who does not observe the Sabbath or castrating themselves for the Kingdom of Heaven.

The gist of his closing paragraph on charity is good in that it stresses will over emotional feelings.

He next moves on to hope as one of the theological virtues. To Lewis it is good for Christians to look forward to Heaven and that doing so is not a form of "escapism" or "wishful thinking." This does not recognize the fact that many historians believe it played a part in the collapse of the Roman Empire. This chasing after a good afterlife and neglecting the here and now is what Gibbon in his *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* states was one of the real reasons for the fall of Rome. Perhaps, in their anger and hatred for Gentiles, Jews such as Saul, aka Paul, used Christianity to do exactly that, to bring down the biggest enemy of Judaism at the time, Rome. Lewis attempts to qualify his statement by writing, "It does not mean that we are to leave the present world as it is. If you read history you will find that the Christians who did most for the present world were just those who thought most of the next. The Apostles themselves, who set on foot the conversion of the Roman Empire, the great men who built up the Middle Ages, the English Evangelicals who abolished the Slave Trade, all left their mark on Earth, precisely because their minds were occupied with

Heaven.” Lewis conveniently forgets that the Middle Ages are also referred to as the Dark Ages. That is because the Semitic superstitions reigned supreme and destroyed most of the knowledge and science of the Greeks and Romans. In fact, so entrenched was the ignorance born of the Jews and bought by ignorant and credulous Gentiles that in their fourth council of Carthage in 398 the Christian leadership “forbade bishops to read the books of the gentiles.” This act of raw ignorance virtually limited the bishops, who made up a very large bulk of the people who could actually read, to ancient Hebrew texts full of superstition, fear and Jewish supremacy and it also outlawed the books of real value and meaning written in Greek and Latin. Lewis also seems to forget that the Bible never once teaches that slavery should be outlawed. As shown above, it in fact teaches slaves to be fearfully obedient to their masters. Perhaps the Christians who worked to outlaw slavery were following their God-given conscience and not the man-made Bible. Lewis goes on talking/writing about life after death with, “It is since Christians have largely ceased to think of the other world that they have become so ineffective in this.” This is in direct opposition to reality. No one **KNOWS** for certain, though various “revealed” religions teach **BELIEFS** about an afterlife as if they were **KNOWN FACTS**, what the afterlife is like, or even if there is one. Deists like Thomas Jefferson agreed with the Stoics that we should trust God and not worry about it. Jefferson wrote, “Whatever is to be our final destiny, wisdom, as well as duty, dictates that we should acquiesce in the will of Him who gives and takes away.” And as mentioned before, this lack of knowledge regarding an afterlife allows us to love God unconditionally. Lewis ends this paragraph with an absurd statement that has already been proven false as shown above regarding Rome. He states, “Aim at Heaven and you will get earth ‘thrown in’: aim at earth and you will get neither. It seems a strange rule, but something like it can be seen at work in other matters. Health is a great blessing, but the moment you make health one of your main, direct objects you start becoming a crank and imagining there is something wrong with you. You are only likely to get health provided you want other things more -food, games, work, fun, open air. In the same way, we shall never save civilisation as long as civilisation is our main object. We must

learn to want something else even more.” When Christianity ruled the only thing we got thrown in was the Dark Ages. And his lame analogy of wanting health makes the assumption that the person he’s describing is ignorant of the things that bring us health like diet, exercise, etc. It stands to reason that a beneficial, free and progressive civilization without reason is impossible. This Christianity made abundantly clear with its Dark Ages!

In his next paragraph Lewis starts with absurdity and ends with confusion. He writes, “Most of us find it very difficult to want ‘Heaven’ at all – except in so far as ‘Heaven’ means meeting again our friends who have died. One reason for this difficulty is that we have not been trained: our whole education tends to fix our minds on this world.” How can it be otherwise? As stated above many times, the **FACT** is nobody **KNOWS** what Heaven is like or if there even is a Heaven or an afterlife. There may be, but nobody **KNOWS**. If we don’t even know if there is an afterlife or a Heaven, how can we be trained for it on Earth in this life? Lewis then seems to confuse what he earlier accurately described as mere fleeting emotions as a God-given desire for “heaven.” Continuing he says/writes, “Most people, if they had really learned to look into their own hearts, would know that they do want, and want acutely, something that cannot be had in this world.” Who would teach them and how would they teach them to look into their own hearts and to recognize this desire for something “that cannot be had in this world.” The clergy? Next he writes about the emotional feelings we get when we first fall in love, etc. “There are all sorts of things in this world that offer to give it to you, but they never quite keep their promise. The longings which arise in us when we first fall in love, or first think of some foreign country, or first take up some subject that excites us, are longings which no marriage, no travel, no learning, can really satisfy.” These longings are mere emotions which Lewis properly described earlier as being of little importance. Why he’s placing such immense importance on them now is logically impossible to understand. He finishes the paragraph trying to justify this switch regarding emotions and then closes by saying “there are two wrong ways of dealing with this fact, and one right one.” The “fact” he’s talking about dealing with

is only an emotional feeling, and as he said earlier several times, emotional feelings come and go and are of very little importance.

The first wrong way of dealing with Lewis' manufactured "fact" he says is to blame the things themselves, such as saying, "If only I had married another person," etc.

The second wrong way Lewis describes is to basically settle for the lack of emotional stimulus and reason that that's just the way things are. Lewis writes that this would be the best approach to take "if man did not live for ever." Although Lewis stated earlier that he is going to write the rest of the book assuming the Christian teaching of people living forever is true, it's important to never forget that this is only an assumption and it should never be accepted as a fact unless it can be proven. One thing we do know is that once our body dies it remains that way.

Next Lewis moves on to the right way – the Christian way. As usual, there's a huge assumption in his Christian reasoning. "The Christian says, 'Creatures are not born with desires unless satisfaction for those desires exists. A baby feels hunger well, there is such a thing as food. A duckling wants to swim: well, there is such a thing as water. Men feel sexual desire: well, there is such a thing as sex. If I find in myself a desire which no experience in this world can satisfy, the most probable explanation is that I was made for another world.'" Of course Lewis ignores the fact that no one can experience everything there is to experience in the world! This fact makes his conclusion of being made for another world invalid. His closing sentence in the paragraph is what has caused many wars and much suffering throughout the world and throughout history. He writes, "I must keep alive in myself the desire for my true country, which I shall not find till after death; I must never let it get snowed under or turned aside; I must make it the main object of life to press on to that other country and to help others to do the same." This was one of the reasons for the bloody Christian Crusades; a guaranteed ticket to heaven and to "help" others to get to the Christian Heaven.

The opening of his next paragraph seems to indicate that C.S. Lewis needs a time out. He angrily writes, "There is no need to be worried by facetious people who try to make the Christian hope of

'Heaven' ridiculous by saying they do not want 'to spend eternity playing harps.' The answer to such people is that if they cannot understand books written for grown-ups, they should not talk about them." In order to back up this nonsensical statement, he either openly lies or genuinely cannot grasp the fact that his statement to back up what he has just written is factually incorrect. He states, "All the scriptural imagery (harps, crowns, gold, etc.) is, of course, a merely symbolical attempt to express the inexpressible. Musical instruments are mentioned because for many people (not all) music is the thing known in the present life which most strongly suggests ecstasy and infinity. Crowns are mentioned to suggest the fact that those who are united with God in eternity share His splendour and power and joy. Gold is mentioned to suggest the timelessness of Heaven (gold does not rust) and the preciousness of it. People who take these symbols literally might as well think that when Christ told us to be like doves, He meant that we were to lay eggs." If Lewis is correct, why would such detail be given regarding the city of Jerusalem with its streets of gold and all which in Revelation 21:10-21 says will descend from heaven? It is described with mathematical detail: "And the city lieth foursquare, and the length is as large as the breadth: and he measured the city with the reed, twelve thousand furlongs. The length and the breadth and the height of it are equal. And he measured the wall thereof, an hundred and forty and four cubits, according to the measure of a man, that is, of the angel." The Bible depicts Noah's ark as if it were real by giving it mathematical dimensions in Genesis 6:15 because the writers, whoever they were, intended for people to believe these paltry stories. As far as Lewis' statement implying that the Bible in general and Revelation in particular, since Revelation specifically describes Heaven, are "books written for grown-ups" it's interesting to see what Thomas Jefferson thought about the Bible's Book of Revelation. In a letter to General Alexander Smyth dated January 17, 1825 Jefferson wrote that he "considered it as merely the ravings of a maniac, no more worthy nor capable of explanation than the incoherences of our own nightly dreams. I was, therefore, well pleased to see, in your first proof sheet, that it was said to be not the production of St. John, but of Cerinthus, a century after the death of that apostle. Yet the change of the author's name does not

lessen the extravagances of the composition; and come they from whomsoever they may, I cannot so far respect them as to consider them as an allegorical narrative of events, past or subsequent. There is not coherence enough in them to countenance any suite of rational ideas. You will judge, therefore, from this how impossible I think it that either your explanation or that of any man in ‘the heavens above, or on the earth beneath,’ can be a correct one. What has no meaning admits no explanation; and pardon me if I say, with the candor of friendship, that I think your time too valuable, and your understanding of too high an order, to be wasted on these paralogisms. You will perceive, I hope, also, that I do not consider them as revelations of the Supreme Being, whom I would not so far blaspheme as to impute to Him a pretension of revelation, couched at the same time in terms which, He would know, were never to be understood by those whom they were addressed.” Thomas Jefferson makes it refreshingly clear how little he thinks of the Book of Revelation and that he thinks it’s a waste of time to attempt to understand its meaning because it really has none.

In the next paragraph Lewis starts covering faith. He writes, “I must talk in this chapter about what the Christians call Faith. Roughly speaking, the word Faith seems to be used by Christians in two senses or on two levels, and I will take them in turn. In the first sense it means simply Belief-accepting or regarding as true the doctrines of Christianity. That is fairly simple. But what does puzzle people-at least it used to puzzle me-is the fact that Christians regard faith in this sense as a virtue, I used to ask how on earth it can be a virtue-what is there moral or immoral about believing or not believing a set of statements? . . . But what I did not see then – and a good many people do not see still – was this. I was assuming that if the human mind once accepts a thing as true it will automatically go on regarding it as true, until some real reason for reconsidering it turns up. In fact, I was assuming that the human mind is completely ruled by reason. But that is not so. For example, my reason is perfectly convinced by good evidence that anesthetics do not smother me and that properly trained surgeons do not start operating until I am unconscious. But that does not alter the fact that when they have me down on the table and clap their horrible mask over my face, a mere childish panic begins inside

me. I start thinking I am going to choke, and I am afraid they will start cutting me up before I am properly under. In other words, I lose my faith in anesthetics. It is not reason that is taking away my faith: on the contrary, my faith is based on reason. It is my imagination and emotions. The battle is between faith and reason on one side and emotion and imagination on the other.” As Lewis often does, he’s comparing apples and oranges. Christianity’s claims and promises remain either unproven or they have already been proven false. For example its promise that Christians who go to Heaven will have mansions in Heaven (John 14:2) is unproven because nobody knows what happens when we die, if anything. A Christian promise that is proven to be false is found at John 14:12 which says that Jesus said, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.” Are there any Christians who can do more than what the Bible claims Jesus did? Any Christians who can raise the dead and then some? This Bible promise is proven false. These facts make clear people are wrong to put their trust or faith in Christianity and the Bible. On the other hand, we know as a rule rather than an exception to the rule that a qualified anesthesiologist with the proper equipment can take care of our pain when we go into surgery. It’s scientifically proven. This is a major reason why Christian faith-healers like Pat Robertson don’t rely on the Bible and Christianity but instead go to doctors and the hospital when they are sick or injured. In addition, Lewis, as he usually does, assumes that because something causes him to react in a certain way it causes everyone else to react in the same way as he does. This is also not true. Millions of people, myself included, have had medical surgeries without experiencing the panic or negative feelings that Lewis claims he experienced. Lewis ends the paragraph with more meaningless apples and oranges comparisons.

In his next paragraph Lewis writes, “I am not asking anyone to accept Christianity if his best reasoning tells him that the weight of the evidence is against it.” That’s good! Anyone who has the bulk of the facts and who is objective will not believe in Christianity or in any of the “revealed” religions. Unfortunately, Lewis continues with, “That is not the point at which Faith comes in. But supposing

a man's reason once decides that the weight of the evidence is for it." The only way that can happen is if a person does not have all the facts about Christianity and/or is not objective. Lewis continues by saying he knows that within a few weeks of accepting Christianity a new convert will experience emotions that "will rise up and carry out a sort of blitz on his belief." Or, there will be a moment when he wants to do something against what Christianity teaches such as having a woman or telling a lie. A moment "at which it would be very convenient if Christianity were not true." This last statement is a slick assumption that Christianity is true. Lewis ends the paragraph with a true and reasonable statement. He writes, "I am not talking of moments at which any real new reasons against Christianity turn up. Those have to be faced and that is a different matter. I'm talking about moments where mere moods rises up against it." That's great he teaches that reasons against Christianity need to be faced and that we should never allow our moods to influence our decisions.

His next paragraph is an indirect attack on our God-given reason. He writes, "Now Faith, in the sense in which I am here using the word, is the art of holding on to things your reason has once accepted, in spite of your changing moods." He should have added that if you discover new facts then it is reasonable and obligatory for your love of truth and self-respect, to change your mind/belief as the new facts become known to you. Lewis continues with giving great advice against allowing your moods and emotions getting the best of you and having too much influence in your decision making. However, he ends the paragraph with, "Consequently one must train the habit of Faith." He mistakenly wants "Faith" to do the job of reason. Our reason tells us that being influenced by fleeting emotions and moods is a bad idea, not our "Faith." This is just one example of why our gift of God-given reason is so important and why it needs to be given priority over "Faith" emotions and moods.

In Lewis' next paragraph he seems to be fighting emotions and moods with different emotions and moods as well as with indoctrination. He writes, "The first step is to recognize the fact that your moods change. The next is to make sure that, if you have once accepted Christianity, then some of its main doctrines shall be

deliberately held before your mind for some time every day. That is why daily prayers and religious reading and church going are necessary parts of the Christian life. We have to be continually reminded of what we believe.” This clearly demonstrates the lack of validity in Christianity. When I was a Christian I agreed with Lewis on this point. But being removed from the fog of “faith” and replacing my faith in man-made doctrines and dogmas which make up Christianity with my God-given reason I now see how this is wrong. If the teachings of Christianity are true, then there is no need to indoctrinate yourself as Lewis instructs. Lewis ends the paragraph with, “Neither this belief nor any other will automatically remain alive in the mind. It must be fed.” This is true in a sense. Christians, in order to maintain their belief in Christianity must stay in contact with like minded people and read what they believe is the word of God on a regular basis in order to maintain their belief. Jews must do the same regarding their beliefs, Muslims must also do the same as all members of all the various and contradictory “revealed” religions must do. Deists, however, do not need to regularly read books by Deists in order to remain Deists. ***This is because our reason is united to our belief.*** We see and are a part of the real and only word of God – the Creation. Every waking moment we are aware of this, whether we are alone or are with other Deists, whether we’re reading books by Deists or not. Lewis finishes the paragraph with, “And as a matter of fact, if you examined a hundred people who had lost their faith in Christianity, I wonder how many of them would turn out to have been reasoned out of it by honest argument? Do not most people simply drift away?” Based on what I hear from former Christians and other “revealed” religionists, as well as from former Atheists and Agnostics, I’d have to say people leave those belief systems for Deism based on reason.

Lewis’ second sense of faith is addressed in the next paragraph. He says it is necessary to practice the Christian virtues as a way to learn exactly how good or bad you are, with the suggestion of giving it your best for six weeks. He makes the comparison of not knowing how strong the wind is until you try walking against it, or not knowing how strong the German army is until you fight it. Lewis says/writes, “We never find out the strength of the evil

impulse inside us until we try to fight it: and Christ, because He was the only man who never yielded to temptation, is also the only man who knows to the full what temptation means – the only complete realist.” This would mean that Jesus, if he really existed, was perfect, or at a very minimum Jesus was at least good. However, the Bible says that Jesus said, “And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God.” This implies that Jesus was not perfect since it says that Jesus said he is not even good. It also shows that Jesus did not believe he was God. Lewis now attempts to poison his readers/listeners with Christian manufactured guilt. He writes/says, “Very well, then. The main thing we learn from a serious attempt to practise the Christian virtues is that we fail.” He doesn’t mention that Jesus himself failed, according to the Bible. No matter which ambiguous Bible teaching you believe, whether Jesus was God or he was not God, Jesus failed in having faith in himself or in God. Both Matthew 27:46 and in Mark 15:34 say that Jesus said as his last words on the cross, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?” This is very obvious, and painfully so for Christians, that Jesus lost his faith in God, or, for those Christians who believe Jesus and God are one, in himself. If the Christian god is not perfect, how can Christian clergy and Christians like Lewis find fault in imperfection in anyone? Lewis ends the paragraph with these foolish statements: “If there was any idea that God had set us a sort of exam, and that we might get good marks by deserving them, that has to be wiped out. If there was any idea of a sort of bargain-any idea that we could perform our side of the contract and thus put God in our debts so that it was up to Him, in mere justice, to perform His side-that has to be wiped out.”

Lewis continues this idea of an exam and that man cannot put God into his debt in the next couple of paragraphs. Interestingly Lewis admits that our power of thinking is “given you by God.” This should lead to people asking why should they believe in a “revealed” religion, whether it’s Christianity, Judaism, Islam, Hinduism or any other which goes against their gift from God of thinking and reasoning. He then ends with, “When a man has made these two discoveries” (that God doesn’t give us an exam in which we can earn good marks by deserving them and that we can’t bargain

with God to put God in our debt) “God can really get to work. It is after this that real life begins. The man is awake now. We can now go on to talk of Faith in the second sense.”

Getting into his idea of a “second sense” of faith, Lewis starts the first couple of paragraphs making clear that he is not certain if what he believes about a second sense of faith is correct or not and asks that if any “instructed Christians” see where he is wrong to let him know. This is very admirable. But when applied to the ambiguous “revealed” religion of Christianity, it is meaningless. The teachings in Christianity are so self-contradictory that you can make it mean virtually anything you want it to mean.

Lewis again erroneously attempts to degrade us by saying/writing, “I am trying to talk about Faith in the second sense, the higher sense. I said last week that the question of Faith in this sense arises after a man has tried his level best to practise the Christian virtues, and found that he fails, and seen that even if he could he would only be giving back to God what was already God’s own. In other words, he discovers his bankruptcy.” It does not stand to reason that people are morally bankrupt because they cannot follow the ambiguous and often unnatural teachings of a “revealed” religion, a “revealed” religion whose own god failed at satisfying its own demand for faith. Our human empathy for others, our desire to learn and to follow our God-given reason without being threatened or bribed unshakably demonstrates our value and the fact that we are not bankrupt. In the very next sentence Lewis again makes the mistake of teaching that God does not care about our actions by writing, “Now, once again, what God cares about is not exactly our actions.” As shown many times throughout this book, the Bible does state that salvation depends on our actions, while it also says that it only depends on our faith, and it also says our salvation depends on both faith and actions. So, Lewis is right in one sense and wrong in two others. He closes the paragraph with, “And he cannot get into the right relation until he has discovered that fact of our bankruptcy.” This can only help to solidify the power of Christianity and its clergy over the individual since it is impossible to keep self-contradictory rules and beliefs. There should be nothing surprising to discover that such rules and beliefs

cannot be followed and that because of that you would be considered “bankrupt” by that nonsensical “revealed” religion.

In his next paragraph Lewis leads with a dangerous and deadly assumption. He writes/says, “Now we cannot, in that sense, discover our failure to keep God’s law except by trying our very hardest (and then failing).” This makes the incorrect and dangerously deadly assumption, in Lewis’ case, that the Bible is “God’s law” instead of merely poorly written ramblings of the ancient Jews and Christians. The same is true for a Jew who claims the Torah is “God’s law” or a Muslim who claims the Koran is “God’s law.” History and current events through endless religious wars and violence both prove why these false assumptions are dangerous and deadly. At the end of the paragraph Lewis very sadly reveals that what matters, why discovering we are bankrupt is so important is because, “It is the change from being confident about our own efforts to the state in which we despair of doing anything for ourselves and leave it to God.” He sees this as a good thing! When a revealed religious person says to “leave it to God,” in reality and in practicality it means leaving it to the clergy. It’s similar to the Old Testament verses telling of X amount of sheep were given as a tithe to the Lord. Of course “the Lord” did not benefit from them, but the clergy sure did.

The next paragraph Lewis opens with, “I know the words ‘leave it to God’ can be misunderstood, but they must stay for the moment. The sense in which a Christian leaves it to God is that he puts all his trust in Christ: trusts that Christ will somehow share with him the perfect human obedience which He carried out from His birth to His crucifixion: that Christ will make the man more like Himself and, in a sense, make good his deficiencies. In Christian language, He will share His ‘sonship’ with us, will make us, like Himself, ‘Sons of God.’” Applying our God-given reason to Jesus we would realize that Jesus Christ may never have even existed. Or if we believe he was a real person, there is nothing to make us reasonably believe that he was either God or the son of God. We know, also, that he did not even leave any of his own writings. He is simply a character, real or imagined, that ancient Jews wrote about approximately 50 years or more after it is claimed that he lived. Therefore, what Lewis just wrote/said re-

garding Christians putting all of their trust into such a character does not align with God-given reason.

Lewis attempts to convince us that Christianity/Christ offers something for nothing. He even says Christ/Christianity “offers everything for nothing.” This is a lie. In order to believe it, to believe in all the ridiculous doctrines that make up Christianity, you must pay with your God-given reason. You must, at the very least, suspend your God-given reason in order to believe such nonsense as original sin, raising the dead, etc., etc., etc. Why would someone who wants to get closer to God give up such a beautiful and powerful gift from God, our God-given reason, in order to believe contradictory and ignorant claims made up by men? Lewis nudges us to the point of helplessness by writing/saying, “But the difficulty is to reach the point of recognising that all we have done and can do is nothing.” He goes on with, “And, in yet another sense, handing everything over to Christ does not, of course, mean that you stop trying. To trust Him means, of course, trying to do all that He says.” As mentioned above, we do not KNOW what Christ said or even if Jesus was a real person who actually lived. But when Christians think of doing what Jesus “said” or, in reality what the Bible says Jesus said, they must do some things they probably do not expect. For example, they must remember that the Bible says at Luke 14:26 that Jesus said, “If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.” In a similar anti-family vein Matthew 19:29 has Jesus teaching, “And every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands, for my name’s sake, shall receive an hundredfold, and shall inherit everlasting life.” These teachings have the sound of what they really are: a cult. Another teaching attributed to Jesus is found at Luke 18:18-25 which is the story of the rich ruler who kept all the Jewish commandments who asked Jesus what he had to do in order to receive eternal life. Jesus told him to sell all he owned and to give the proceeds to the poor and then to follow Jesus. When the rich man couldn’t do this Jesus said, “How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God! For it is easier for a camel to go through a needle’s eye, than for a rich man to enter into the king-

dom of God.” Even though Lewis next wrote, “There would be no sense in saying you trusted a person if you would not take his advice.” C.S. Lewis did not take the advice of Jesus on this issue. He did not sell all he had and give the proceeds to the poor. Next Lewis makes it sound as if being “saved” is a gradual process. He writes, “Not doing these things in order to be saved, but because He has begun to save you already.” Most Christians believe you’re saved the moment you say you accept Jesus as your savior. Lewis continues, “Not hoping to get to Heaven as a reward for your actions, but inevitably wanting to act in a certain way because a first faint gleam of Heaven is already inside you.” This goes directly against one of the very few things the Bible is consistent about: greed and rewards. Everything in Christianity is based on greed: You pray in private so God sees you and rewards you; you sell all you have and give to the poor so you can get more rewards in heaven; in short, you do good to get rewarded. Altruism is dead in the Bible. Neither Jesus or Moses or any of the main characters of the Bible taught people to do good simply because it’s the right thing to do. (Even the convoluted story of Jesus dying on the cross for our sins isn’t really altruistic since he, if the story is true, didn’t really give his life for, as the story goes, he rose from the dead shortly after allegedly dying.) There is always either a reward or a punishment involved.

In his next paragraph Lewis does a terrible job of using an analogy to help bring some clarity to the Christian contradiction of what exactly is required for salvation. The facts are, as stated several times throughout this book that there are three different teachings on this most important topic. One is that only faith is required. Another is that good actions are required. And yet another is that both faith and good actions are required. Lewis makes a pathetic attempt to reconcile these contradictory Christian teachings. Hypocritically he attempts to use reason as a way to justify his conclusion that both faith and good acts are required for salvation in spite of the fact that the Bible remains ambiguous on this most important question for Christians.

Almost comically in the next paragraph Lewis says/writes, “The Bible really seems to clinch the matter when it puts the two things together into one amazing sentence. The first half is, ‘Work

out your own salvation with fear and trembling' – which looks as if everything depended on us and our good actions: but the second half goes on, 'For it is God who worketh in you' – which looks as if God did everything and we nothing." First off, Lewis is factually wrong when he writes that this is one sentence. "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling" is found in Philippians 2:12 and it ends with a period which indicates the end of a sentence. In verse 2:13 we find the rest of what Lewis incorrectly claims is part of the previous sentence: "For it is God who worketh in you." But that is only the first part of a new sentence. The remainder of the sentence and the remainder of the verse is, "both to will and to do of his good pleasure." This seems to mean that God works in us so we can want to do, and actually do, his good pleasure or works. Contrary to Lewis' claim, this does not "clinch" or settle the dispute of Christian doctrine in regards to what exactly is required for a person's salvation. We can reach the same conclusion about the Bible teachings and Christian doctrines regarding the cornerstone of Christianity, salvation, as Thomas Jefferson did in regards to the Book of Revelation: "You will perceive, I hope, also, that I do not consider them as revelations of the Supreme Being, whom I would not so far blaspheme as to impute to Him a pretension of revelation, couched at the same time in terms which, He would know, were never to be understood by those whom they were addressed." Lewis finishes this paragraph with meaningless apologetic sophistry.

In his last paragraph on the subject of the second sense of faith he states that all Christians would agree with him that even though Christianity seems to be "all about morality, all about duties and rules and guilt and virtue" it leads to "something beyond." By that he means it leads to Heaven. He tragically attempts to describe what Heaven is like. He writes, "One has a glimpse of a country where they do not talk of those things, except perhaps as a joke. Every one there is filled full with what we should call goodness as a mirror is filled with light. But they do not call it goodness. They do not call it anything. They are not thinking of it. They are too busy looking at the source from which it comes. But this is near the stage where the road passes over the rim of our world. No one's eyes can see very far beyond that: lots of people's eyes can

see further than mine.” What little he does describe of what he thinks Heaven is like is pure speculation as are all descriptions of Heaven and Hell in both the Bible and the Koran. Like Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, Marcus Aurelius and many great minds throughout history who rejected Christianity and the “revealed” religions, Lewis seems finally to admit that we can’t know what the afterlife is like. Of course, as a Christian, he is prohibited from being completely honest and objective and admitting that no one knows for certain even if there is an afterlife. Too bad Lewis didn’t enjoy the peace of mind Deism offers in its altruistic love of God and complete trust of God. A peace of mind strong enough to free a person from concern about the question of if there even is an afterlife or not, knowing full well that whatever the case may be it is part of our Designer’s design and Deists are very happy with that.

Chapter Five

Examining and Answering Book IV – Beyond Personality: Or First Steps In The Doctrine Of The Trinity

Lewis starts off his last book stating that he is going to talk/write about theology. He claims that theology means “the science of God” which is not true. Theology is derived from the Greek word *theos* which means God, and *ology* which means book. In practice, however, it boils down largely to the study of what men have written about God. Thomas Paine helps to clarify and differentiate this study of what men have written about God with what Paine calls the true theology. In *The Age of Reason* he writes, “That which is now called natural philosophy, embracing the whole circle of science, of which astronomy occupies the chief place, is the study of the works of God, and of the power and wisdom of God in His works, and is the true theology.

“As to the theology that is now studied in its place, it is the study of human opinions and of human fancies *concerning* God. It is not the study of God Himself in the works that He has made, but in the works or writings that man has made; and it is not among the least of the mischiefs that the Christian system has done to the world, that it has abandoned the original and beautiful system of theology, like a beautiful innocent, to distress and reproach, to make room for the hag of superstition.”

Lewis also says in this first paragraph that he thinks people who want to think about God “would like to have the clearest and most accurate ideas about Him which are available.” Based on the contradictory and ambiguous teachings of Christianity and the “re-

vealed” religions about God, it seems we need to look elsewhere to learn what we can about God.

In his next paragraph Lewis mentions a confrontation he had with an officer in the R.A.F. The officer had a natural Deistic connection with God. Lewis says/writes that the officer told him he had no use for Christian theology. He made it clear that he believed in God and said he felt God when he was alone in the desert at night. He described it as “the tremendous mystery.” The officer continued, “And that’s just why I don’t believe all your neat little dogmas and formulas about Him. To anyone who’s met the real thing they all seem so petty and pedantic and unreal!” This is similar to what Albert Einstein said about God. He said, “I cannot imagine a God who rewards and punishes the objects of his creation, whose purposes are modeled after our own – a God, in short, who is but a reflection of human frailty. It is enough for me to contemplate the mystery of conscious life perpetuating itself through all eternity, to reflect upon the marvelous structure of the universe which we can dimly perceive and to try humbly to comprehend even an infinitesimal part of the intelligence manifested in Nature.”

Lewis can’t leave this honest, objective, beautiful and natural idea of God alone without attempting to sling some Christian nonsense on it. He attempts to minimize the beautiful experience the officer had by using a flawed analogy. Lewis compares the officer’s experience to someone who visits a beach on the Atlantic Ocean, and who then “goes and looks at a map of the Atlantic, he also will be turning from something real to something less real: turning from real waves to a bit of coloured paper.” Lewis claims the point is that even though the map is only colored paper, “it is based on what hundreds and thousands of people have found out by sailing the real Atlantic. In that way it has behind it masses of experience just as real as the one you could have from the beach; only, while yours would be a single isolated glimpse, the map fits all those different experiences together.” This is making a very false assumption that theologians have accurately mapped the road to God. By objectively looking at all of the contradictory and nonsensical writings written by the theologians themselves, and not only Christian theologians but also Jewish and Islamic theologians,

we know this is not an accurate or true statement/analogy by Lewis. He continues with, “In the second place, if you want to go anywhere, the map is absolutely necessary. As long as you are content with walks on the beach, your own glimpses are far more fun than looking at a map. But the map is going to be more use than walks on the beach if you want to get to America.” This is just a continuation of his flawed reasoning and analogy. If the map you want to use to find your way from England to America was drawn by someone who never made the trip and you saw that it contained known mistakes, you’d be a fool to follow it. If you listened to your God-given reason, you would never follow such a map.

In his next paragraph Lewis makes clear that in his flawed analogy, “Theology is like the map.” He writes/says, “Doctrines are not God: they are only a kind of map. But that map is based on the experience of hundreds of people who really were in touch with God-experiences compared with which any thrills or pious feelings you and I are likely to get on our own are very elementary and very confused.” How does he know that the people who wrote the various, competing and contradictory doctrines of the “revealed” religions really were in touch with God? Lewis here should have addressed the idea of revelation, for that is why people believe in what men wrote as Christian doctrine, or any other “revealed” religious doctrine. People falsely believe that the religious leaders received revelations from God and that is what they put in the Christian, or Jewish, or Islamic doctrines. The huge flaw in this is that we only have the word of the religious leaders that God revealed something to them directly. For if God tells you something directly, that is a divine revelation to you. But when you tell it to someone else it stops being a divine revelation and becomes mere hearsay because the person you tell it to has to put their trust in you and not in God if they are going to believe what you are telling them. This real flaw makes all “revealed” religions meaningless. Lewis next dogmatically states, “if you want to get any further, you must use the map.” Again, why would any rational person use flawed maps? He continues, “You see, what happened to that man in the desert may have been real, and was certainly exciting, but nothing comes of it. It leads nowhere. There is nothing to do about it. In fact, that is just why a vague religion-all about feeling God in

nature, and so on-is so attractive. It is all thrills and no work; like watching the waves from the beach. But you will not get to Newfoundland by studying the Atlantic that way, and you will not get eternal life by simply feeling the presence of God in flowers or music. Neither will you get anywhere by looking at maps without going to sea. Nor will you be very safe if you go to sea without a map.” Dogmatic people like Lewis want for themselves structure even though their reason knows it is flawed. Intelligent people like Lewis, or, like the father of the neoconservative movement Leo Strauss, may at best believe the average person cannot function without believing in superstitious nonsense. Or, at worse, they know “revealed” religions are a great way to control people. Regardless, Lewis’ statement that the feelings people get of awe and inspiration from Nature “leads nowhere” is proven wrong by none other than Albert Einstein. The driving force that motivated Albert Einstein to learn and discover all he did about physics and Nature was his burning desire to “know the mind of God.” He derived this desire from observing Nature. Obviously, Lewis’ next statement is wrong by the same standard of Einstein’s breathtaking accomplishments. Lewis says/writes, “There is nothing to do about it.” As Einstein showed us, if we want to learn about God we need to learn about what God actually designed and created, not what ancient men who believed the Earth was flat wrote about God! Thomas Paine also believed in learning about God through God’s Universe. He wrote, “It is from the study of the true theology that all our knowledge of science is derived, and it is from that knowledge that all the arts have originated.

“The Almighty Lecturer, by displaying the principles of science in the structure of the universe, has invited man to study and to imitation. It is as if He had said to the inhabitants of this globe that we call ours, ‘I have made an earth for man to dwell upon, and I have rendered the starry heavens visible, to teach him science and the arts. He can now provide for his own comfort, AND LEARN FROM MY MUNIFICENCE TO ALL, TO BE KIND TO EACH OTHER.’”

Lewis' irrational and weak thinking revealed in, “But you will not get to Newfoundland by studying the Atlantic that way, and you will not get eternal life by simply feeling the presence of God

in flowers or music. Neither will you get anywhere by looking at maps without going to sea. Nor will you be very safe if you go to sea without a map” shows he still does not realize all the holes in Christian theology. Holes so big that even his ideas on “eternal life” are so muddled as shown in previous chapters that Christianity is not even clear about its biggest selling point!

Lewis starts off his next paragraph with a statement so absurd it's actually funny. He writes, “In other words, Theology is practical: especially now.” If by “practical” he means useful he is terribly wrong. How can a theology that can't even get its primary purpose right, in Christian theology that is eternal salvation for the individual follower, possibly be practical? A theology so contradictory that Christians spent centuries killing each other over its “true” meaning? Lewis goes on by stating that due to all the information that is available in the world and freely exchanged, “if you do not listen to Theology, that will not mean that you have no ideas about God. It will mean that you have a lot of wrong ones—bad, muddled, out-of-date ideas. For a great many of the ideas about God which are trotted out as novelties today, are simply the ones which real Theologians tried centuries ago and rejected. To believe in the popular religion of modern England is retrogression—like believing the earth is flat.” I'm sure proponents of Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, etc. all tell their fellow believers the same thing. That is a true sign of a closed mind. And a closed mind cannot make progress. It stagnates and eventually dies. To let ancient theologians do your thinking for you is a slap in the face to God and to God's gifts to you of life and of reason. It's also comical that Lewis would compare “popular religion of modern England” to “believing the earth is flat.” This is funny because the Bible, which Lewis claims is the word of God, states and/or implies in several verses, such as Matthew 4:8 which has the Devil and Jesus on top of a high mountain looking at “all the kingdoms of the world” which could only be done if the Earth is flat, that the world is indeed flat!

In his next sentence Lewis finds fault with people who say that Jesus was a great moral teacher and if we took his advice seriously we would be able to make a better world. He dismisses that idea as having “no practical importance at all.”

His next paragraph seems to explain why he believes following the teachings of Jesus while believing Jesus is simply the best moral teacher will not work. He writes, "If Christianity only means one more bit of good advice, then Christianity is of no importance. There has been no lack of good advice for the last four thousand years. A bit more makes no difference."

The popular idea that Jesus was a good moral teacher, perhaps the best moral teacher ever, really seems to upset Lewis. His next paragraph is still on this same topic. He writes/says, "But as soon as you look at any real Christian writings, you find that they are talking about something quite different from this popular religion. They say that Christ is the Son of God (whatever that means). They say that those who give Him their confidence can also become Sons of God (whatever that means). They say that His death saved us from our sins (whatever that means)." Lewis' "whatever that means" statements seem to be a form of sarcasm. However, they are in reality very valid. For what does Christianity mean when it says Christ is the son of God but also claims he is God? What does it mean when it claims that people who believe Jesus is the son of God, or who "give Him their confidence" can also become sons of God when the Bible says Jesus is God's only begotten son? What does Christianity mean when it says the death of Jesus saved us from our sins? What about Christian teachings which say we'll be judged by our good actions?

Next Lewis says that Christianity is telling us something about an other world, and if it's true it'd be at least as difficult to understand as "modern Physics, and for the same reason." A rational person can't agree with this statement regarding physics. Physics is based on observable reality and Nature, not on man-made superstitions and assumptions about "another world" which we cannot observe. There is absolutely no comparison between Christian theology, or of any religious theology, and physics. It's a complete absurdity to say or believe there is.

In the next couple of paragraphs Lewis differentiates between the idea that all people are "sons of God" or children of God and what Christianity means when it talks of people "becoming" sons of God through Jesus. He then mentions one "of the creeds" that

says Jesus is the son of God “begotten, not created, begotten by his Father before all worlds.” This creed is the Nicene Creed which Christian bishops decided upon in 325 CE. The creed was then amended in 381 CE. Lewis wants his listeners and readers to be very clear that the Nicene Creed is talking about Jesus before he was allegedly born of a virgin. Lewis says, “We are thinking about something that happened before Nature was created at all, before time began. ‘Before all worlds’ Christ is begotten, not created. What does it mean?” How the Christian leadership knew this, knew what happened before time itself, three centuries after the time it is said that Jesus lived is difficult, if not impossible, to understand. It’s sad that otherwise intelligent people waste their time and energy trying to figure out such ungodly nonsense.

Next Lewis makes clear the difference between “begetting” and “creating.” He says begetting is to “become the father of.” This is done through procreation. Lewis then says that “to create is to make.” He goes on and says/writes, “When you beget, you beget something of the same kind as yourself. . . . But when you make, you make something of a different kind from yourself.” He uses the examples of a man begetting a human baby and a man making a statue.

He starts his next paragraph with, “Now that is the first thing to get clear. What God begets is God; just as what man begets is man. What God creates is not God; just as what man makes is not man.” He claims that this is why men are not sons of God in a way similar to the way Christianity appears to teach that Jesus is. However, Lewis’ argument that Jesus is begotten by God seems to imply that Jesus is the only son of God as the revised Nicene Creed of 381 CE teaches. This contradicts what Luke 3:38 teaches; “Adam, which was the son of God.” And we shouldn’t overlook Genesis 6:2-4 which teaches us that “the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose.” It goes on to teach that there were “giants in the earth in those days” and that the sons of God procreated with “the daughters of men.” Were Adam and the other “sons of God” which the Bible mentions “begotten” by God or “created” by God? If they were begotten then Jesus loses his uniqueness. Unfortunately for Christians, Christianity is not clear whether they were

begotten or created by God. The Nicene Creed only mentions Jesus, but the Bible is not clear on the subject. And since the Nicene Creed is not the Bible, Christians do not consider it the word of God.

In his next paragraph Lewis states that man has the likeness of God but does not have “the kind of life God has.” He goes on making comparisons between space and God, between matter and God, between vegetables and God, between animals and God, and finally between man and God observing that man has the closest resemblance to God than all of the other things he just compared to God. In an open minded way, Lewis allows for intelligent life on other planets who may be “more like God than man is” an open mindedness which could have gotten him burned alive by the Christians if he had lived a few hundred years earlier. Belief in the existence of other worlds was one of the charges the Inquisition charged Giordano Bruno with prior to burning him alive on February 17, 1600.

In the next paragraph Lewis claims that people do not have spiritual life in their “natural condition.” – “the higher and different sort of life that exists in God.” He says/writes that there is such a huge difference between biological life and spiritual life that he must give them two distinct names: Bios he assigns to biological life and Zoe he assigns to represent the “Spiritual life which is in God.” He claims there would be as big a change for a man going from Bios to Zoe as there would be for a statue that came alive and became a real man. He claims that this is “precisely what Christianity is about. This world is a great sculptor’s shop. We are the statues and there is a rumour going round the shop that some of us are some day going to come to life.” It’s not a good idea to trust in rumors! It’s a much better idea to apply your reason to the designs in Nature which point us to Nature’s God, not to the god of the Bible or Koran.

Lewis, in his next paragraph, makes some more foolish statements. He writes, “the Christians are the only people who offer any idea of what a being that is beyond personality could be like. All the other people, though they say that God is beyond personality, really think of Him as something impersonal: that is, as something

less than personal. If you are looking for something super-personal, something more than a person, then it is not a question of choosing between the Christian idea and the other ideas. The Christian idea is the only one on the market.” This is not true. The Muslims give a lot of ideas of what God is like, as do the Jews. Both Muslims and Jews pray to God/Allah/Jehovah/Jealous in a very personal way asking for help for themselves, families and friends. The primary difference is that Jews and Muslims do not believe God became a man and allowed himself to be temporarily killed and that this somehow will wash away their sins. And like most of the other topics in their “holy” books, their ideas are conflicting and contradictory. Perhaps this is one common thread that runs between all of the “revealed” religions – contradiction.

In his next paragraph he’s making assumptions again about life after death. He dismisses the Eastern religious idea that “human souls will be ‘absorbed’ into God.” Lewis objects that this would end the individual’s existence. He ends the paragraph with the assumption that, “It is only the Christians who have any idea of how human souls can be taken into the life of God and yet remain themselves-in fact, be very much more themselves than they were before.” They have an idea but they do not KNOW if it is a correct idea. Nobody knows regardless of the claims to the contrary. The best we can do is to trust our Designer and not worry about it. There may be a continuation of our existence in a different form after our body dies and there may not. The truth is that nobody knows. And, as a Deist, I believe that is for a reason, for, as stated previously, this goes a long way in allowing us to have unconditional love for God. That is much more meaningful than being rewarded with Heaven or Paradise.

His next paragraph is a short, somewhat pompous, assumption. “I warned you that Theology is practical. The whole purpose for which we exist is to be thus taken into the life of God. Wrong ideas about what that life is, will make it harder. And now, for a few minutes, I must ask you to follow rather carefully.” He then goes on to attempt to explain how the Trinity, three gods in one, can be a reality.

An important point to keep in mind throughout Lewis’ contortions in logic as he vainly attempts to make sense of this nonsensical myth of the Trinity is that “Trinity” is not even mentioned in

the Bible. The myth of the Trinity was made-up by a third century theologian named Tertullian. To show that Tertullian leaned more towards emotions than to reason, it's interesting and informative to realize he became a member of a Christian sect called Montanism which was similar to present day Pentecostalism. It's also interesting to realize that Nicene Christianity, which was backed by the power of Emperor Constantine and therefore became the established/orthodox Christian sect, adopted Tertullian's myth of the three gods in one Trinity in its Nicene Creed but also outlawed Montanism and made it an official heresy. Not only was Montanism a target of the orthodox official Christianity, so was the Christian sect called Arianism. Arianism rejected Tertullian's idea of the Trinity. In the sixth century Emperor Justinian I defeated the Arian heretics with military violence.

Lewis' next two paragraphs are factual and are probably intended to lull the listener's/reader's mind when the facts are merged into paragraphs of virtually pure assumption and speculation. He correctly states that space as we know it is made up of three dimensions which allow us to move up or down, side to side and forward and back. He goes on to correctly notice that, "If you are using only one dimension, you could draw only a straight line. If you are using two, you could draw a figure: say, a square. And a square is made up of four straight lines. Now a step further. If you have three dimensions, you can then build what we call a solid body, say, a cube-a thing like a dice or a lump of sugar. And a cube is made up of six squares."

In his next paragraph he writes, "Do you see the point? A world of one dimension would be a straight line. In a two-dimensional world, you still get straight lines, but many lines make one figure. In a three-dimensional world, you still get figures but many figures make one solid body. In other words, as you advance to more real and more complicated levels, you do not leave behind you the things you found on the simpler levels: you still have them, but combined in new ways-in ways you could not imagine if you knew only the simpler levels." All of this is obviously true.

His next paragraph has him leaving facts behind as he dives into assumptions. He writes/says, "Now the Christian account of

God involves just the same principle. The human level is a simple and rather empty level. On the human level one person is one being, and any two persons are two separate beings—just as, in two dimensions (say on a flat sheet of paper) one square is one figure, and any two squares are two separate figures. On the Divine level you still find personalities; but up there you find them combined in new ways which we, who do not live on that level, cannot imagine.” How he knows what the “Divine level” is like he does not say. He continues on with our direct introduction to the Trinity myth. “In God’s dimension, so to speak, you find a being who is three Persons while remaining one Being, just as a cube is six squares while remaining one cube.” How he knows this, again he does not say. Also, he does not say why, according to this Christian doctrine of the Trinity, the Christian god stopped at only three gods in one – why not a million gods in one? Why not an infinite number of gods who are all one? And why not at least one part of the multi-gods in one entity being female; a mate for the father god which would more easily explain the son-god.

Lewis, in his next paragraph, attempts to answer the obvious question, “If we cannot imagine a three-personal Being, what is the good of talking about Him?” Well, there isn’t any good talking about Him. The thing that matters is being actually drawn into that three-personal life, and that may begin any time -tonight, if you like.” This is raw Christian apologetic sophistry and nonsense tinged with emotion. The emotion being in the last sentence – an alter call of sorts.

Assumptions abound in his next paragraph, too. He claims that a Christian “knows” that God prompts him to pray. This is not knowledge but only mere assumption. He next assumes that all of a Christian’s real knowledge of God comes to him or her through Jesus, “the man who was God.” And that Jesus is standing next to Christians helping them to pray as well as praying for them. He writes, “You see what is happening. God is the thing to which he is praying—the goal he is trying to reach. God is also the thing inside him which is pushing him on—the motive power. God is also the road or bridge along which he is being pushed to that goal. So that the whole threefold life of the three-personal Being is actually going on in that ordinary little bedroom where an ordinary man is

saying his prayers. The man is being caught up into the higher kind of life-what I called Zoe or spiritual life: he is being pulled into God, by God, while still remaining himself." No, I do not. All that we can see happening is assumption based speculation.

He starts out his next paragraph with a falsehood. He writes/says, "And that is how Theology started. People already knew about God in a vague way." What theology? Christian theology. Contrary to Christian arrogance, Christianity is not the first "revealed" religion. Theology started a long time prior to Christianity. He continues with a sentence based on subjectivity and not objectivity and reason. He states, "Then came a man who claimed to be God; and yet He was not the sort of man you could dismiss as a lunatic. He made them believe Him." If a person came along today who said they are God, most people would probably classify him as a lunatic. Lewis says that Jesus "made them believe Him." That doesn't mean much. Cult leaders today are always able to find some followers who believe all they say. Lewis continues with the far-fetched Christian story. He writes/says, "They met Him again after they had seen Him killed." There is absolutely no evidence to support this Biblical claim. In fact, one of the followers of Jesus, Thomas, did not believe that Jesus rose from the dead. The Bible claims that he would not believe until he saw Jesus and until he put his fingers into Christ's wounds. Thomas Paine addresses this claim in *The Age of Reason*. Paine writes, "A thing which everybody is required to believe, requires that the proof and evidence of it should be equal to all, and universal; and as the public visibility of this last related act was the only evidence that could give sanction to the former part, the whole of it falls to the ground, because that evidence never was given. Instead of this, a small number of persons, not more than eight or nine, are introduced as proxies for the whole world, to say they saw it, and all the rest of the world are called upon to believe it. But it appears that Thomas did not believe the resurrection, and, as they say, would not believe without having ocular and manual demonstration himself. So neither will I, and the reason is equally as good for me, and for every other person, as for Thomas." He ends this paragraph with either a lie or an historically inaccurate/false statement. "And then, after they had been formed into a little society or community, they found God

somehow inside them as well: directing them, making them able to do things they could not do before. And when they worked it all out they found they had arrived as the Christian definition of the three-personal God.” As shown above, the Christian myth of the Trinity was not imagined and written about until the third century CE when it was made-up and put forward by Tertullian.

Confusingly in the next paragraph he writes, “This definition is not something we have made up; Theology is, in a sense, experimental knowledge.” This is confusing because he was just talking/writing about the myth of the Trinity. The Trinity is a doctrine of Christianity. Theology is the study of those doctrines. He goes on saying that the simple religions are the ones that are made-up. He gives no information to back that up. He then jumps back to theology and falsely claims he said it was “an experimental science” when in fact he just said/wrote that, “Theology is, in a sense, experimental knowledge.” Science and knowledge are two different things. Science makes it possible for us to arrive at knowledge. He ludicrously attempts to say that theology is similar “in a sense” to experimental real sciences like geology and zoology. This is an insult to the true sciences and to our God-given reason. A quote from Thomas Paine’s *The Age of Reason, The Complete Edition*, makes this very clear. “The study of theology, as it stands in Christian churches, is the study of nothing; it is founded on nothing; it rests on no principles; it proceeds by no authorities; it has no data; it can demonstrate nothing; and it admits of no conclusion. Not any thing can be studied as a science, without our being in possession of the principles upon which it is founded; and as this is not the case with Christian theology, it is therefore the study of nothing.

“Instead then, of studying theology, as is now done, out of the Bible and Testament, the meanings of which books are always controverted and the authenticity of which is disproved, it is necessary that we refer to the Bible of the Creation. The principles we discover there are eternal and of divine origin; they are the foundation of all the science that exists in the world, and must be the foundation of theology.”

After more sophistry and rubbish, Lewis comes to his point that our ability to know God depends on God showing Himself to

us. He says the amount of God we're able to see depends on how good we are. He writes, "it is impossible for Him to show Himself to a man whose whole mind and character are in the wrong condition." It's funny that he claims that God does not have favorites when Deuteronomy 7:6 clearly says that the Hebrews/Jews are God's favorites to the exclusion of every one else on planet Earth.

In his next paragraph Lewis writes/says, "You can put this another way by saying that while in other sciences the instruments you use are things external to yourself (things like microscopes and telescopes), the instrument through which you see God is your whole self. And if a man's self is not kept clean and bright, his glimpse of God will be blurred-like the Moon seen through a dirty telescope. That is why horrible nations have horrible religions: they have been looking at God through a dirty lens." By horrible nations does he mean ancient Israel and the wholesale genocide they committed against their neighbors? Does he mean the Christian ruled countries of Europe during the Dark Ages when they tortured and murdered at least tens of thousands of innocent people, or when they invaded the Middle East and brought death and destruction there for Jesus sake? Or how about Communist nations like England's former ally, the U.S.S.R., which slaughtered tens of millions of people and who didn't even have religion but was Atheist?

Lewis next throws out much of the teachings in the Bible, plus he shows his sexism by writing, "God can show Himself as He really is only to real men. And that means not simply to men who are individually good, but to men who are united together in a body, loving one another, helping one another, showing Him to one another. For that is what God meant humanity to be like; like players in one band, or organs in one body." His sexism is in tune with the Bible. Although verses in the Bible promote Christians working together and making each other firm in their belief of Christian doctrines and superstitions, it does not teach that God can only really show himself to men united together in such community.

Lewis' next paragraph is funny and brings up some important points that Lewis and insincere Christians would rather ignore. He starts out with, "Consequently, the one really adequate instrument

for learning about God, is the whole Christian community, waiting for Him together.” They’ve been waiting for 2,000 years with no success. It appears that Jesus got his return time wrong, too. At Luke 21:27-32 it is written that Jesus said, “And then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory. And when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh. And he spake to them a parable; Behold the fig tree, and all the trees; When they now shoot forth, ye see and know of your own selves that summer is now nigh at hand. So likewise ye, when ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand. Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass away, till all be fulfilled.” The generation Jesus was allegedly talking to passed away about 2,000 years ago. Lewis continues in the same paragraph writing about “Christian brotherhood.” He writes/says, “Christian brotherhood is, so to speak, the technical equipment for this science-the laboratory outfit. That is why all these people who turn up every few years with some patent simplified religion of their own as a substitute for the Christian tradition are really wasting time. Like a man who has no instrument but an old pair of field glasses setting out to put all the real astronomers right. He may be a clever chap-he may be cleverer than some of the real astronomers, but he is not giving himself a chance. And two years later everyone has forgotten all about him, but the real science is still going on.” This is very degrading to the real sciences and to astronomy in particular to compare the unreasonable and unnatural superstition of Christianity with them. And it is tragically comic that Lewis talks of “Christian brotherhood” when much of Christian history is filled with Christians butchering each other over differences in Christian doctrine. Not to mention that Lewis, in his blanket rejection of all new religions, sounds a lot like the established religious leaders in Jerusalem at the time it is said that Jesus lived. They looked at this new religion of Christianity just as Lewis looks at new religions.

His next paragraph is funny, too. He writes, “If Christianity was something we were making up, of course we could make it easier. But it is not. We cannot compete, in simplicity, with people who are inventing religions. How could we? We are dealing with Fact. Of course anyone can be simple if he has no facts to bother

about.” It’s odd that he would claim Christianity is based on “Fact” when he’s shown no fact to support it. As the Deist Thomas Paine wrote in *The Age of Reason, The Complete Edition*, “I am not contending with these men upon points of doctrine, for I know that sophistry has always a city of refuge. I am speaking of facts; for wherever the thing called a fact is a falsehood, the faith founded upon it is delusion, and the doctrine raised upon it not true. Ah, reader, put thy trust in thy Creator, and thou wilt be safe; but if thou trustest to the book called the Scriptures thou trustest to the rotten staff of fable and falsehood.”

Next Lewis deals with time and eternity. He uses the next several paragraphs to state that God is eternal and exists outside of the constraints of time. This is probably true. Great minds throughout history have looked at the Universe as being eternal. People like Thomas Paine and Albert Einstein spoke of eternity and Paine in particular spoke and wrote of God being eternal. Although it is not proven, it does seem to make the most sense. However, Lewis falls back into making assumptions and presenting them as known facts. He writes, “Before I became a Christian one of my objections was as follows. The Christians said that the eternal God who is everywhere and keeps the whole universe going, once became a human being. Well then, said I, how did the whole universe keep going while He was a baby, or while He was asleep? How could He at the same time be God who knows everything and also a man asking his disciples “Who touched me?” You will notice that the sting lay in the time words: “While He was a baby.” How could He at the same time?” In other words I was assuming that Christ’s life as God was in time, and that His life as the man Jesus in Palestine was a shorter period taken out of that time—just as my service in the army was a shorter period taken out of my total life.” This is presenting the assumption that Jesus is God and presenting it as a known fact. The fact is, the idea and belief that Jesus is God does not have a rational leg to stand on. As an aside, if Jesus was God he would have known who had touched him which Luke 8:43-48 shows he did not know. The rest of the paragraph is based on the false assumption that God is Jesus and Jesus is God and of pretending to know more about eternity than he really does. He does,

however, make the interesting point about time that it is always “now.”

Lewis next attempts to show that all three parts of the non-Biblical myth of the Trinity existed from eternity. He wastes his time and energy in several paragraphs attempting to present an unreasonable myth as a reality. In his silly attempt to make it appear that all parts of the three gods in one entity existed eternally he makes no sense whatsoever. The best he can come up with is presenting the Trinity myth as being in the imagination of God. Lewis pathetically writes/says, “If there were a Being who had always existed and had always been imagining one thing, his act would always have been producing a mental picture; but the picture would be just as eternal as the act.” What complete and utter nonsense! Even though the Bible is riddled with genocide, violence, ignorance and fear based superstitions, it is to its credit that nowhere in its pages is to be found the word Trinity!

In another pathetic effort to promote the myth of the Trinity Lewis claims that the Christian statement “God is love” has no real meaning if the Trinity is not a reality. He writes, “But they seem not to notice that the words ‘God is love’ have no real meaning unless God contains at least two Persons. Love is something that one person has for another person. If God was a single person, then before the world was made, He was not love.” Wouldn’t God love Himself/Himself? Also, when I was a Christian I always took that phrase to mean God was so full of love He created the Universe and all the life in it and that His love encompasses everyone and everything. Regarding the question of if the Universe is eternal or not, the American Revolutionary hero and Deist Ethan Allen believed that both God and the Universe are eternal, as he wrote in his thought provoking book, *Reason: The Only Oracle of Man*. Questions like these will probably never be answered in the foreseeable future. We should not, Lewis and other revealed religionists included, speak of such matters as if we have the definitive answer when we, nor anyone else, actually does.

In the next paragraph Lewis states, “perhaps the most important difference between Christianity and all other religions: that in Christianity God is not a static thing – not even a person – but a

dynamic, pulsating activity, a life, almost a kind of drama.” Most Jews, Muslims and Hindus would probably disagree with this boastful “my god is better than your god” claim by Lewis.

The next paragraph has Lewis introducing his listeners and readers to the third part of the three gods in one Trinity, the Holy Ghost.⁹ He claims that the Holy Ghost, “grows out of the joint life of the Father and Son” and that the Holy Ghost is a “real Person.” This complicated, unnatural and unreasonable nonsense makes Christianity’s longevity to date a true mystery.

In his next paragraph Lewis goes into more detail about the Holy Ghost. His description seems to have a lot of potential for a Monty Python sketch. Lewis writes/says, “This third Person is called, in technical language, the ‘Holy Ghost’ or the ‘spirit’ of God. Do not be worried or surprised if you find it (or Him) rather vaguer or more shadowy in your mind than the other two. I think there is a reason why that must be so. In the Christian life you are not usually looking at Him: He is always acting through you. If you think of the Father as something ‘out there,’ in front of you, and of the Son as someone standing at your side, helping you to pray, trying to turn you into another son, then you have to think of the third Person as something inside you, or behind you.” This is priestcraft at its worse! The priests and clergy know that the more complicated they make their “revealed” religion, the more job security they have. Hence their hatred for Deism even though Deism is the first article of every “revealed” religion. As Thomas Paine wrote in *The Age of Reason, The Complete Edition*, “Every person, of whatever religious denomination he may be, is a DEIST in the first article of his Creed. Deism, from the Latin word Deus, God, is the belief of a God, and this belief is the first article of every man’s creed.

⁹Holy “Ghost” is not used as much anymore. At the time the King James version of the Bible was written “ghost” usually meant the living essence of a person. Since the meaning of words change over time and the word now means the spirit of a dead person, most Christian authors use “Spirit” in its place. This change in the meaning of words over time is one main reason why Deists and other freethinkers who believe in God do not believe God would communicate with humanity through one of the human languages. The eternal laws of Nature and Reason seem a much better way.

“It is on this article, universally consented to by all mankind, that the Deist builds his church, and here he rests. Whenever we step aside from this article, by mixing it with articles of human invention, we wander into a labyrinth of uncertainty and fable, and become exposed to every kind of imposition by pretenders to revelation.”

Lewis, in his next paragraph, brings greed up again as a motivation to become a Christian. He says/writes, “If you want joy, power, peace, eternal life, you must get close to, or even into, the thing that has them. . . . Once a man is united to God, how could he not live forever?” That’s the big selling point of Christianity, eternal life and escaping death. But as shown many times already in this book, Christianity is not clear on just what is required to obtain their biggest claim of eternal life. And, more importantly for the here and now and possibly even for an afterlife, it’s not conducive to making a better person by appealing to their selfishness and fear. Add to this, the fact that based on self-contradictions and other nonsense found throughout the Bible there is no way that it will align with our God-given reason, therefore, we cannot accept the Bible as being the word of God. Therefore, people who place their faith and trust in the Bible and Christianity in the hopes of getting to Heaven are mistaken. Continuing to follow something that is an assault on a gift given to us by God can only get us further away from God, not closer. So the offer of Christianity to people of their belief in exchange for salvation and eternal life is not a valid offer.

Next Lewis tries to compare people with “obstinate toy soldiers.” He starts by again stating an assumption as a fact. He writes, “The Son of God became a man to enable men to become sons of God.” He then talks/writes as if the myth of the Fall of Man in the Garden of Eden, its talking snake and all is also a fact and reality. Lewis writes/says, “We do not know-anyway, I do not know-how things would have worked if the human race had never rebelled against God and joined the enemy. Perhaps every man would have been ‘in Christ,’ would have shared the life of the Son of God, from the moment he was born. Perhaps the Bios or natural life would have been drawn up into the Zoe, the uncreated life, at once and as a matter of course. But that is guesswork. You and I are concerned with the way things work now.” In reality, he means the way things work according to the myth of Christianity, not the way they work in reality.

In his next paragraph Lewis attacks “natural life” which God gave us, and paints it as a negative, something “self-centered.” This takes either a lot of gall or a lot of ignorance since, as pointed out many times throughout this book, Christianity appeals to the selfishness and fear of the individual. It falsely promises the individual eternal life and bliss in Heaven, not to mention the earthly promises in John 14:12-14 of Christians being able to do more than Jesus himself is said to have done and to ask anything in the name of Jesus and he will do it, if they buy into Christianity. And if they reject Christianity they will burn in Hell for eternity.

Lewis’ lame analogy of a tin soldier being made into a person is meant to represent individual people who come alive because the son of God part of the Trinity myth became a person. He asks what you would do if you were turning a tin soldier into a real human being but the tin soldier did not want to become a human.

In the next paragraph he states, “What you would have done about that tin soldier I do not know. But what God did about us was this. The Second Person in God, the Son, became human Himself: was born into the world as an actual man—a real man of a particular height, with hair of a particular colour, speaking a particular language, weighing so many stone. The Eternal Being, who knows everything and who created the whole universe, became not only a man but (before that) a baby, and before that a fetus inside a Woman’s body. If you want to get the hang of it, think how you would like to become a slug or a crab.” If the Christian god really does “know everything” how did he allow Satan to box him into a corner where the only way out was for one of his personalities to become a man and to temporarily die? The Christian myth is belittling to the Creator of the Universe.

The point of his next paragraph is that by being crucified, killed and coming back to life, Jesus did not just rise himself, but mankind rose with him. He closes the paragraph with, “One tin soldier—real tin, just like the rest—had come fully and splendidly alive.” Anyone who takes their salvation seriously should examine the Bible on this most important point of Christianity. To look into it we need to ask legitimate questions. When was Jesus crucified? Mark 15:25 claims it was the “third hour” or 9am. However, John

19:14 makes clear it was sometime after the sixth hour, or in the afternoon. One of them has to be incorrect, or perhaps both are incorrect. Add to this the conflicting Bible stories of what the last words of Jesus were. Matthew 27:46 and Mark 15:34 both claim that his last words were, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Luke 23:46 claims his last words were, "Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit." John 19:30 claims Jesus' last words were simply, "It is finished." Again, at least two of these claims must be false. Regarding his alleged resurrection the Gospel stories are just as contradictory as the Gospel stories of the alleged crucifixion of Jesus. For example, regarding the number of women who came to his sepulchre, each Gospel gives a different number! Our God-given reason demands that we not accept as truth claims that are so obviously false. Stories and testimony like this would not even stand up in small claims court!

In his next paragraph Lewis makes a statement and then immediately makes another statement that shows his previous statement to be false. He says/writes, "But then, we are so made that we can see only the present moment. If we could see the past, then of course it would look different." Obviously, if his first statement is true, that we can see only the present, then he would not logically be able to make his second statement commenting on what we cannot see would look like. He then moves directly into a biological blunder by stating, "For there was a time when every man was part of his mother, and (earlier still) part of his father as well." This false idea that an embryo is a part of its mother brings confusion to the issue of abortion. Based on Lewis' statement, it would be permissible for a woman to have an abortion since the unborn baby is a part of her. If he was correct, there would not be any problem with abortion. However, Lewis is incorrect. The embryo is a completely different and unique genetic individual from its mother and from its father. Lewis then makes the pompous assumption that he can see humanity as God does by telling us how God sees humanity.

The next paragraph has Lewis relying on his Christian sophistry by saying/writing, "Consequently, when Christ becomes man it is not really as if you could become one particular tin soldier. It is as if something which is always affecting the whole human mass

begins, at one point, to affect that whole human mass in a new way. From that point the effect spreads through all mankind. It makes a difference to people who lived before Christ as well as to people who lived after Him. It makes a difference to people who have never heard of Him. It is like dropping into a glass of water one drop of something which gives a new taste or a new colour to the whole lot. But, of course, none of these illustrations really works perfectly. In the long run God is no one but Himself and what He does is like nothing else. You could hardly expect it to be.” How Jesus could make a difference to the billions of people who’ve never heard of him, or to the billions of people who died before the alleged birth of Jesus makes absolutely no sense.

A key mistake in his next paragraph is stating as a fact that Jesus is God. Lewis says/writes, “If we will only lay ourselves open to the one Man in whom it was fully present, and who, in spite of being God, is also a real man He will do it in us and for us.” Like salvation itself, the Bible is very ambiguous regarding the divinity of Jesus. There are at least 11 different Bible verses which strongly indicate that he is not God and that Jesus himself, if he really existed, did not believe he was God. One example is John 14:28 which says that Jesus said, “My Father is greater than I.” Another one is John 20:17 which says that Jesus said, “I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God.” These, along with at least nine other alleged quotes from Christ found in the Bible make it clear he did not see himself as God. If he did not, why should anyone else?

Lewis’ next paragraph is funny in that he writes, “You may say that the Father has forgiven us because Christ has done for us what we ought to have done.” How could anyone have been crucified, die and rise again from their grave? This is nonsense.

In his next paragraph he addresses a question he received asking why God didn’t just make a lot of sons instead of tin soldiers which would have made the transformation process a lot easier and less painful. Lewis claims that this would have been possible if it weren’t for the fall of man in the Garden of Eden. It appears that darn talking snake which talked Eve into eating the forbidden fruit really screwed up God’s creation. It’s interesting to note that the

tree which was forbidden was the “tree of knowledge of good and evil.” If Lewis is right and God gave people free will, then God should of told Adam and Eve to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil for that would allow them to truly exercise and develop their free will and moral character by actually knowing what is good and what is evil and using their free will to choose good. As the story stands, they did not know what good and evil were before eating of the forbidden fruit. However, the Bible god punished them and us and all of humanity after them for their not knowing any better. What a terrible myth and what a terrible way to portray the Supreme Intelligence! Lewis also repeats his mistake of again claiming there is only one son of God, when, as shown above in this book, the Bible indicates there is an unknown number of sons of God. Next, in the same paragraph, Lewis seems to be talking of something Stephen Hawking, Albert Einstein and other scientists were and are looking for – the singularity. Lewis writes/says, “But when you are talking about God-i.e. about the rock bottom, irreducible Fact on which all other facts depend- it is nonsensical to ask if It could have been otherwise.” It’s never nonsensical to ask a question. The remainder of the paragraph is filled with sophistry, speculation and assumptions.

His next paragraph is a long-winded statement which boils down to the idea of how we should look at our neighbors, assuming they are Christians. He says/writes, “If you forget that he belongs to the same organism as yourself you will become an Individualist. If you forget that he is a different organ from you, if you want to suppress differences and make people all alike, you will become a Totalitarian. But a Christian must not be either a Totalitarian or an Individualist.” This appears to be in conflict with the Communism found in the New Testament which seems to promote Christianity as a totalitarian organization. Totalitarian in the sense that if an individual tries to keep more of their property than the religious organization thinks they should, that individual will be killed by God. Acts 4:34 – 5:11 tells the story. It reads, “Neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them down at the apostles’ feet: and the distribution was made unto every man according as he had need.” (This was probably done

because they thought they would not need land or homes since they mistakenly believed Jesus was going to return to Earth in their lifetimes. Actually, any day now.)

“And Joses, who by the apostles was surnamed Barnabas, (which is, being interpreted, The son of consolation,) a Levite, and of the country of Cyprus. Having land, sold it, and brought the money, and laid it at the apostles’ feet.

“But a certain man named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife, sold a possession, and kept back part of the price, his wife also being privy to it, and brought a certain part, and laid it at the apostles’ feet.

“But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?

“Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.

“And Ananias hearing these words fell down, and gave up the ghost: and great fear came on all them that heard these things.

“And the young men arose, wound him up, and carried him out, and buried him.

“And it was about the space of three hours after, when his wife, not knowing what was done, came in.

“And Peter answered unto her, Tell me whether ye sold the land for so much? And she said, Yea, for so much.

“Then Peter said unto her, How is it that ye have agreed together to tempt the Spirit of the Lord? behold, the feet of them which have buried thy husband are at the door, and shall carry thee out.

“Then fell she down straightway at his feet, and yielded up the ghost: and the young men came in, and found her dead, and, carrying her forth, buried her by her husband.

“And great fear came upon all the church, and upon as many as heard these things.”

This Bible story is instructive not only because it shows Christianity as a totalitarian communistic regime, it also shows how it is

a cult, by giving people different new names and how the clergy substitute themselves for God as is made evident by Peter saying to Ananias that “thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.”

In his next paragraph he states that the devil “always sends errors into the world in pairs-pairs of opposites.” He doesn’t say how he knows this, or how he knows there is actually a devil. The rest of the paragraph is just foolish gibberish about why the imaginary devil is always doing such a thing. Imagine how far the world could have progressed had we been willing to give up on such superstitious nonsense a few thousand years ago and instead focus our reason on science, mathematics and philosophy.

Lewis ends his next paragraph with the assumption that anyone who says their prayers will probably say the Lord’s prayer. He doesn’t say why he makes this assumption. Based on the next paragraph he probably made the assumption because he wanted to write/talk about the Lord’s prayer.

In Lewis’ next paragraph he says that saying the Lord’s prayer which starts with “Our Father” is similar to playing dress up in regards to Jesus, or pretending you are Jesus. He says this is because the instant you realize what the words mean, you realize that you are not a son of God. Instead, Lewis says you’re “a bundle of self-centred fears, hopes, greeds, jealousies.” Since Christianity plays on the selfishness, fear, ambitions and greed of people as shown multiple times above, Christianity in reality only strengthens these traits. And the last fault Lewis lists and which he pins to his listeners and readers, jealousy, is, according to Lewis’ Bible at Exodus 34:14, a trait of God himself, as stated in a previous chapter.

Lewis spends the next several chapters stressing how we play dress up in regards to Jesus Christ and how that is actually a good thing. He states that Jesus is turning us “into the same kind of thing as Himself.” As stated earlier, Jesus was not perfect since he believed, according to two of the contradictory Gospels, that God deserted him which they say he said as his last words, “My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.” This shows lack of faith in God. Why would Lewis want us to be like that?

In his next paragraph he makes the foolish statement, “If there were no help from Christ, there would be no help from other human beings.” This is very obviously wrong since many people who do not believe in Jesus help other people.

The next paragraph sees Lewis attempting to backpedal with these even more foolish statements. “Men are mirrors, or ‘carriers’ of Christ to other men. Sometimes unconscious carriers. This ‘good infection’ can be carried by those who have not got it themselves. People who were not Christians themselves helped me to Christianity.” This is saying that Jesus hijacks people and uses them to unwittingly promote himself and Christianity. He makes people, in a sense, like zombie computers that are secretly taken over by viruses put there by hackers and start sending out the messages they’re programmed to send. This takes foolishness to a whole new level! He continues in the same paragraph with, “But usually it is those who know Him that bring Him to others. That is why the Church, the whole body of Christians showing Him to one another, is so important.” Of course, as has already been shown in previous chapters, for hundreds of years Christians have been slaughtering each other over doctrine. It seems the only thing that really restrains them from such destructive action is the power of the secular governments. To paraphrase Thomas Paine, they are now content with damning each other to Hell instead of cutting each others throats.

In his next paragraph Lewis instructs us to see Jesus behind all who help us, which is just a continuation of his above foolishness. He is so strong about this misconception that he writes, “We must go on to recognise the real Giver. It is madness not to.” In reality, it is foolishness and madness to pretend that Jesus is the reason for people helping us. Lewis’ teaching of something this ridiculous shows how correct Thomas Jefferson was to warn people that one turn away from principle sets a precedent for more. In this case the principle that is violated is to hold firm to our God-given reason. Lewis gave up on that when he suspended this principle enough to accept Christianity. It’s been down hill ever since as his belief and teaching that we should see Jesus behind every good thing someone does for us and that Jesus uses non-Christians to spread Christianity.

His next assault on reason is found two paragraphs down when he makes the giant assumption that Jesus actually said the words that are attributed to him in the Bible. Since many of those words and teachings are self-contradictions, and since they were not written by Jesus but by people who said they knew Jesus about 30 to 60 years after it is said that Jesus died and were then voted on by Christian bishops to be Jesus' words and the word of God a few hundred years after that, it is truly a giant assumption to believe and to teach that those are actually Jesus' words and teachings. Ignoring these facts Lewis brings in emotion. He writes/says, "They mean that a real Person, Christ, here and now, in that very room where you are saying your prayers, is doing things to you. It is not a question of a good man who died two thousand years ago. It is a living Man, still as much a man as you, and still as much God as He was when He created the world, really coming and interfering with your very self; killing the old natural self in you and replacing it with the kind of self He has. At first, only for moments. Then for longer periods. Finally, if all goes well, turning you permanently into a different sort of thing; into a new little Christ, a being which, in its own small way, has the same kind of life as God; which shares in His power, joy, knowledge and eternity." It sounds as if Lewis believes that Jesus will, along the lines of the Mike Myers' Austin Power films, turn Christians into spiritual "Mini-Me's" cloned copies of himself!

Next Lewis focuses on how deep the evil in us really is. He writes, "we begin to notice, besides our particular sinful acts, our sinfulness; begin to be alarmed not only about what we do, but about what we are." He goes on to say that when we're caught off guard we will snap at someone or say something unkind. This is called being human. Contrary to Lewis, it does not mean we are evil. Imperfection is one of our traits. There is no person who is or was perfect, including Jesus Christ as shown by what two Gospels claim were his last words which showed he lost his faith or trust in God. In addition to this spiritual fault, the Bible says that Jesus said he would return from heaven before that generation passed away which he failed to do. If the Christian god is not perfect, how can he make us perfect? In the same paragraph poor Lewis inadvertently attacks the driving engine of Christianity: fear and self-

ishness. Writing/talking about good actions he says, “How many of them were done for the right motive? How many for fear of public opinion, or a desire to show off?” According to Christianity the right motive to give to the poor, etc. is to get a reward from God. That is a terrible motive, but that is what Christianity teaches at Matthew 6:1-6 among many other places.

His next comical paragraph has all three parts of the Trinity myth pretending that we evil and disgusting human beings are actual Mini-Me’s of Jesus Christ. They/it does this, according to Lewis, so each individual Christian will actually be transformed into a real Mini-Me of Jesus. Lewis claims this is similar to what mothers do when they talk to their infant child. Even though the baby can’t understand what the mother is saying they still talk to them as if they could. As is common with the bulk of what Lewis has said/written in *Mere Christianity*, this is not completely true. Mothers who do this are not pretending their baby can understand what they’re saying, they’re doing it to teach the baby sounds that make up words and eventually words themselves.

In his next chapter Lewis asks the wrong question. He asks, “Is Christianity Hard or Easy?” He should have asked, “Is Christianity Real or False?”

In his first paragraph of the chapter he writes, “In the last chapter we were considering the Christian idea of ‘putting on Christ,’ or first ‘dressing up’ as a son of God in order that you may finally become a real son.” It is just common sense that by dressing up as someone who you are not will not turn you into that person. Likewise, acting as you are told a person who may have never really existed did will not make you a real Mini-Me version of that person whether it be Jesus or Hercules or anyone else. Lewis states that this pretending is “the whole of Christianity.” How sad that so many people turn against their God-given reason enough to accept this man-made ancient nonsense.

The next paragraph has Lewis making the assumption that all people prior to accepting the myth of Christianity only want “to do good” at best, reluctantly. How he knows that “all” people feel this way he does not reveal. Perhaps Jesus told him. Contrary to this assumption by Lewis, there *are* people who *want* to do the right

thing simply because it's the right thing. Not everyone needs the carrot and the stick of Christianity and the other "revealed" religions. As Thomas Paine wrote, "Human nature is not of itself vicious." A revolution in religion that would focus on this truth would help to greatly improve humanity instead of teaching we're all basically scum and are stained with sin because of our own evil thoughts and deeds as well as being due to Adam and Eve listening to the talking snake, etc., etc., etc. His next paragraph is based on this error as well.

He next claims that Christianity is both harder and easier. His first paragraph on this topic is, like Christianity itself, based on the myth of original sin brought to us by the mythical characters of Adam, Eve and the talking snake. In it Lewis claims that Jesus wants to destroy our natural selves and, again, make us Mini-Me's of himself. This destruction of who we are naturally is similar to what Lewis objected to earlier in regards to religions that teach we all will be absorbed back into the essence of God, thus destroying who we are naturally, unless of course the other religions teach that this is just part of Nature.

Lewis attempts to show that the hard part of Christianity, that of giving your entire self to Jesus, is really much easier than what he claims we're trying to do instead. He says/writes, "We are all trying to let our mind and heart go their own way-centred on money or pleasure or ambition-and hoping, in spite of this, to behave honestly and chastely and humbly. And that is exactly what Christ warned us you could not do. As He said, a thistle cannot produce figs." How he knows that this is what all people are trying to do he does not tell us. Again, maybe Jesus told him so. There are many non-Christian people who are good, honest, kind and caring people who sincerely do all they can to make a much better world. Lewis completely ignores them.

His next paragraph sounds a lot like the Stoics. He talks about when we first wake up in the morning and all our "wishes and hopes for the day rush at you like wild animals." Personally, I don't know any one who starts their day quite like that. For myself, I think of what I have to do that day and what I want to accomplish for the day. Nothing comes rushing at me like a "wild animal."

However, since everyone is different, I'm sure some people fit Lewis' description. Lewis suggests that we should instead be "listening to that other voice, taking that other point of view, letting that other larger, stronger, quieter life come flowing in. And so on all day. Standing back from all your natural fussings and frettings; coming in out of the wind." This last part sounds a lot like the Stoics. Marcus Aurelius taught that we should start each day knowing that some people will probably try to sabotage us and our work but not to let that influence the good we will try to do. He also wrote, "The happiness of your life depends upon the quality of your thoughts, therefore guard accordingly; and take care that you entertain no notions unsuitable to virtue, and reasonable nature."

In his next paragraph Lewis says that Jesus taught us to "be perfect" and also that Jesus meant it. As stated above, Jesus himself, if he really did exist, was not perfect. Therefore it does not matter if he demanded perfection from us.

The next paragraph has Lewis comparing Christianity with secular government. His comparison reveals the superficial nature of Christianity in that it is targeting the individual's fear and greed, and its counterpart in government is doing the same. Lewis writes that the purpose of government is to protect the average person's happiness. He gives examples of a "husband and wife chatting over a fire, a couple of friends having a game of darts in a pub, a man reading a book in his own room or digging in his own garden—that is what the State is there for. And unless they are helping to increase and prolong and protect such moments, all the laws, parliaments, armies, courts, police, economics, etc., are simply a waste of time." Sadly, too many people seem to agree with this. Just as most people seem to endorse Christianity because it's their ticket to Heaven in the hereafter, so they endorse government because they see it protecting them so they can lead a comfortable life in the here and now. Unfortunately too many people have turned their backs on things like freedom of and from religion, freedom of speech and assembly, freedom of the press, the presumption of innocence, etc.

In his next paragraph he talks again of the possibility of "other worlds" that may contain intelligent life. As mentioned above, this

is one of the charges brought against Giordano Bruno before the Christian's found him guilty of being a heretic and burned him alive. Again, Lewis is lucky he was not born a few hundred years earlier or he would have probably met the same horrific fate as Bruno did.

His next paragraph helps to make clear the damage Christianity, or any similar "revealed" religion, can do by misleading people to believe their entire purpose for being alive is the afterlife. Lewis writes, "What we have been told is how we men can be drawn into Christ – can become part of that wonderful present which the young Prince of the universe wants to offer to His Father-that present which is Himself and therefore us in Him. It is the only thing we were made for." Wouldn't it be better to teach people that they were designed to make progress, to study the Designer's designs, to help one another, to be kind, to be honest, and to pursue virtue?

The next paragraph finds Lewis trying to justify what he said earlier about Jesus wanting us to be "perfect." This apparently upset "a good many people." To clarify his statement, he claims that Jesus will help us to become perfect. This, in spite of the fact that as already shown in this book, Jesus himself was not perfect. Lewis wastes the next several paragraphs trying to demonstrate that Jesus will make us perfect.

In one paragraph he writes/says, "On the one hand we must never imagine that our own unaided efforts can be relied on to carry us even through the next twenty-four hours as 'decent' people." This is wrong and degrading. He continues with the equally ignorant statement, "If He does not support us, not one of us is safe from some gross sin." Does that mean Jesus is not supporting the clergy who rape innocent children? If they are active Christian leaders and they can't stop themselves from committing such horrible and permanently damaging crimes against children and against Nature, what good is Christianity?

Lewis spends the next few paragraphs basically stating what Friedrich Nietzsche said, "What does not kill me makes me stronger." Only in Lewis' case he meant makes people stronger and more perfect Christians.

Lewis starts a new chapter and paragraph with a statement about Jesus. He writes, “He meant what he said.” Unfortunately for Christians, this is a false statement. As shown above, Jesus said several things that are not true, such as stating he would return to Earth before his listeners passed away. Perhaps he meant it if and when he said it, but he did not fulfill it. He uses the rest of the paragraph saying how perfect Jesus is even though it’s been proven Jesus was not perfect.

Next Lewis tries to answer the question of why, if Christianity is true, aren’t all Christians “nicer” than all those non-Christians. Lewis says that perhaps people who are mean, or have some other fault, did not really have a conversion to Christianity, that it was just an “imaginary” conversion. He then tells a half truth about a statement attributed to Jesus. Lewis writes/says, “Christ told us to judge by results.” In Luke 6:37 the ambiguous Bible says that Jesus said, “Judge not, and ye shall not be judged.”

The next paragraph has Lewis saying that some critics of Christianity say they “should see the whole world neatly divided into two camps – Christian and non-Christian – and that all the people in the first camp at any given moment should be obviously nicer than all the people in the second.” I’ve never heard that demand. But since Christianity makes such outrageous promises and claims, promises such as being able to get anything you ask for in prayer as stated in John 14:14, this demand is not out of line as Lewis claims it is. Lewis’ next six or seven paragraphs attempt to show why this demand is not fair. They are filled with Christian apologetic sophistry and very little, if any, logic and reason, with references to that imaginary creature, the Devil. He also tries to rope in nice people so they think their kindness is not enough for God, he wants them to give up their God-given reason so they believe in the Christian myth and Jesus fable. It doesn’t matter how good you are, how much you love and help others and work to make the world a better place, if you don’t reject your God-given reason and believe the unreasonable teachings of the Bible and Christianity, God will burn you alive for all eternity. Thank God Christianity is not true!

Lewis closes the chapter saying/writing, “If what you want is an argument against Christianity (and I well remember how ea-

gerly I looked for such arguments when I began to be afraid it was true) you can easily find some stupid and unsatisfactory Christian and say, 'So there's your boasted new man! Give me the old kind.' But if once you have begun to see that Christianity is on other grounds probable, you will know in your heart that this is only evading the issue." There are no rational grounds for Christianity, nothing which agrees with our God-given reason.

Lewis gives his next chapter a title which seems to be influenced by Nietzsche: "The New Men." Though Nietzsche talked of building a new race of supermen through will and, indirectly, genetics, Lewis speaks of new men based on Christian superstitions and myths. In his previous chapter Lewis had written of turning a horse into a winged animal to show how Christ influences people. In this new chapter he writes, "In the last chapter I compared Christ's work of making New Men to the process of turning a horse into a winged creature." One is just as real as the other. "I used that extreme example in order to emphasize the point that it is not mere improvement but Transformation. The nearest parallel to it in the world of nature is to be found in the remarkable transformations we can make in insects by applying certain rays to them. Some people think this is how Evolution worked. The alterations in creatures on which it all depends may have been produced by rays coming from outer space. (Of course once the alterations are there, what they call 'Natural Selection' gets to work on them: i.e., the useful alterations survive and the other ones get weeded out.)." It's interesting to see Lewis again in violation of Christianity and the Bible. Before he did this by talking about the possibility of intelligent life on other planets. Now he's doing it by positively speaking about evolution and natural selection. This, of course, is in violation of the Biblical account of creation. In his next few paragraphs he lamely attempts to use evolution as an analogy of what Christ is supposed to be doing to Christians. He falsely implies, although he probably wasn't aware of it at the time, that evolution can only be studied by studying the past and makes no mention that evolution can be observed in viruses.

In his second paragraph, Lewis is trying to show how evolution is like converting to Christianity. Lewis writes/says, "At the earlier stages living organisms have had either no choice or very

little choice about taking the new step. Progress was, in the main, something that happened to them, not something that they did.” After learning more about DNA, it now appears that progress is built into DNA. The desire to procreate and to survive is part of the working code of life and progress which is DNA and our genetic makeup. Since this code, like all other code, is intelligence dependent, it is a design of our Designer, the Supreme Intelligence. What does not appear to be in the code of life and progress is anything that would push us to give up our reason, which helps us to procreate and to survive, for Christianity or for any other reason.

Lewis writes several more paragraphs of speculation and assumption trying to show how Christianity is like evolution. I wouldn't be surprised if some of his more “fundamentalist” Christian readers were not too happy with this analogy.

In one of his paragraphs comparing Christianity with evolution he says/writes, “On this view the thing has happened: the new step has been taken and is being taken. Already the new men are dotted here and there all over the earth. Some, as I have admitted, are still hardly recognisable: but others can be recognised. Every now and then one meets them. Their very voices and faces are different from ours; stronger, quieter, happier, more radiant. They begin where most of us leave off. They are, I say, recognisable; but you must know what to look for.” Lewis is wrong. If Christianity and its promises were actually true and real, the entire planet would now be Christian. It would be very easy to tell who was a Christian because they would be able not only to heal the sick, they would be able to raise the dead based on the Bible promise at John 14:12 which the Bible claims Jesus himself made, that Christians will be able to do the works he did plus they'll be able to do even more!

Next Lewis attempts to show how if all people become like Christ and have his same desires and think his same thoughts, those people will not all be alike. This makes as much sense as the Trinity myth. It can't happen. The people may still physically look different, but they will obviously all think and act the same, for to deviate from Jesus would be against the stated goals of Christianity. To show how dangerous it is to think and act based on your

own God-given reason Lewis writes, “The more I resist Him and try to live on my own, the more I become dominated by my own heredity and upbringing and surroundings and natural desires. In fact what I so proudly call ‘Myself’ becomes merely the meeting place for trains of events which I never started and which I cannot stop. What I call ‘My wishes’ become merely the desires thrown up by my physical organism or pumped into me by other men’s thoughts or even suggested to me by devils. . . . Propaganda will be the real origin of what I regard as my own personal political ideals. . . .” This is pathetic. First off, by “resisting Him” a person is NOT resisting God, they are simply resisting an ancient irrational superstition and the clergy who make money off of that superstition. Lewis shows he’s a true believer, that he knows how Christianity and the “revealed” religions work. He appreciates the power of fear to control other people which is shown by these destructive and fear promoting statements. He ignores the fact that we all have reason. By employing our gift of reason regularly, we protect ourselves from being used and manipulated by other people, both politically and religiously. And our reason protects us from being influenced by devils by letting us know there is no such thing as a devil.

In his last paragraph of *Mere Christianity*, Lewis continues with the call to kill your own natural identity and to surrender completely and totally to Jesus/the clergy. He says/writes that if you should “submit with every fiber of your being, and you will find eternal life.” Of course, as already proven through the Bible itself several times throughout this book, the Bible is not clear on how we get eternal life and salvation. Christianity, mere or otherwise, fails to deliver on its most basic, fundamental and important promise, eternal salvation.

About the Author

Bob Johnson has been a Deist since 1984 and is the founder and director of the World Union of Deists. The World Union of Deists was founded on April 10, 1993 at the same time as he began the first Deistic publication since the days of Thomas Paine and Elihu Palmer, *THINK!*. In 1996 he launched the first website dedicated to Deism, www.deism.com. Currently the World Union of Deists offers three Deist webzines. *THINKonline!* is a monthly and *Bruno's Bulletin* which is published sporadically. Both of these webzines are free. To help secure the necessary funding to properly and effectively promote Deism, *Deistic Thought & Action!* is published monthly and requires a subscription.

The World Union of Deists strives to make Deism a household word so that people can be empowered by knowing that there is such a thing as Deism and that they have a reasonable, natural and powerful alternative to “revealed” religion, Atheism and Agnosticism in Deism.

Bob has also written the book, *Deism: A Revolution in Religion, A Revolution in You* which gives a good overview of Deism.

C.S. Lewis' *Mere Christianity* has been read by millions of people over the last six decades. Not surprisingly, it is most popular with Christians who see it as demonstrating the reasonableness of Christianity. However, if we follow the advice of philosophy and objectively apply our God-given reason to the arguments Lewis puts forward for Christianity, we soon see they are painfully lacking. No matter how hard Lewis attempts to unite reason and Christianity, he fails.

An Answer to C.S. Lewis' Mere Christianity helps the reader realize not only the absurdity of Lewis' arguments, but it points the reader to a much more profound appreciation of God and of God's gift to us of reason. This book is a great instrument to use to help you make the very important real distinction between God and religion.