

Neoplatonism

(Continued from last issue.)

Melito, bishop of Sardis 141 A. D. dedicated an apology to Marcus Antoninus emperor, in behalf of the Christians community, which Eusebius thinks was written 170 A. D. "Pious men" he says, "are now persecuted and harassed throughout all Asia by new decrees which was never done before, and impudent Sycophants, and such as covet the possessions of others taking occasion from the edict to rob without fear or shame, etc." Again he says, and here is the thing in a nutshell. "For the philosophy (religion) we profess truly flourished a foretime, among the barbarous nations; but having blossomed again (or been transplanted) in the great reign of thy ancestor, it proved to be above all things ominous of good fortune to thy kingdom." This bishop Melito suffered mutilation for "the kingdom of heaven sake." Let the reader compare this statement with Paul's declaration in Colossians 1:23. "If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven; whereof I Paul am made a minister" and consider well what it all means. I verily believe, Paul was a Neoplatonist.

Justin Martyr 140 A. D. in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew says "There exists not a people whether Greek or barbarian, or any other race of men, by whatever appellation or manners they may be distinguished, however ignorant of arts or agriculture—whether they dwell under tents, or wander about in covered wagons—among whom prayers are not offered up, in the name of a crucified Jesus, to the Father and creator of all things. Paul knew nothing of the sayings or miracles of Jesus of the gospels, as there were no gospels in his day. From what he says, he knew very little about the apostles. It also appears he knew nothing of the immaculate conception. He preached Christ and him crucified. He says Gal. 1:9 "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received let him be accursed." In 10th verse he says, "God speaks to them through him, and that the gospel which he preached was not taught to him by man." "When it pleased God to call him to reveal his Son he did not confer with anybody, and especially that he did not go to Jerusalem, nor to the apostles before him." Here he does not consider it necessary to see these apostles as he runs the whole thing himself. "Three years after, he visited Jerusalem and then he saw of the apostles only Peter and James. He did not go to Jerusalem again, until fourteen years after, and asserts that he then went up by revelation, not to consult, but to communicate unto them that gospel which he preached among the gentiles; that is to say, he had been sent by God to instruct those apostles who had been taught by Christ! Does this not look as if the apostles were extenuated to a degree. He says that James, Peter and John "seemed to be pillars as though he had never known that. It may be he did not know very much about the twelve apostles. But what are we to think of Paul's declaration in Colossians 1:23! It is not in line with other christian evidences, which I have given, and it is not proof, that what is called christianity is nothing but the transplanting and embel-

lishing of the older religions to Palestine and Egypt, by the Neoplatonists.

The Savior of this Christianity is composite, being taken from both Buddhism and Brahminism. The birth, and infancy of the christ myth in the gospels, is identical with the birth and infancy of the Hindoo Savior, Krishna, who is said to have been on earth 1000 years before the Neoplatonist appropriated him for their Savior. In those days, remember India was many days journey from Alexandria, and the fraud (plagiarism) was not likely to be soon discovered. The Jesus of the one to three years ministry in the gospels, is an entirely different representation, and never was born. This is a conclusive argument, that settles forever that much mooted question, as to what year he was born, or the day, and releases God from the uncomfortable position of trying to save the world by sending, and sacrificing his only son, and then not even have his natal day remembered. He appeared on the banks of the Jordan, the Gnostics said, a man in appearance—and "he began to be about thirty years of age"—but still nothing but a spirit. He was a materialized spirit, as the Manichean and Gnostic sects stoutly maintained, even in apostolic times, and as there were more of these sects, than of the others, why not accept their opinion! Faustus, that highly intelligent Manichean says, in answer to the question "you also admit Christ was born!" "Not so; for it by no means follows, that in believing the gospels I should therefore believe that Christ was born." As I have elsewhere shown in this article that the Manichean and Gnostic sects were strongly indoctrinated with Neoplatonism, it will be apparent, that this mythical spiritual conception of Jesus, is purely Neoplatonic. One cannot arrive at any other conclusion, when he understands what was Neoplatonism in the early centuries, and its power. Many of the beliefs and teachings of the Essenes, and Therapeutae were put into his mouth by the gospel writers. Resist not evil, but overcome evil with good. "Sell what thou hast and give to the poor." "Love thy neighbor as thyself." "And again I say unto you it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven." See also Matt. 19:12 as an appropriate ascetic doctrine. There are many more bearing on the same idea, that are nearly like the sayings of Buddha. There are others of different import, that are probably interpolations by the church when it became powerful enough to fix the texts for their aggrandizement. This Jesus of the gospel was ever the companion of the poor and needy, like Buddha, was, in the other story, "You shall forgive your brother seventy times seven" is Essenism and in strict accord with their beliefs. In that miracle of the cure of the blind man, in John, Jesus asked by his disciples, a purely Buddhist question, to wit: "Has this man sinned or his parents that he was born blind." It is evident that these disciples asking that question knew something of Buddhism, and one is constrained to ask how Jesus is made, no doubt by some later interpolator to deny, for he says, "Neither has this man sinned nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." This is even worse than if Jesus had admitted the reincarnation idea, as this answer admits a conspiracy to defraud this young man of his

rights—that of seeing, for a period of twenty years or more. All this, had been done by God, Jesus says, so he could come along some day and show his power by opening the eyes of the innocent victim!

The Destruction of the Heretical Sects.

During the reigns of Constantine Valentinianus Theodosius and Justinian, the main business of the church was the killing of competition. The assumption that we have the "only true way to heaven" gave the church the sanction of the bible God in this inhuman business and soon the different heretical sects began to disappear. Theodosius sent the Roman legions through Thrace and Macedonia and laid waste the Arian cities of those counties, killing all the men, women and children. It is said that when St. Ambrose bishop of Milan, heard of the massacre of Arians at Thessalonica he wept. This statement is doubtful, for we know there was a general rejoicing in popedom after the St. Bartholomew massacre. The same relentless cruelty was apparent in the church organization even thus early, that was seen later, in the massacres of the Albigenses, Waldenses and on St. Bartholomew's day. Fifteen edicts in fifteen years, was Justinian's method of doing away with all heretics. Some of these edicts were cruelties of the most inhuman description. They were of such construction as to exterminate the heretics in one way or another. They must go, change faith or die, was the church ultimatum. Many died martyrs, to a belief that could not have been worse than the belief of their adversaries. Under these edicts the heretical sects were nearly all annihilated. It never met with but two competitors it did not conquer The "Mohammedan whom they fought for 500 years, and the Reformation which they, in a thirty year war, tried their best to suppress. This bloody war killed nearly all the able bodied men of central Europe. Massacres of the most horrible description were perpetuated. This great church or trust must control the whole people, for all the emoluments, of all kinds, must be gathered into its coffers. This trust, the greatest and richest the world has ever known, commercialized the credulity of the people, and forced them to buy their "only true way to heaven." This was as much a trust as the Rockefeller oil trust. The one sold "through tickets to heaven" the other oil, and both forced men to buy of their trust, as competition was dead. It dictated and controlled all laws for the governing of the people, yet ignorance, wretchedness and misery increased. The people were slaves physically and mentally and there could be no improvements in conditions, only in opposition to the church, and that would necessitate an auto defa in the near future. This earth, was only to prepare for the other life, and the greater the suffering here, the more the happiness in the world to come. Now if this religion is a good thing for the people, as its advocates today claim, why were not the people, in the dark ages, on the top wave of prosperity and happiness, when this church had supreme power! The reason is not hard to find.

This Christian religion which teaches that "faith alone is sufficient unto salvation" is not conducive to the happiness or best interests of any people. Character which is an exponent of true men, and desirable people has not of necessity, any part, as a saving grace in such a potpourri religion, as Christianity. That is why it grew so rapidly among the half civilized nations of Europe. Those savage tribes under Charlemagne accepted