

Introduction

Good morning. You are listening to The Nexus, the most controversial show on radio. I'm Sankara Saranam, the author of God Without Religion.

1-877-899-5866

www.godwithoutreligion.com

God Without Religion is a multi-award winning book that the centralized powers hope you never read.

12 My Comments/News

Later on in the show and on next week's show, I'm going to share some music I've recorded for a forthcoming double album titled Fusion-Fission. When I was younger, I studied classical guitar at the Manhattan School of Music. I also played rock guitar. I left the conservatory to become a monk, but after the monastery, I developed my singing and songwriting talents, and wrote instrumental compositions as well.

But before that, I'd like to talk for a bit about this tiring and trying liberal and conservative divide. Of course, I'm not either, and the demarcation between the two is artificial, misleading, divisive, and downright stupid. It's popular, but I sure hope it's getting old. Each person's mind, with its thoughts and faculties and experiences should be a personal, social, political, and spiritual party unto itself.

The question is making the effort to develop the intellectual and intuitive faculties so that each person's mind-party can stand free, independent, in solidarity, and in proactive mutual cooperation and identity with other mind-parties.

If I had to simplify a position and give it a name, I could as much as anyone can. For example, when it comes to the issue of gay marriage, for example, call me a conservative. It doesn't affect me one bit if two men or two women engage in any social contract to

which they both consent. It doesn't enter into my business if they want to call it marriage or garrige or carriage.

So conservative to me means the State is conservative, CAREFUL, in how it exercises power. Conservative politicians, to me, will always be against the inherent danger of the centralization of power in themselves, which is why there aren't any conservative politicians.

Or if that doesn't sound conservative to you, but rather sounds very socially liberal of me, call it that. But you know, we can call it Jimbo if we want to, so long as we define our terms. You know the old saying, Jimbo by any other name...

Conservative to me means protecting certain principles, not for the sake of the principles, but for the sake of the social benefit that those principles confer, when put into practice.

So, Conservative to me means to look at the data, the hard science, not ideology, wishful thinking, or theology to determine policy. If a belief when implemented into a policy brings about disastrous social consequences, well, it should never be promoted to the ranks of principles in the first place.

Conservative to me means to be careful with money, to spend it wisely, and again, wisely means looking at the consequences of where my money went. Now, conservatives right about now will start saying, hey, that's what we stand for, but I beg to differ. It's one thing to stand for mouthing principles, and another to proactively apply them.

And about the importance of looking at the consequences of our actions, that was one thing the Catholic priest I interviewed didn't get. He said many times in my interview with him that the consequences were not of any concern to him. Actually, he was perfectly representing Church doctrine.

He claimed to know right from wrong just by following the interpretations of Church leaders who are reading a book written in the Dark Ages and calling it God's book, and that he didn't have to look at the consequences of doing just that. He is not a member of

the Conservative party by my standards. He is not careful. He is not cautious. He's a modern day conservative.

But, he was honest, more honest, I must say, than some so-called liberals. I'll get to that later.

It is because I am politically a Conservative that I support the will of three or four or ten individuals from entering consensual contracts, as long as that contract does not infringe on my rights. That means I support polygamy and polyandry. They are not unconstitutional, even the well-known constitutional scholar Jonathan Turley acknowledges that and defends these kinds of contracts, and they should be freely allowed like any other contracts between consenting adults in a free society.

In Sweden, teenagers have sex with their parents' approval. They start genuine sex education at the age of 10. What is the real consequence of this? What is the hard data? Well, only 7 out of 1000 kids have children, but in America, the most religious industrialized nation, 54 out of 1000 have children. 17 out of 1000 have abortions, while in America, 30 out of 1000 need an abortion. In Sweden 25 out of 1000 get pregnant but 83 out of 1000 get pregnant in America.

The hard science for years has shown that teen sex lowers the violence in society, lowers the misogyny, lowers the rape, lessens the organized religion, and reduces the likelihood of war. So, I am a Conservative, I am careful, I am cautious, I never use State power to legislate a narrow moral view, I look at the data, and am for teen sex.

Should a modern social "liberal" be for teen sex or for polygamy or polyandry or gay marriage? Sure, and for exactly the same reasons.

But are they? I just represented what Conservative is and what conservatism would have been at its best, which, by stark contrast with conservatism today, shows how backwards it is today.

Conservatism today stands for fear, centralized authoritarianism, dogmatism, and an unscientific theological world view, which just means a world view that has nothing to actually do with this world. It is centered in blind belief, faith in the existence of some Dark Age

tribal war god and the irrational denial of the existence of any of the other thousand gods invented by the various cultures of the past.

Ironically, if conservatism went the direction it was meant to go, no conservative would be a Christian because the scientific evidence does not support Christianity, the history it presents, the beliefs it espouses, or the policies it wants to put in place based on its dogmas.

Remember, a conservative is careful to look before leaping, investigating as much as possible before embracing anything as true, upon which to govern. The consequences of such theological policies have been and will ever continue to be horrendous in this world, and a conservative would have nothing to do with them.

But that's not the direction conservatism took, so now I suppose we could call real conservatism Jimbo and grab the reigns of reason and due reflection and common sense. I submit that all mind-parties must ask the questions and look at the data and arrive at those principles, wherever the data leads, despite the mad ravings of our misguided morals.

Conservatism was hijacked by Christian doctrine. Christianity like most religions and quite a bit of philosophy, was an exercise in plagiarism. The Hebrews were big plagiarists, ripping off the flood story and even their Satan. Of course, the Muslims were even bigger plagiarists.

Anyway, Christianity happened to plagiarize some correct principles too, which were accidentally allowed to remain in the books during the Middle Ages. You reap as you sow is one of them. It's not repeated enough, because it alone obliterates the foundation of Christian theology. You can't have a vicarious atonement doctrine or an eternal heaven or hell earned from the merits of one brief lifetime if you reap as you sow.

But reap as you sow means if the consequences of your actions are horrendous, then you are sowing based on ignorance of the way the world works. We learn how to sow from the results of our conduct. We don't learn conduct from a book, but from life and laws of nature.

12 Minutes Guest/Skit/Callers/E-mails

You are listening to The Nexus, the most controversial show on radio. I'm Sankara Saranam, the author of God Without Religion.

1-877-899-5866

www.godwithoutreligion.com

When we ignore the consequences, like Christianity perforce teaches and every self-mystifying religion enables, and we ignore the history of consequences, we repeat the same mistakes over and over and disaster follows.

That's why religions don't widely teach their history to the millions. It keeps the ignorant busy with thoughts of an absurd ascension to come in the near future. If people learned of all the atrocities, the consequences, of their beliefs in the past, both on a personal and social level, only a mad person would maintain their religious identity.

So, with all the absurdity spread by all organized religions, how can anyone with a straight face talk about freedom of religion? It's a contradiction in terms. How can you say an adult is free to believe what he wants to believe when as a child he was indoctrinated into a particular belief system and had no intellectual or reasoned defense against it? How is he freely believing what he wants to believe when freedom of thought was stripped from him at an early age by parents who were slaves to the conditions of their own upbringing?

How can there be freedom of religion when religion is a question of geography? If everyone was free, well, there wouldn't be religion, but if in some alternate universe every religion was actually reasonable, then freedom would mean that every society has its representative percentage of people from every religion. There wouldn't be a billion Hindus all crammed in India and a billion Muslims in another area and a billion Christians in their particular areas with each branch of Christianity occupying its specific area. The very fact that religion is a question of geography means that kids are influenced by what is around them, and that is the textbook definition of subjugation, bondage, and mental conditioning/slavery.

Liberal at its best means to me freedom of thought. In a perfect world, or mind-party, it is the perfect counterpart to the careful conservative attitude. The word liberal can mean generous or uninhibited, but politically it means to me the attitude that looks at new territory of possibilities, looks at current social issues and dilemmas and investigates new answers, and then reports back to the conservative mind that then looks at the data of the past and the liberal mind's projected data, and carefully makes decisions.

These two attitudes are not to be separated into different people. Each person needs to be in life both conservative and liberal. Success in all avenues of life is assured when people are both conservative and liberal in these ways.

Now, we already talked about the nonsense that conservatism de facto represents today. So, let's be fair and talk about what liberals can stand for, like freedom of religion. When liberals start talking about freedom of religion, I think I want to gag. First off, how would I as a parent or friend or partner in this social experiment be responsible if I did not challenge dangerous belief systems, when their consequences can undermine society?

So here are my challenges: How can I be asked to defend so-called religious freedom when that is perforce asking me to defend the right of parents to brainwash their children into cults? Where did parents get the right to do that? If people want to be part of this social experiment, then where do they get the right to teach nonsensical doctrines to defenseless children that undermine society?

Instead of seizing this opportunity of life - supposedly intelligent life - on this planet, and strive for the advancement of knowledge for the entire human race, our minds are made are busy narrowly identifying with parties, worshipping authoritarian con artists, and worst of all, continually having to resist the influence of the Dark Ages that the adults of every generation seemingly insist on passing onto the next generation in the form of irrational religious ideology.

If we want religious freedom, why isn't the history of the various religions, from the standpoint of the unbiased academic observer,

taught in junior high schools and high schools? Why is it just an elective course in some colleges? Who has the right to teach divisive beliefs to vulnerable minds that undermine society by burdening every generation with its cultural war, and still claim the right to be a part of this social experiment? Who or what can even give that right? Don't tell me fornication gives that right. Being a parent not only does not give that right, but it contrary to principles of sound parenting to teach ignorance that leads to the suffering for your children.

How can someone be called free when they are unable to see the world past their own narrow sense of self, past their self narrowed by religious indoctrination? That's freedom?

And here's the real kicker: How can we mouth platitudes about religious freedom when that perforce means that we permit religions whose very doctrines require that its followers infringe on the social rights of others? It's a contradiction.

You can't support both religious freedom and freedom of thought at the same time. And you can't have freedom of religion and what automatically comes with it – freedom of religious expression – when that freedom means that the rights of others are to be religiously trampled upon by holier than thou religious people as their holy duty.

And here's the other misguided notion commonly escaping the mouths of liberals: The separation of church and state. If there is any bigger naïve pile of malarkey than this one, I don't know of it. You might as well be talking about leprechauns or no, religious unity.

It's not that separating church and state would be a bad thing, if it were even possible, but it's not enough. It's the wrong battle, which I do not consider a coincidence. We are hoodwinked into fighting for the separation of church and state when then bigger war is being lost.

First off, anyone who says they can separate religion from politics knows nothing about either. People will vote according to their religion, and politicians will act according to their religion. And if they don't act according to their religion, they are STILL acting according to their religion because then their religion is simply telling them not to act in a particular way. Someone who promotes the separation of

church and state is perforce promoting his world view and values, which are informed, if not interchangeable, with his religion. So it is self-contradictory. Religion is merely that which we personally bind to, and to which we socially give our power. So it's just a battle between one religion and another, as usual. And again, meanwhile ignorance is winning in society as we are kept busy with distracting nonsense.

When running for president, John Kerry tried to say that as a Catholic he was against abortion, but as a politician he supported women's rights. That is a crock. He is one human being, not two. If he supported women's rights over their bodies, then he does not support the Catholic view and he is not a Catholic in that specific regard and so he should not be expressing that particular Catholic view as part of his identity, personal or political.

If his wife or daughter wanted to have an abortion, would he say, as a politician I support your right but as a Catholic I don't? And then we wonder why liberals are called wishy washy?

That's why I really appreciated Father Peter Ingwe, the Catholic priest we had on the show. He didn't apologize for anything. He was severely misguided by his faith to not care about the consequences of his beliefs in the real world, but he admitted his god hated gays, was for the disempowering of women, and was warlike.

We NEED people who will take sophisticated, deeply considered, spiritual values into public service precisely so that they can contend with the belief systems that are infested with divisiveness.

But, we can't tell people to do that and then tell another group of people to leave their beliefs at the door. If only people with conviction can stand up to Dark Age ignorance, then we can't be hypocrites and ask religious people not to stand for their convictions.

In fact, we DON'T want the people who believe in Dark Age theologies to NOT stand for their convictions. We must encourage them! Because only then, in an open and free debate, using reason and the evidence, will the errors in their thinking be fully exposed.

12 Minutes Guest/Skit/Callers/E-mails

You are listening to The Nexus, the most controversial show on radio. I'm Sankara Saranam, the author of the multi-award winning God Without Religion.

1-877-899-5866

www.godwithoutreligion.com

So the issue is not the separation of church and state. Religions ARE political entities, and they have been for as long as they existed. Right from the beginning with the tribal shaman, all the way up through the Holy Roman Empire and today. You can have laws on the tables that try to mimic that separation, but they either infringe on rights or are hypocritical or naïve or impossible to implement, or difficult to prove that they have even been broken.

Why should a fundamentalist Christian vote against his identity in favor of a Muslim politician? Because the unbiased data from that Muslim politician's career shows promise? Hah! It's not like empirical data ever concerned that fundamentalist Christian. Why should it suddenly concern him now? If it did, he might have to be concerned about other data, like the kind that undermines his religious beliefs.

Why should a fundamentalist Jew in the radio business be forced to hire talk show hosts that don't support Israel? How is anyone who is truly religious supposed to act contrary to their beliefs in public life? How can anyone of any conscience even ask such a thing? I ask people to use reason and common sense, to question everything, but I do that precisely because I will never expect people to not live and act by the blind beliefs they haven't deeply investigated.

So again, the problem is not in defending the separation of church and state. The issue is in the dire necessity to undermine both of them. They are both centralized powers. Make the State weak, make local governance, self-governance, strong, and it won't matter who is running it. The politicians of an overarching political institution won't have the power to wreak havoc on society with their beliefs. And

where local politicians do have that power, everyone in their district will be all for the havoc, because they'll believe the same craziness.

And why not? Why can't we let ourselves, our fellow humans, like the ones deluded from birth, against their will, by religion, live according to their religion and make their own mistakes and suffer the consequences? Why can't a state decide to ban abortion and suffer the consequences? Why is it we have so much faith in laws that keep people from living the way they want to live, and so little faith in the consequences of the way they'll live to teach them right and wrong?

I can boycott the goods and services of a state that bans abortion and gay marriage. I can move from the state that bans these things. These states will suffer brain drain. These states will suffer in innumerable ways because they choose to follow their god's laws instead of the laws of human nature.

I can live in a state that wants to experiment with ways of living that is in keeping with the data. Where is the state that can imagine a new life and decriminalize teen sex, polygamy, polyandry, gay marriage, marijuana and psilocybin use, prostitution, any contracts between consenting adults that do not infringe of the human rights of others?

Where is the state that will put first and foremost hard scientific education concerning world history, sexuality, and human psychology and identity, and let the ethics born of education and questioning, not superstition, guide human conduct?

If a state arrives at something that works, it can be imitated. Where it errs, it can still share the data with other states. Let's end this silly fight between red and blue and let the consequences decide who is right and who is wrong. People refuse to learn from history, unless it's their own history, so let them make their history. If we let them do that, their narrow self and myopic religious morality will BE history!

Another thing to keep in mind is that stronger states and a streamlined Federal government might also result in more involvement in politics because politics will be closer to home and will mean self-government. It won't mean painstakingly doing your little part to counteract the ongoing damage done to this country and the

human race because Washington has become a centralized feeding trough for multi-national corporations.

It's hard to get inspired to combat that. It's getting harder and harder to identify with all of the USA. It's so big, that it just becomes a concept, and one that is not strong enough, we've seen, to maintain unity of spirit. But state identity, that's more manageable.

A truly conservative state that undermines religious doctrine in the minds of the millions of children will never have to be concerned with a resurgence of popularity of religion, or the justification for immorality that comes with religion. Once that beast is dead, it will be dead forever, or at least for as long as free thinking is valued and we develop and continually maintain the outlets for the self when it finds itself in times of vulnerability, so it doesn't run to narrow ideologies for a lack of a place to go.

Another absurdity modern liberals love is religious tolerance. Now, I know it's suppose to mean we tolerate others and even allow that their lives will teach them right from wrong, but in practice it never works that way.

First off, if my son, whose mind is still impressionable, was secretly being indoctrinated into a dangerous and divisive belief system that I knew from the data was not in keeping with history and would lead to his unhappiness and the suffering of those around him, would I tolerate that religion in his mind? Would I tolerate that that indoctrinator was just following his religious beliefs in brainwashing my son?

Wouldn't I take responsibility and remove that person from my son's life and look at where I erred in instructing my son in asking questions, in doubting, in taking nothing at face value, in using reason, and in questioning authority, including questioning my assertions? I would have no trouble with my son questioning me. None at all! If he questions me, he'll question everyone, and that is a good thing, and if he asks me something I haven't asked myself, then I'll learn something too.

Now you might say, but that's your son. Everyone is not your son. No, but we are no less responsibility and more to the real point, we are to identify, not merely tolerate, other human beings no less. Of course, I identify as a father with my son like I identify with no other, but the society we all live in is determined by the members of society. If I am socially responsible, then I have to identify with all the members of my society, not to mention the other members of my species and this world and cosmos. That's my obligation.

I have to address social crimes, popular lies, the threat of centralized power, and the threat of dangerous belief systems in my society because they are all a part of me. I can't tolerate them if the data shows that they are dangerous to society. If I do tolerate them, I will not only be party to the ruin of my society, but to the ruin of any society that my society can affect, which in our modern age means the world. Tolerating the ignorance here means we will export that ignorance abroad in the form of misplaced values and bombs.

So does that mean we should be intolerant? Damn straight! Like Jefferson said, we should all vow eternal hostility against any subjugation of the minds of humanity, whether in the name of God or the war or terror or a political party.

We must all vow eternal identity, not puny tolerance of others, but active spiritual identity with every human being on this planet, and, armed with reason and the evidence, join together in colloquiums and seek to undermine the stranglehold of organized religion from the human psyche.

THAT is the new course the liberal mind can plot. That is the way of the future. That projected data of the way the world can be, a world where there is real freedom in thought, can be presented by the liberal and creative mind to the conservative mind, which will then weigh it carefully against past data, and then seek to carefully implement this new vision for the future, and in a way that the conservative mind has found to be most effective and safe.

In the next segment, we'll play some music from my new double album, Fusion-Fission.

12 Minutes Guest/Skit/Callers/E-mails

You are listening to The Nexus, the most controversial show on radio. I'm Sankara Saranam, the author of the multi-award winning God Without Religion.

1-877-899-5866

www.godwithoutreligion.com

You can pre-order the CD at godwithoutreligion.com. Click on the Buy Now! Link, and then go to Music on the left hand side bar of links, and you'll see the album Fusion-Fission. All the proceeds of the album will go to purchasing and planting trees at the Whirlwind Community, which is located about 25 miles south of Deming, NM, very near the Mexican border. Whirlwind, will be a place where people can freely come and learn pranayama, retreat, take courses, and become long term or even lifetime residents, going back to the land.

Fusion-Fission's claim to fame is that it spotlights both virtuoso classical and rock guitar songs and instrumental pieces of music composed and performed by one artist. In a little bit, we'll play various tracks that are examples of this.

Closing

Thank Callers and listeners

www.godwithoutreligion.com Write questions and comments, or let us know if you are interested in sponsoring The Nexus.

You can also find my retreat schedule. I'll be leading a course at the Embracing Simplicity Hermitage.