

# **THE CONTRADICTIONS IN WESTERN MONOTHEISM:**

**alexis dolgorukii © 1998**

Western Civilization, by which I mean European Civilization and those wide areas of the planet which are totally influenced by European Civilization, quite vociferously brags about the fact that its religions are monotheistic, and that its monotheism is infinitely superior and preferable to the polytheism and pantheism the West sees as intrinsic to the religious beliefs of the rest of the world. This claim to superiority is inherently racist and, is, in fact, based on abysmal ignorance of both its own European religion, and very much more so, regarding the religions of others.

The fact of the matter is that the European Religion is nowhere near truly monist, and the other religions of the world are no where near as dualist as they seem. But, one fact is absolutely true, all organized religion is at least intrinsically dualist . This is so, quite simply, due to the fact that any belief that posits a "God" as separate from its creation, thereby makes "God" one thing, and its 'creation' another, and this is the most basic form of dualism.

Now that is a pretty outrageous statement isn't it? Well, while it may seem outrageous, it is none the less completely true, and completely provable." Prove it" is exactly what I am going to proceed to do.

Now let us start our discussion with the so-called Polytheistic Religions", I am going to leave "Pantheism" ("God" is everything) for last, because if the cutting edge of modern science is correct, and I am strong in my belief that it is, then "Pantheism", with certain relatively minor changes in language, is much closer to the truth than anything else.

Now then, how polytheistic is polytheism? Well, if one understands the perceptions of their religion by those deemed to be both adherents of polytheism, and well-informed as to the basis of their beliefs, they are not nearly as polytheistic as they may seem although they are in all likelihood entirely dualistic.

But not all so-called polytheists are even slightly dualistic, not if one delves deeply into the foundations of their religion as opposed to the popular practice

thereof. The Hindu Religion is, of course, the most important of these as it has the largest number of adherents of any religion, especially if, as do I, you regard Buddhism as merely an off-shoot of Hinduism, which it clearly is, just as Christianity is an off-shoot of Judaism.

Popular Hinduism is clearly a religion and very clearly polytheistic, but the Vedas, which are the basis of Hinduism, are rather a philosophical statement, and a totally monistic one at that, than any kind of religious statement. Buddhism, at least in its original formulation was an entirely agnostic statement of the Vedic philosophy.

So, let's look at the original Vedic statement. It is, in a way, "Pantheistic", in that it assumes a creative force "Parabrahm", which is absolutely unknowable and utterly incomprehensible and which contains everything that is, within its self, or substance. In other words "Parabrahm" or "God" is everything that exists, and conversely everything that exists is "Parabrahm" or "God". That, of all statements is the most purely Pantheistic, for, if "God" is everything, then clearly everything is also "God" which is what "Pantheism" means. This is pure monism, there is no duality, no "good" and "Evil", there is only "Parabrahm" or "God" and all things and events take place within the context of that unimaginable beingness.

Religion, if I may digress a moment, began as an attempt by totally limited beings (Humans) to define the process whereby they came into being. A process which was, and quite probably still is, totally beyond their fullest comprehension. "Parabrahm" as an unknowable, incomprehensible, unreachable thing, was truly beyond humanity's comfort level, and so humans intellectually began to create a "stepping down process", by which the unknowable could be made more amenable to human aspirations and needs. In India, the home of the Hindus, this stepping down process began with the invention of a tripartite division of the very distant and unknowable "Parabrahm", into a more comfortably comprehensible Brahma (the creator), Vishnu (the preserver) and Shiva (the Destroyer-regenerator) in this context then, Brahma-Vishnu- Shiva are seen as individual Gods that emanated from the Supreme God head which is Parabrahm.

Parabrahm then, can be seen as meaning to say "beyond God". This, by the way, is a very sophisticated perception with which the so-called "advanced West" is very uncomfortable.

To the Western Mind, nothing can be "beyond God", but to the far more subtle Eastern Mind, such a state is completely conceivable.

That is one of the primary contradictions to the West's presumption of the Monotheistic superiority. Because of course, "Parabrahm" can be seen as a

euphemism for "The Big Bang" which is clearly irrelevant to the subject of "Gods" and "Divinity. To rational people, all religion can be seen as an effort to explain what happened after the big bang which led to the establishment of the human condition and its intrinsic context. The human condition is all that really concerns religion because the human condition and its context is all that human beings know anything about.

No religion is based on knowledge, they are all based entirely on beliefs arising from and out of, superstitions and ignorance. That statement is true of every single religion on the planet. The single worst fault I find with religion per se, is that Religion, and the Religious, claim to irrefutably know, **what cannot be known**, usually on the basis of "Divine Revelation" , which thing, of course, is neither provable nor disprovable. The very worst feature of these claims is how very many of the religions and their adherents will gladly kill you if you question either their statements or their authority to make them.

Getting back to Hindu Polytheism, far be it from me to deny that the greatest mass by far of the Hindu population are clearly and openly and proudly polytheistic, because they are all of these things. But it has to be acknowledged that they are all of those things in the context of a religion whose basic philosophical statement is an entirely agnostic document, The Vedas.

Hinduism, of the polytheistic variety, is an entirely decadent belief structure, brought to its present state of superstitious religion, by some 6,000 years of continual degradation caused by an entirely basically ignorant nepotistic hereditary Priesthood, the Brahmins.

True, there are "Pandits" in India who understand the monistic nature of the original Vedic philosophy, but they are highly respected by the masses and otherwise totally ignored.

Buddhism, which depending on its variety, (Hinayana and Mahayana) is viewed by scholars as either "Pantheistic" (Hinayana) or "Polytheistic" (Mahayana), started out as an agnostic counter reformation of Brahminism. Here let me pause to say that "Brahminism" is probably the best word to use to define Popular Hinduism, and the best definition for intrinsic Hindu metaphysical philosophy is "Vedic Monism". Sakya Gautama Siddhartha

was intrinsically a Hindu reformer, whose goal in life was to return the Vedic Monism to its pristine, **and Priest less** state. I firmly believe it was never his intention to found yet another religion, when, like me, he deplored the effects of religion. Gautama sought to alleviate Human suffering, and again like me, he saw religion as one of the principle causes of that suffering. Mahayana Buddhism is

simply Brahmanism revised. It too is clearly and proudly Polytheistic though it tends to acknowledge that its religious certainties and all other physical things, are largely illusory.

Now let's pause a while to discuss the truest polytheists on the planet, the various beliefs of people like the Yoruba Peoples of Africa and others who posit various "Gods" and "Goddesses". But of course our highly admired predecessors the Romans, Greeks, and Egyptians did too. But let's look at the beliefs, first at the ancient inhabitants of what is called "Classical Civilization" and then of the Yorubas and others..

The most imposing, and certainly the longest lasting of the so-called Ancient Civilizations is clearly that of the Egyptians, which is also, as most people view it, the most clearly polytheistic. But while we all know they built magnificent Temples and Monuments to many Deities, many of them zoomorphic, what were their true beliefs as to this subject?

Well the first "clue" we have is the fact that they referred to these so-called "Divinities" as "NETERS" which probably best transliterates as "forces", for they believed these "deities" symbolically personified the natural forces inherent in nature. Now, conceptually, it's a far cry from being an actual being to being the symbolic personification of a force of nature

The mistake under which we labor, comes from the confusion of Christian archeologists and Egyptologists in the 18<sup>th</sup>, 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries and before, who never dreamed that there were sophisticated premises behind what appeared to be totally unsophisticated statuary and carvings. Now, in that case, were the old Egyptian Priests and Priestesses truly polytheistic or merely symbolically so?

Now we do know that the ordinary people of Egypt were polytheistic in the extreme, to them the various "Neters" were individual beings like themselves. But all ordinary" or "common" people, everywhere, and in every time, are totally incapable of discriminating between appearances and actual substance. They always take things, and especially religion at its face value, and NEVER try to look behind those appearances for actual meaning. That is why Sakya Gautama Siddhartha insisted that it was tremendously important for people to develop what he called "Right Discrimination". He wanted people to discern between form and substance. Unfortunately that part of his agenda, and it's far from the least important, was almost totally ignored. Or at least ignored in the sense he meant it to be taken.

I am strongly of the opinion that the educated classes in Egypt were not confused between form and substance, and that they knew very well that the universe was monistic. That is pretty clear from their depictions and descriptions of PTAH, their creative source. Almost every characteristic of PTAH is abstract, this is clearly demonstrated by his depiction as un-living (Mummiformed) but procreative (Phallic). He is the Egyptian equivalent of the equally procreative Indian Shiva, who is most frequently symbolized by a Phallus or "Lingam".

One of the things that the Western Intellectual does, that is most destructive, is their assumption that everyone but themselves is clearly stupid and gullible. This is particularly true of their attitudes towards any precursor culture and to anyone who isn't just like them.

It is important to realize that most of our ideas as to the glories of western monotheism come from the Jews, who claim the idea for their own. But it isn't their idea, it was the creation of the Mazdazdian Dualists of ancient Babylon, the Jews just added the concept of dualistic monotheism (which is an oxymoron) during what is called "The Babylonian Captivity". I will come back to the fallacy inherent in presenting dualism as monotheism directly, but first I want to discuss the other peoples of the classical World and their views of spirituality.

Now, everyone, or rather all educated people, are aware of the wonderful fairy tale mythology of the Greek and Roman Gods and Goddesses; involving feuds, adultery, actual warfare, and petty revenge. We moderns of course, don't take a word of it seriously. Nor should we. My question is: Did they?

Once again there's a bi-level answer. The common people, or the en-educated classes took it all very seriously indeed. How could they not? They absolutely lacked not simply the capacity and intelligence to make the comparative evaluations needed to know whether to take it seriously or not, but they also lacked the time and freedom to do so.

"They lacked the time and freedom to do so"; that's a very important fact. People who spend all of their time just trying to "get by" to survive, and that describes the common people of all times and places, really have neither the time necessary for the studies leading to independent thought, nor the means that would enable them to think about things as unnecessary to survival as abstractions. The common people have to accept what they're told about these things, and, as the various Priests and Teachers who tell them these things are usually highly respected (or greatly feared), they accept the dogma as truth.

It is urgent, especially at this time, for everyone to know that the principle purpose of organized religion is to keep the great mass of the commonality supinely "in line". Religion is the club used to beat humanity into obedience! It is so now, it was so in the beginning, and will continue to be so until humankind outgrows it's need for something else to blame for it's perceived weaknesses!

Getting back to what the educated Greeks actually believed about their amusing "Gods and Goddesses" I think that there's ample evidence to demonstrate that they didn't really give credence to the legends, while enjoying immensely all the wonderful theatrical performances which featured them. This is a reasonable perception giving the fact that the Greeks gave us philosophers who were as advanced as anything since. With people such as Thales, Anaxagoras, Anaximander, Parmenides, Democritus, and, of course, Plato and Aristotle who discussed such disparate things such Atomic theory, Heliocentricity, Tectonic Plates, energy states and many other subjects we regard as the cutting edge of modern science. The ancient Greeks were, at least in their educated classes hardly barbaric or primitive.

The practice of religion in Greece as far as the upper classes were concerned, was more of a civic duty than a religious one. The Temples of the Various Gods and Goddesses were the primary centers of the "social security system" of the time. They provided all "charity" and were the "safety net" of the time. The Temples of certain deities were also the primary medical care providers of the period. Religion was of greater use then than it is now.

Now, of course, we know that the excuse for the execution of Socrates was that he "taught impiety to the youth", but that was the excuse and not the reason. The reason Socrates was executed (though the real goal of his persecutors was exile) was that the Oligarchs

ruling Athens at that time saw Socrates and his coterie of aristocratic students as the core of the resistance against their rule. They thought that by removing the person who inspired the opposition they would end the opposition. They were wrong.

Plato, Socrates' most famous student, was a metaphysician NOT a man of religion, but he viewed religion as very useful in keeping society peaceful and controlling the behavior of the masses. That gives rise to an important question: Can an amicable social fabric be maintained WITHOUT religion? I think it can, in fact, I am certain that our societies would be far more amicable and benign without the constant friction and irritant of competing religions. Human Beings are, by and large, much better than their religious institutions portray them.

The situation that pertained in Greece, equally was pertinent to the Romans. The best word on the subject of the Religions of the Romans was said by Edward Gibbon (1737-1794) in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" (chapter.2) when he said:

*"The various modes of worship, which prevailed in the Roman World, were all considered by the people as equally true; by the philosopher, as equally false; and by the magistrate, as equally useful. And thus toleration produced not only mutual indulgence, but even religious accord".*

Unfortunately for human kind, that toleration and accord afforded Christianity the opportunity to triumph, a subject I shall clarify in a subsequent essay. However, once again in Rome as in Greece we find that the polytheism of their society depended on one's class and educational background.

And now let's turn our attention to those parts of human society who are arguably "polytheistic". But are they really? The peoples of whom I am presently speaking are folk like the Yoruba/Ife Culture of Africa, other African indigenous religions, and those of South America, Polynesia, Siberia and various other places on the globe where pre-Christian religions survive.

Are these peoples (each in their own individual fashion) truly "Polytheistic"? I think that the answer to that question is a qualified Yes, they are. They certainly believe in various "divinities" but the big problem arises when we try to define and quantify that word. To the Western so-called Monotheistic" mind, "God" is the omnipotent, omniscient, petulant, "Cosmic Busybody" but to these allegedly more primitive minds there is no such thing. I think the so-called "primitives" are more nearly correct than the most eminent Western theologians. Certainly they are devoted to, or afraid of, certain "Gods" and "Goddesses"

who are more powerful than they see themselves as being. The question is, to what are these peoples devoted. The answer to that question is that, unlike western theology in which "God" is actually rather more hypothetical than not, a matter of "faith" rather than knowledge; the "divinities" of the "polytheists" seem to fall into two categories. The first of these categories is identical to the Egyptian Notion of "Neters" or representatives of the forces of nature itself. The second of these categories is based entirely upon the nature of their religious practices as forms of Shamanism, and therefore their "spirits" are exactly that, incarnates and discarnates. The relationships between these peoples and their religious images is completely different than the relationship between supposedly civilized and sophisticated Western Monotheists and their "God Almighty". In the Western societies that relationship is entirely fear based. Among the polytheistic peoples the relationship is far more intimate and personal, and while the element of fear is hardly absent (especially regarding certain divinities) there is also an aspect of

friendliness and companionability that is entirely absent in western religion. Much of this is covered in my previously published essay on Shamanism, but probably deserves further elucidation, Which I will shortly produce. But for now, and in the context of this essay, I have, I think made my point

My point was that so-called "polytheism" is not, and never was, what the western monotheists" portrayed it as being. But then neither is "monotheism".

You will recall, I am sure, that in my opening remarks I commented that: "any belief that posits a "God" an entirely separate from its "creation, where "God" is one "thing" and it's 'creation" an entirely separate and disparate thing, is essentially dualistic" a dualistic belief is NOT monotheistic. But this is only the first contradiction intrinsic to Western Monotheism. Nor is it the most important.

The most important contradiction to the religions of the West's claim to be monotheistic

is that they posit both "God" and "Devil" and that is simply pure polytheism.

Many years ago, I was having a discussion with a Roman Catholic Bishop regarding "The Devil". I stated firmly that I did NOT "believe" in the Devil", the Bishop responded, "But you MUST, if you don't believe in the Devil you cannot believe in God". My response was, "if that is truly the case, then you have just managed to make me believe in neither of them".

Now, all of Western Religion is an outgrowth of Judaism, and the Jewish claim to monotheism is utterly specious. It's all based upon a completely erroneous interpretation of the all-important "First Commandment":

**"I AM THE LORD THY GOD, THOU SHALT HAVE NO OTHER GODS BEFORE ME!"**

That is certainly not what can be considered a clear cut monotheistic statement. In fact, it could very easily be viewed as totally polytheistic but possessive on the part of one of many "Gods". There is no denial, intrinsic to that statement, of the existence of other Gods"

merely a demand for primacy among them. In fact, there is nothing inherent in that statement forbidding the worship of "other Gods" merely a demand for paramount status.

It has always been clear to me that one cannot justly base a claim to be a monotheistic religion on that "Commandment".

Now, the Muslims have a clear cut monotheistic statement: "There is only one God and his name is Allah." Now that is unambiguous, but then it is the result of almost 2,000 years of theological development, and several hundred years of the discussion of Monotheism.

To be brutally honest, I wonder how Western Theologians can possibly manage to make a valid claim for their religions to be at all "monotheistic". They are anything but. To be truly monotheistic one needs to be monist, and no western religion is even slightly monist.

What exactly is monism, how can it be defined?

In "monism" "God" is usually viewed as The "Creative Urge" or "Creative Spirit" the Vedas don't even personify it that much and call it "The That". What is it? Well to paraphrase Vince Lombardi:

**"THE "THAT" ISN'T EVERYTHING, THE "THAT" IS THE ONLY THING"**

And that is the definition of Monism, it is the ultimate "pan-theism" for by that definition the entire universe is "God" or "The That", there is nothing separate from it, there is nothing that is differentiated from it.

I believe this to be true.

Now, all western religion and most developed other religions too, completely differentiate the divine from its creation, and that sets one firmly on the road to "polytheism".

For instance, ever since the Orient opened itself to western view (and especially the Indian sub-continent) European observers have been bemused and bewildered by what they perceived as the Eastern belief in literally infinite numbers of "divinities". But this is primarily a mis-comprehension based on style. When Hindus conversant with the Vedas, and also their Buddhist confreres, say there are 999 million Devas (divinities) they are saying that "everything" and "everyone" is divine, and from a monist point of view this is accurate. Now the Western Theologian is most amused by this and smug in their totally false assumption of Monotheistic superiority. But do they really differ? Or are they

actually even more primitive?

Let's take Catholicism as our example, as it is the first, and least revised, of the Christian religions. Is it truly monotheistic? I don't think so!

In the first place, their "God" is absolutely separate from, and totally foreign to, it's creation. (That their "God" is viewed as a "He" is further evidence of the primitivity of Christian beliefs). Now, not only is their "God" a male, and absolutely foreign to it's creation but it's also tripartite, a "trinity". Now the Christians view themselves as far superior and infinitely more sophisticated than the Hindus. But how does "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" really differ from "Brahma, Vishnu, Shiva"? In point of fact, the latter with its sub-descriptions of "Creator, preserver, and destroyer-regenerator" is intellectually and ethically the more sophisticated view of the idea.

Let's look further shall we? In addition to their tripartite "God", the Catholics have a "Goddess" for that is precisely what the "Holy Mother" is. She is the Christian version of the Pagan "Divine Mother", after all she has many honorifics, one of the, the most frequent, is "Mother of God". She is also, as any art historian knows, a total stylistic plagiarism from the Pagan Mother Goddess, and her attributes (except for virginity) are all stolen from Pagan pre-Christian beliefs. The Pagans at least were sensible enough to have three figures to personify "women"...virgin (Maiden), Mother, and Crone. That Christianity illogically tries to merge the three makes them different (a bit) but hardly more sophisticated, and certainly hardly more "monotheistic" for the Virgin Mother is, despite Christianity's claims to the contrary, clearly a Goddess! This is monotheism in action?

To continue, the Christians are fond of mocking the so-called "polytheists" for having large numbers of "spirits" either negative or positive. But what then is the congregation of the Saints"? They are simply an aggregation of "positive spirits". To be a Catholic you MUST believe in them and venerate them, and no matter what they say about it, the veneration takes the form of worship. Catholics regularly state that they pray "to the Holy Mother and the Blessed Saints". This is monotheism in action?

The most important aspect to the discussion of Christian Polytheism is of course their concept regarding God's negative doppelganger.....The devil! No one who seriously studies the beliefs of the so-called Western Monotheistic religions, can escape the clear fact that these religions are totally dualistic, and dualism precludes monotheism.

Let me make this absolutely clear: dualism, no matter how defined, absolutely precludes monotheism! If it is true, as the Bishop claimed; that according to their theology: "If you don't believe in the Devil you can't believe in God". Then their God, besides being Trinitarian, in it's personal nature, is totally dual in his over-all nature. This alone renders their case for monotheism invalid.

Now let's add to our admixture all the Thrones, Powers, Arch-Angels, Angels, Seraphim, Cherubim as other at least semi-divine figures on the "God" side, and the Thrones, Powers, devils and demons and fallen angels on the Devil's side and you get a universal view that is not different at all than that of the most clearly polytheistic religions.

The proud and vaunted claim by Western Religions that their religions are monotheistic and therefore superior to other belief systems would be amusing were it's results not so harmful. Secure in their pretended superiority, the Western Religions have long debased and degraded and oppressed all those who they announce are "polytheists", when they, themselves are more polytheistic than most other religions.

These contradictions to their claims of monotheistic superiority are intrinsic to those claims and are totally contradictory to the claims for the validity of their religions.

There is no religion on this planet that is valid in any way, they are all oppressive, they are all based entirely upon fictions or misrepresentations of just plain lies.

As I have said before, and will say again, all religions are simply aggregations of people seeking power, control and profit based upon either false histories or false claims to knowledge they do not possess, and they, all of them, do nothing but harm to the human race and all that shares the planet with that race.