

The Future of the Humankind: The Dictatorship of Conscience or the Tyranny of Bible Owners.

<i>1. Is the conscience free within the traditional confessions?</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>2. God is the best of planners...</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>3. Conjecture will not avail aught against the truth...</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>4. Why are hierarchs of churches against the Rightness-Truth?</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>5. The task is to prevent from unleashing the new world war on the basis of interconfessional enmity.....</i>	<i>20</i>

1. Is the conscience free within the traditional confessions?

On the September 18, 2006 in the Russian newspaper “Izvestia” there was published an article with the title “We swear to destroy your cross in the center of Rome” with the following subtitle “Islamists threaten to revenge the Pope Benedict”. The newspaper informs:

«The speech of Benedict XVI in front of the students and professors of the Regensburg University¹ (where he taught theology, being a professor Joseph Ratzinger in 1969-1977) has caused a wave of indignation in the whole Islamic world. This flood of anger can be compared with the reaction on the caricature of the prophet Muhammad, published in the Danish newspaper “Jyllands-Posten” last year in September. It seems that the Roman pontific has caused by accident a new loop of “civilizations wars”.

He stressed in his statement the philosophic differences of Christianity and Islam and drew attention to the relation between religion and violence. The speech starts with a rather long quotation taken from the letter of Manuel II Palaiologos to the unknown Muslim divine of the 14th century. The governor of Byzantium, “the theorist of the war against Jihad, fighting against Ottomans, writes:

“Show me just what Muhammad brought that was new, and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached”.

The Pope had emphasized twice that he cited the words of Palaiologos and didn’t share them on his own. Benedict XVI has criticized the Western society and said that its moral crisis is the reason of Islamic extremism distribution. “A reason which is deaf to the divine is incapable of entering into the dialogue of cultures.”², – the Pontific says. Then he enumerates the points, uniting the two religions: Muslims as well as Christians believe in a single God, honour Jesus Christ, although not as a God but as a prophet.

Almost all the leaders of Islamic states demanded apologies from Benedict XVI, including the President of Iran – Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and the prime minister of Turkey – Recep Tayyip Erdogan. Morocco has called away its ambassador from Vatican. “The Pope used the words, that we reject and that remind us the historical hostility of the Catholic Church towards Islam”, Ahmed Fathi Sorour, the Speaker of the Egyptian parliament, said.

The mass protests took place in the streets of the Turkish cities³, Palestinian autonomy, Indonesia, Iran, Morocco, Jordan and Algeria. In Nablus, Palestine, the buildings of Latin

¹ It took place on the September 12, 2006.

² “Izvestia” perverted Pope’s words by removing some text. That’s how it should be: “A reason which is deaf to the divine *and which relegates religion into the realm of subcultures* is incapable of entering into the dialogue of cultures”. (<http://www.cwnews.com/news/viewstory.cfm?recnum=46474>)

³ Besides this: «The officials of the State Turkish Directory on religion affairs filed an official claim against Benedict XVI, the Pope of Rome. They want the Turkish law enforcement agencies detain the head of the Catholic Church during his forthcoming visit to Turkey in November. The document is intended for the Minister of Justice and contains the proposition to proclaim the Pope officially wanted because of his last speech concerning Islam.

and Anglican Churches were attacked by vandals who threw firebombs at the walls. In Mogadishu, the capital of Somali was shot an Italian nun, working as a volunteer in the children's hospital.

It turned out to be a great suddenness for a Vatican. Benedict XVI insisted on reconciliation of Christianity and Islam, but got an opposite effect. "...I am deeply sorry for the reactions in some countries to a few passages of my address at the University of Regensburg, which were considered offensive to the sensibility of Muslims. In general my statement was and it is an invitation for an open and frank dialogue. This quotation taken from a medieval text by no means reflects my personal opinion¹", – said the Pope of Rome

The plaintiffs believe that Benedict XVI has violated the Turkish law regarding the freedom of conscience, offending the Prophet Mohammed. What is more, they want the Pope apologize before coming to Turkey.

This law document can become a real obstacle for the Pope's visit, taking in consideration the fact, that if an appeal is not called away, the Turkish authorities will have to act against an accused.

The politicians of Turkey are at a loss: they have already stated that "unacceptable words of the Pope" won't affect the visit, expecting, presumably, that it will somehow help Turkey to join the EU» (http://www.newsru.com/religy/21sep2006/turkey_print.html).

¹ The phrase of Benedict XVI reveals that backstage wheeler-dealers, out of all relation to Catholicism and Islam, have used the Pope as well as the leaders of Muslim countries and organizations in order to incite inter-religious hatred. But this object will never be implemented without journalism mediation – false and ignorant, "working" to create and sell sensations.

The Pope of Rome has definitely become a "victim" of political manipulation. It becomes clear looking at the text of his lecture at the University of Regensburg, especially at the passage where Benedict XVI gives the quotation of Manuel II Palaiologos :

"Recently I have read the edition by Professor Theodore Khoury (Muenster) of part of the dialogue carried on – perhaps in 1391 in the winter barracks near Ankara – by the erudite Byzantine emperor Manuel II Palaiologos and an educated Persian on the subject of Christianity and Islam, and the truth of both. It was presumably the emperor himself who set down this dialogue, during the siege of Constantinople between 1394 and 1402; and this would explain why his arguments are given in greater detail than those of his Persian interlocutor. The dialogue ranges widely over the structures of faith contained in the Bible and in the Koran, and deals especially with the image of God and of man, while necessarily returning repeatedly to the relationship between – as they were called – three "Laws" or "rules of life": the Old Testament, the New Testament and the Koran. It is not my intention to discuss this question in the present lecture; here I would like to discuss only one point – itself rather marginal to the dialogue as a whole – which, in the context of the issue of "faith and reason", I found interesting and which can serve as the starting-point for my reflections on this issue.

In the seventh conversation edited by Professor Khoury, the emperor touches on the theme of the holy war. The emperor must have known that Sura 2, 256 reads: "There is no compulsion in religion". According to some of experts, this is probably of the Suras of the early period, when Mohammed was still powerless and under threat. But naturally the emperor also knew the instructions, developed later and recorded in the Koran, concerning holy war. Without descending to details, such as the difference in treatment accorded to those who have the "Book" and the "infidels", he addresses his interlocutor with a startling brusqueness, a brusqueness that we find unacceptable, on the central question about the relationship between religion and violence in general saying: "Show me just what Mohammed brought that was new, and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached". The emperor, after having expressed himself so forcefully, goes on to explain in detail the reasons why spreading the faith through violence is something unreasonable. Violence is incompatible with the nature of God and the nature of a soul. "God", he says, "is not pleased by blood – and not acting reasonably ("syn logo") is contrary to God's nature. Faith is born of the soul, not the body. Whoever would lead someone to faith needs the ability to speak well and to reason properly, without violence and threats... To convince a reasonable soul, one does not need a strong arm or weapons of any kind or any other means of threatening a person with death..."

The decisive statement in this argument against violent conversion is this: not to act in accordance with reason is notary to God's nature. The editor, Theodore Khoury, observes: For the emperor, as a Byzantine shaped by Greek philosophy, this statement is self-evident. But for Muslim teaching, God is absolutely transcendent. His will is not bound up with any of our categories, even that of rationality. Here Khoury quotes a work of the noted French Islamist R. Arnaldez, who points out that that Ibn Hazm went so far as to state that God is not bound even by his own word, and that nothing would oblige him to reveal the truth to us. Were it God's will, we would even have to practice idolatry". (taken from the official text of "lecture of the Holy Father", Aula Magna of the University of Regensburg, Tuesday, 12 September 2006 – "Faith, Reason and the University Memories and reflections").

→→→

during his preaching in Summer Roman residence Castel Gandolfo on Sunday (Sept 17, 2006). In fact, he apologized for some passages of his speech that have offended Muslims.

The whole Europe was up to protect the pontific. “The critics have interpreted his words by contraries”, – said Angela Merkel, the Chancellor of Germany. “We can’t leave the Pope on lonesome. And I’m waiting for solidarity from the Muslim world – both religious and political, that mustn’t use this incident for the sake of violence”, – said Franco Frattini, vice-president of the European Commission.

Vladimir Putin, the President of Russia, hasn’t stayed apart either, calling for “responsibility and tolerance”. “I am sure that the leaders of the main confessions have enough wisdom to avoid any excesses in relationships between religions, – said the Russian President at the meeting with the members of “parliamentary 8” in Sochi. – We realize how delicate this sphere is. And do our best to set the dialogue between civilizations» (<http://www.izvestia.ru/world/article3096651>).

On the next day the newspaper “Izvestia” once again turned to the statement of Benedict XVI at the University of Regensburg and to the reaction of the world on it. On the 19th of September, 2006 Maxim Sokolov published an article with the title “the Pope and the Emperor”.

Here is the full version of this article:

«The speech of Benedict XVI at the University of Regensburg where the Pope quoted the words of Byzantine emperor Manuel II Palaiologos, who lived in the 14th century made a great flutter far beyond the catholic circles. The quotation taken from the theological dispute of the emperor with the Persian interlocutor reads: “Show me just what Muhammad brought that was new, and there you will find things only evil and inhuman, such as his command to spread by the sword the faith he preached”. The pontific said that the emperor’s words were “rude” and “brusque”, but nevertheless this didn’t save him from blame. Most of Muhammad followers reacted on the Pope’s speech with official protests (the authorities of Iran and Pakistan), some of them with a threat to “wipe off the Vatican from the map” and “to destroy the cross in the center of Europe” (“The Army of mujahidins” of Iraq), some reacted with the pogroms of the churches in Jerusalem (Palestinian patriots, supported by HAMAS leaders).

The only thing that united all these different reactions on the Pope’s speech was incapacity to give a substantial answer for the next quotation of the emperor’s words given by Benedict XVI: “Whoever would lead someone to faith needs the ability to speak well and to reason properly, without violence and threats... To convince a reasonable soul, one does not need a strong arm or weapons of any kind or any other means of threatening a person with death...” (marked with **bold** by us when citing). We won’t talk about bombers, but the official documents of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Pakistan (“Why to make an insulting cite from some emperor who lived centuries ago? What does it mean today, when we try to overcome antagonisms dividing us?”) and Iran (which suddenly started conjuring the Pope for tolerance – may be they mean that he should follow Ahmadinejad’s example in tolerance?) don’t fully prove the ability to “speak well” and to give strong arguments.

But the worst thing is – that even now, we don’t have any persuasive answer for the question of emperor who lived many centuries ago, – “Show me just what Muhammad brought that was new etc...” Looking back at recent events we can see how Mohammedans answer this question and it seems that they try to do their best to prove rightness of Manuel’s II point of view. If we ask the followers of other religions or atheists and agnostics we will find out that they won’t name something new of what Mohamed had brought, besides those things that the emperor had already mentioned and that each of us observes today.

It’s a great riddle for us how Ibn Hazm manages to go so far as to say, “that God is not bound even by his own word”. It’s more than once said in Koran that: “There is no changing the words of God” (Sura 10:64); “And you shall not find any change in the course of God.” (Sura 33:62) (and 48:23 tell the same). And there are many other riddles, if only Ibn Hazm was translated and understood right...

In the whole text we take Koranic cites from here: <http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/quran/>. We use mainly Shakir’s text, and/or sometimes two other translations.

In the Pope's speech context, where the main idea was the harmony of mind and faith but not the blame of Muhammad, an overall incapability to answer the question represents weak points of gentile opponents of Benedict XVI. It is obvious that an appeal to reason and an inclination to spread the faith by sword are in inverse proportion. The one whose faith is truly good and reasonable, doesn't need the sword and on the contrary.

Mr. Putin hinted on the incautious words of Benedict XVI saying that an excessive sensibility of Mohammedans should make everyone dealing with this subject extremely delicate in his words. But if we do agree that it's not the business of Christians to interfere in the Muslim countries and at the same time admit that Mohammedans can thrust themselves in whatever they want happening in Christian states – including the speech of the pontiff, we dumbly admit who the owner in the house is. Who, if not the Pope, can say things unpleasant for Mohammedans?

What is going on in the world? – The Roman ecclesiastics have been avoiding answering this question since the second Vatican meeting. In the times of the previous pontificate guys under the green colors had made a lot – including the September 11¹, but Vatican successfully evaded that problem, nearly related to it². It was Benedict XVI who didn't evade this problem and touched upon it with a Bavarian rudeness. "It becomes clear that even the Bavarian rudeness gains a strong support, proving that there should be someone able to ask questions simple as bleat». (<http://www.izvestia.ru/sokolov/article3096690/index.html>).

Certainly, it is a great pity and incredibly dangerous for the future of the humankind that the Muslim world represented by its ruling "elite" hasn't given a substantial answer to the question, asked by the Byzantine emperor Manuel II Palaiologos³ in the 14th century and cited by the Pope of Rome. It is

¹ On the September 11, 2001 several hijacked passenger airliners destroyed the two skyscrapers of the World Trade Center in New York City. Although there are lots of facts proving that the tragedy couldn't happen without the participation of the US Secret Services, the general responsibility is shouldered on the "Islamic terrorists".

² Evidently, the author hints on the fact that Ali Ahdzha who committed an attempt on the Pope's John Paul II life in 1977 was a Turk, i.e. a Muslim in the Western perception.

³ **Manuel II Palaiologos** or **Palaeologus** (Greek: Μανουήλ Β΄ Παλαιολόγος, *Manouēl II Palaiologos*) (June 27, 1350 – July 21, 1425) was Byzantine emperor from 1391 to 1425.

Manuel II Palaiologos was the second son of Emperor John V Palaiologos (1341–1376, 1379–1390, 1390–1391) and his wife Helena Kantakouzena. His maternal grandparents were Emperor John VI Kantakouzenos (1347–1354) and Eirene Asanina.

Created *despotēs* by his father, the future Manuel II traveled west to seek support for the Byzantine Empire in 1365 and in 1370, serving as governor in Thessalonica from 1369. The failed attempt at usurpation by his older brother Andronikos IV Palaiologos in 1373 led to Manuel being proclaimed heir and co-emperor of his father. In 1376–1379 and again in 1390 they were supplanted by Andronikos IV and then his son John VII, but Manuel personally defeated his nephew with help from the Republic of Venice in 1390. Although John V had been restored, Manuel was forced to go as an honorary hostage to the court of the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid I at Prousa (Bursa). During his stay, Manuel was forced to participate in the Ottoman campaign that reduced Philadelphia, the last Byzantine enclave in Anatolia.

Hearing of his father's death in February 1391, Manuel II Palaiologos fled the Ottoman court and secured the capital against any potential claim by his nephew John VII. Although relations with John VII improved, the Ottoman Sultan Bayezid I besieged Constantinople from 1394 to 1402. After some five years of siege, Manuel II entrusted the city to his nephew and embarked on a long trip abroad to seek assistance against the Ottoman Empire from the courts of western Europe, including those of Henry IV of England (making him the only Byzantine emperor ever to visit England - he was welcomed from December 1400 to January 1401 at Eltham Palace, and a joust was given in his honour), Charles VI of France, the Holy Roman Empire, and Aragon.

Meanwhile an anti-Ottoman crusade led by the Hungarian King Sigismund of Luxemburg failed at the Battle of Nicopolis on September 25, 1396, but the Ottomans were themselves crushingly defeated by Timur at the Battle of Ankara in 1402. As the sons of Bayezid I struggled with each other over the succession in the Ottoman Interregnum, John VII was able to secure the return of the European coast of the Sea of Marmara and of Thessalonica to the Byzantine Empire. When Manuel II returned home in 1403, his nephew duly surrendered control of Constantinople and was rewarded with the governorship of newly recovered Thessalonica.

Manuel II Palaiologos used this period of respite to bolster the defenses of the Despotate of Morea, where the Byzantine Empire was actually expanding at the expense of the remnants of the Latin Empire. Here Manuel

frightening that the Muslim states preferred official expression of indignation and threats addressed to Benedict XVI in particular and to the West in general.

All facts mentioned above prove that most of the Muslims over the last 600 years are far from Koran understanding: otherwise the truly Muslim world would have given a substantial answer even to Manuel II Palaiologos. And if that answer were lost, the contemporary Pope of Rome would have got an adequate answer.

On the other hand it's equally important that in the 21st century both Western and Russian intelligentsia still remain ignorant in issues concerning the differences of historically set confessions and that's why stay incapable to develop the dialogue of cultures.

Benedict XVI has given a proper ground in his speech: *“A reason which is deaf to the divine and which relegates religion into the realm of subcultures is incapable of entering into the dialogue of cultures”*.

But he hasn't mentioned the second reason, because he is deaf himself: *It is historically set traditions of culture, including the culture (the procedure) of confession, that make the reason deaf to the divine and divide religion and science, leading them to antagonism.*

One of the hierarchs of the Russian orthodoxy – Theophanous, the bishop of Stavropoulos and Vladicaucasus and the member of Public Chamber of the Russian Federation on the issues of tolerance and the freedom of conscience, indirectly admits the last assertion.

On the 18th of September, 2006 during the press conference on the site of educational Internet-portal “Mediakratia” we found the following dialogue:

«**Marina Zubareva, Kurskaya obl.:** Good afternoon! As you remember the 4th of November is considered to be the Day of good deeds. I wonder if the people in our country (even in the world) do understand what “good things” are. Is it possible to have the common perception of good deeds within different nationalities and confessions? And do young people have the same understanding?

The Sovereign¹ Theophanous: In my opinion it is quite possible. The best criteria to define the good deed – is to listen to your conscience, this is the instrument given to us from the God. If we listen to it we will understand which deeds good are. **Still small voice is the voice of the God and is beyond confessional character** (marked with **bold** by us when citing). There is the common answer in different nations concerning such issues as murder, stealing, betrayal and etc. I have talked to the followers of different religions in different parts of the world and I was incredibly interested in this problem». (<http://www.kreml.org/media/129161973>).

In case we agree with Theophanous's point of view that “the conscience – is the voice of the God”, we should take in consideration that if the confessional creed is false in some aspects or, even worse, if it is wittingly false in general, and herewith dignified as the revelation, it is namely

supervised the building of the *Hexamilion* (six-mile) wall across the Isthmus of Corinth, intended to defend the Peloponnese from the Ottomans.

Manuel II stood on friendly terms with the victor in the Ottoman civil war, Mehmed I (1402–1421), but his attempts to meddle in the next contested succession led to a new assault on Constantinople by Murad II (1421–1451) in 1422. During the last years of his life, Manuel II relinquished most official duties to his son and heir John VIII Palaiologos, and in 1424 they were forced to sign a peace treaty with the Ottoman Turks, whereby the Byzantine Empire undertook to pay tribute to the sultan. Manuel II died on 21 July 1425.

Manuel II was the author of numerous works of varied character, including letters, poems, a Saint's Life, treatises on theology and rhetoric, and an epitaph for his brother Theodore I Palaiologos.

(Taken from Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Manuel_II_Palaeologus)

¹ The title of member of higher orders of clergy in Russian Orthodoxy

that factor, that deafens the conscience – the voice of the God and deafens the reason respectively, turning the faithful into donkeys.

If not for this fact, first of all, Benedict XVI would have paid attention to the points that differ the two religions and would have tried to find the reasons of these discords. In this case he would have been able to answer his rhetorical question on his own, given in the form of quotation taken from the dialogue of Manuel II Palaiologos with a Persian interlocutor. But his conscience is not free: he is the main hostage of historically set traditions of Catholicism.

Today in the times of an overall literacy (i.e. the ability to write and to read) and with a free access to the Holy texts, Benedict XVI could have read Bible and Koran in original and comments on them of other authors to define differences and to think of their significance in order to give an answer to the question put by Manuel II Palaiologos to make *the representatives of Muslim world think over the problem – how does their life differ from those laws given in Koran and from the way of life preached by Muhammad?* Nevertheless, the duty of a professional theologian and ecclesiastic is to make listen to reason not only Roman Catholic flock but other people all around the world either.

So, to set the dialogue of cultures, first of all, Benedict XVI is supposed to find intelligibility on his own and after that to make his flock listen to reason. That will definitely cause discontent within the circles of light-headed and gutless followers of the traditions of Roman Catholicism and lead to the serious problems in the hierarchy.

The same problem regards the journalists as well, including cited above Maxim Sokolov. But it seems that:

Traditionally faithful Jews, Christians, Muslims, public and backstage authorities of these confessions, journalists and sociologists are not interested in the answers for such questions.

The publication entitled “The prior of the church of the Moscow State University supports Benedict XVI” on the site NEWSRU.COM informs:

«**Benedict XVI and the Vatican administration** have given various explanations and comments, but refused to apologize and **moreover to recognize Muhammad as a prophet of the true religion, which we, Christians, are supposed to honor and respect him** (marked with **bold** by us when citing)¹. There is made a step forward presenting a hope to every Christian: we can observe a shift from a black, false and devious ecumenism of last decades to another kind of ecumenism, which Alexander Solzhenitsyn told about during his Templeton’s Speech.

Actually, the words taken from the book “The Rage and the Pride” written by Oriana Fallaci can’t be addressed to Benedict XVI despite of his predecessor:

“Tell me, the Pope, is it true that recently you have asked the sons of Allah² to forgive the jihads where your predecessors were fighting in order to return the God’s coffin? And have the sons of Allah asked for forgiveness for taking the God’s coffin? And have they apologized for enslaving the Catholic Iberian Peninsula, Portugal and the most territory of Spain for more than 7 centuries? And if it not for Isabella of Castile and Ferdinand of Aragon, who sent them away in 1490, we would speak Arabic nowadays.

I am incredibly concerned about this problem as they have never asked me to forgive them for the crime committed by Saracens in the 17th and 18th centuries on the coasts of

¹ If you, the hierarchs and theologians of Jesus’ churches, over the last 1300 years haven’t recognized Mohammed as a prophet of a true religion, why haven’t you shown the falseness and failure of the Koran doctrine then? This is a real hypocrisy towards Jesus.

² The term “sons of Allah”, if used only to Muslims, is inappropriate, and can be not used save metaphorically and moreover outside the Muslim culture. Koran, Sura 112 “Sincerity (of Belief)” tells:

1. Say: He is God, the One and Only. 2. God, the Eternal, Absolute; 3. He begetteth not, nor is He begotten; 4. And there is none like unto Him!

Used Yusufali’s translation.

Toscana and Tyrrhenian Sea. I mean the times when they kidnapped my predecessors and then fettered, took them to Algeria, Tunisia, Tangier and Constantinople and sold them on marketplace. They enslaved them for the rest of their life, locked the young women in harems and brutally punished them for attempts to whip away through jugulating, remember this? Certainly, you do. The Community of white slaves liberation was founded by Italian monks, wasn't it? It was the Church conducting negotiations to liberate those, who had enough money for ransom¹”.

Cited above words prove that Oriana Fallaci, who called herself unbeliever, inherits the Christian civilization much more than John Paul II, who disavowed this civilization so often.

Certainly, Christianity is the religion of toleration and Benedict XVI has emphasized it in his statements. Christian can't but respect an intimate religiosity of people professing other faith. Naturally, we tend to respect the Egyptian peasant or Indonesian fisherman, Malaysian girlie or mother of a big family in Morocco much more than drug-addicts and drunkards in our own country. But such respect of religiosity and natural acceptance of mono-theistic character of Islam (in this respect it has a strong resemblance with Christianity) doesn't imply the religious indifference and acceptance of religions equality. They are equal in the eye of the law. But the real Christian will never say that all religions are equal, and that all prophets are true, and that everyone has his own verity. There is a single truth and we all know WHO is this truth – The ONE who said: “I am the way, and the truth, and the life²». (http://www.newsru.com/religy/21sep2006/kozlov_print.html).

This is a typical Laodicean³ self-satisfaction. In such a way the representative of Church makes reference to Jesus Christ. And in the Creed one never finds a single phrase expressing the Jesus' thoughts. He refers to Jesus Christ having forgotten his own words, more or less truly recorded in the New Testament⁴:

«21. Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of heaven⁵, but the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven.

22. On that day many will say to me, 'Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and cast out demons in your name, and do many mighty works in your name?'

23. And then will I declare to them, 'I never knew you; depart from me, you workers of lawlessness'» (Matthew, 7).

People tend to follow the historically set of faith traditions, within the frames of which they were brought up and usually they don't think over to understand whether these traditions are true or false or whether they correspond to the initial Revelations.

The bishop of Stavropoulos and Vladicaucasus Theophanous incite to return to this suicidal-cul-de-sac way of life. Here is the passage from the cited above press-conference:

«Zelimhan Yahihanov (the newspaper “Molodezhnaya Smena”, The Chechen Republic): I have noticed that recently faithful – Christians as well as Muslims – are

¹ And what about those who didn't have money for ransom? Did the Church provide money for their liberation? Or did they stay slaves for the rest of their life?

² John, 14:6.

³ 14. “And to the angel of the church in Laodicea write: 'The words of the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of God's creation. 15 'I know your works: you are neither cold nor hot. Would that you were either cold or hot! 16. So, because you are lukewarm, and neither hot nor cold, I will spit you out of my mouth. 17. For you say, I am rich, I have prospered, and I need nothing, not realizing that you are wretched, pitiable, poor, blind, and naked. 18. I counsel you to buy from me gold refined by fire, so that you may be rich, and white garments so that you may clothe yourself and the shame of your nakedness may not be seen, and salve to anoint your eyes, so that you may see” (Revelation, or Apocalypses, ch. 3).

⁴ Using “English Standard Version” taken from

<http://www.biblegateway.com/versions/index.php?action=getVersionInfo&vid=47&lang=2>

⁵ We are sure that here is a real forgery. The matter was about the Kingdom of God, rather than of Heaven. One can find grounds for this in our works: “Towards God's Kingdom...”, “«Master and Margaret»: a Hymn to Demonism? Or the Gospel of the Covenantless Faith” (One can find them in Russian at www.dotu.ru, www.vodaspb.ru).

dropping back from traditional religious canons. This is an inevitable process of the changing world. What do you think is better to save in religion and what can we declare off? And how are these processes going on in the real life?

The Sovereign Theophanous: This is a rather controversial question. In my personal opinion one can drop back only in case he has already been there. Over the last century there was a violent abruption, an uprooting of traditional buttresses. Nowadays we face a return to the roots rather than abruption. But these processes are always complicated. The whole century of atheism characterized as an incredibly brutal epoch with severe crimes on religion basis is not in vain. **Christians as well as Muslims have to follow traditions – because of the fact that return to the roots is considered to be acheless. For instance, when one makes organ transplantation he tries to take it from the very same body. And when one tries to impose some new traditions on religious basis – it turns out to be very dangerous. I believe that our country should return to the traditions in order to maintain our culture and religion. Only in this case we will become a peaceful nation»** (marked with **bold** by us when citing)¹. The thing is that we pay attention to the problem of resistance which actually didn't exist. I am sure that there is a lot for the West to learn from us. (<http://www.kreml.org/media/129161973>).

Therefore only those who are not afraid to ask the questions that *are perceived as faithless* and to accept the possible answers for such questions will have a bright future.

2. God is the best of planners...

Returning to the question of Manuel II Palaiologos, which became with the help of the Pope the question of current interest, we can't but stress that: *Muhammad made no pretence of introducing into the humankind culture something absolutely new*. He constantly asserted that:

- Koran is not the fruit of his own thoughts but the God's Revelation. He stated that his duty is to convey this Revelation to the people and to control them in the formative stage of their culture based on Koran;
- The purpose of Koran is to confirm the truth of those Revelations, given earlier through Adam, Noah, Moses, Jesus Christ and other God's missioners to the people, who for many reasons ignored them. Therefore there was a necessity to send Koran and that's why there was in general nothing new in it.

It is said in Koran² many times, for instance (we put sometimes the main text in **bold** to differ it from our commentaries given in *italic*):

¹ That's a sort of private agreement of "dividing the congregation". Moreover, such words are being told for several last years, regardless of the fact that in the past a stupid following traditions hadn't let to find and solve problems of social development. That was the very cause of the Russian Empire break-up and made possible an epoch of undisguised atheism spreading.

² We cite Koran mainly based on Shakir's translation replacing the Arabic word "Allah" with the English word "God" and the word "shaitan" with "satan" (he shouldn't be written from the capital letter). Sometimes we place our commentaries or compile different translations into one – the most adequate.

Taking in consideration the particularity of Arabic language and the sophisticated subtext of Koran itself, its translations into other languages are far from being perfect either concerning the style of Arabic, which is generally impossible to be translated, or concerning the meaning of the text, if a translator concentrates at the style. Interpreters tend to express their own understanding of Koran, diverging from original. That's why all the Koran translations are somehow inadequate and the reader should trap out the point without dignifying this or that translation as a divine canon.

One should keep in mind that the culture of the society and Mohammed's personality became the factors, restricting the possibilities of perceiving information, presenting from Above. Lots of vitally important things are described *indirectly* in Koran, because of the fact that its contemporaries couldn't understand them within the frames of their culture with the lack of worldview. That's why it is useless to look for direct answers for the questions of today life in the texts of Koran and its translations. And it's much more stupid to hedge off from the life with Koran, and moreover with Shariat and commentaries on it.

Nevertheless, those who sincerely desire to get *keys* to the vitally important questions can find them in Koran. He or she just should have a wish: *God answers to people's appeals besides the formality of this or that religious*

→→→

«And We have revealed to you (to Muhammad) the Book with the truth, verifying what is before it (before Koran) of the Book and a guardian over it (from the context it is understood “a guardian over the truth”), therefore judge between them by what God has revealed, and do not follow their low desires (to turn away) from the truth that has come to you» (Koran, Sura 5:48).

«Naught is said to you (to Muhammad) but what was said indeed to the messengers before you; surely your Lord is the Lord of forgiveness and the Lord of painful retribution» (Koran, Sura 41:43).

The thing is that the very formulation of the question put by Manuel II Palaiologos: “*Show me just what Muhammad brought that was new?*” – is one of the signs showing that Manuel II Palaiologos as well as his advisors on theological and political issues (and also their predecessors¹) were incompetent. And that turned out to be the reason for Byzantine collapse².

One should understand that God doesn't uproot righteousness and the collapse of Byzantine reveals unrighteousness of the dominant creed there and proves that everybody adhered to that untruth.

The reaction of the Muslim world towards the Pope's speech in which he cited the question of Manuel II Palaiologos contradicts Koran. In Koran it is said:

«196. Surely my guardian is God, Who revealed the Book, and He befriends the good.

197. And those whom you call upon besides Him are not able to help you, nor can they help themselves.

198. And if you invite them (other people) to guidance (i.e. to the life in harmony with God), they do not hear; and you see them looking towards you, yet they do not see.

199. Take to forgiveness and enjoin good and turn aside from the ignorant!³

200. And if a false imputation from the satan afflict you, seek refuge in God; surely He is Hearing, Knowing.

201. Surely those who guard (against evil), when a visitation from the satan afflicts them they become mindful, then lo! they see» (Sura 7).

«255. God is He besides Whom there is no god, the Everliving, the Self-subsisting by Whom all subsist; slumber does not overtake Him nor sleep; whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth is His; who is he that can intercede with Him but by His permission? He knows what is before them and what is behind them, and they cannot comprehend anything out of His knowledge except what He pleases, His knowledge extends over the heavens and the earth, and the preservation of them both tires Him not, and He is the Most High, the Great.

256. There is no compulsion in religion; truly the right way has become clearly distinct from error⁴; therefore, whoever disbelieves in the satan and believes in God he

ritual. He speaks with people with a language of life's circumstances, confirming the Truth and revealing the falsehood and outrageous lie. And that's the real ethical proof of His existence given by Him to everyone who is attentive and able to think and get free of prejudices. (Look for the book of IP USSR “Dialectics and Atheism: Two Incompatible Essences”)

¹ Mohammed informed his contemporaries in Byzantine about his mission in the written form, but they preferred to ignore the theological speeches with a “barbarian”, having created a background for the Byzantine collapse.

² This regards all those who pay too much attention to this subject in modern mass media.

³ Marked out with **bold** by us when citing. To call other people to the guidance within God's Providence considering circumstances of real life – that's what traditional Islam representatives avoid, and Islamic radicals don't know how to do and don't what to study. The same is for Koranic recommendation “Take to forgiveness and enjoin good and turn aside from the ignorant!”

⁴ Marked out with **bold** by us when citing. This is the direct evidence of the fact, that it is unacceptable to spread Islam by compulsion and intimidation. Those who don't follow this, should read Koran, understand its point and correlate it to the life of his society and the life of the whole humankind.

indeed has laid hold on the firmest handle, which shall not break off, and God is Hearing, Knowing.

257. God is the guardian of those who believe. He brings them out of the darkness into the light; and (as to) those who disbelieve, their guardians are satan who take them out of the light into the darkness; they are the inmates of the fire, in it they shall abide» (Sura 2).

With all this *Koran in its own text is characterized as an "Arab law book"* (sura 13:37 – "true judgment in Arabic"). That means that Koran doesn't oblige those who don't speak Arabic to accept the ritual forms of Islam profession, created in Arabic culture and existing nowadays, because of the fact that God gives the right to everybody to appeal to Him in his native language.

«135. And they say: Be Jews or Christians, you will be on the right course¹. Say: Nay! (we follow) the religion of Ibrahim (*Abraham*), the Hanif², and he was not one of the polytheists.

136. Say: We believe in God and (in) that which had been revealed to us, and (in) that which was revealed to Ibrahim and Ismail and Ishaq and Yaqoub (*Abraham, Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob*) and the tribes, and (in) that which was given to Musa and Isa (*Moses and Jesus*), and (in) that which was given to the prophets from their Lord, we do not make any distinction between any of them (*i.e. all of them taught the same*), and to Him do we submit.

137. If then they believe as you believe in Him, they are indeed on the right course, and if they turn back, then they are only in great opposition, so God will suffice you against them, and He is the Hearing, the Knowing» (Sura 2, – marked with **bold** by us when citing, our commentaries are given in *italic*).

There is inevitable the following question:

If the Koran is really sent from the God in order to confirm the truth of earlier Revelations – Torah and New Testament³, what are the reasons of centuries-old conflicts between those who believe that they are the true followers of Moses', Christ's and Muhammad's creeds?

The answer for this question is given in Koran. Koran accuses the historically set Judaism and Christianity of backsliding from the Unified Testament expressed in various versions by Moses, Jesus Christ and other God's missionaries.

- It is said in Koran about the historically set Judaism and its followers:

«The likeness of those who were charged with the Taurat (*Torah*), then they did not observe it, is as the likeness of the ass bearing books, evil is the likeness of the people who reject the communications of God; and God does not guide the unjust people!» (Sura 62:5).

«It is not meet for a mortal that God should give him the Book and the wisdom and prophethood, then he should say to men: Be my servants rather than God's; but rather (he would say): Be worshippers of the Lord because of your teaching the Book and your reading (it yourselves) » (Sura 3:79)⁴.

That's why law-abiding Jews as well as rabbinate will have to answer for Torah distortion and for the following of the distorted Torah in the everyday life. *And even "kashrut"⁵ won't absolve them of this responsibility – historical ("karmic") and religious (before God Himself).*

- It is said in Koran about the historically set Christianity the following:

«45. When the angels said: O Marium (*Virgin Mary*), surely God gives you good news with a Word from Him (of one) whose name is the '. Messiah, Isa (*Jesus*) son of

¹ This regards contemporary Muslim extremists desiring to distribute their own version of historically set Islam. And the answer to them – is the following sentence of the same Sura.

² The word "Hanif" origins from the verb "hanifa" that means "to tend (to the right way)".

³ Practically, the new Testament – is not the statement of Jesus Christ's creed by his learners, but four biographic references about the life of Jesus Christ among the people + the apostles writings about philosophic and theological issues. And all was censored by founding fathers of the Christian churches and their supervisors from "the world backstage" of that time.

⁴ This is the Koran appeal to those, called the "world backstage"; and to those who overtop rabbinate and masonry.

⁵ The word "kashrut" means in Hebrew "applicable/useful". This word symbolizes the system of permissions and prohibitions of Judaism regarding different kinds of food. Later this notion distributed on all spheres of Jew's life.

Marium, worthy of regard in this world and the hereafter and of those who are made near (to God).

46. And he shall speak to the people when in the cradle and when of old age, and (he shall be) one of the good ones.

47. She said: My Lord! when shall there be a son (born) to I me, and man has not touched me? He said: Even so, God creates what He pleases; when He has decreed a matter, He only says to it, Be, and it is.

48. And He will teach him the Book and the wisdom and the Taurat (*Torah*) and the Injeel (*Evangelium – Gospel*).

49. And (make him) a messenger to the children of Israel: That I have come to you with a sign from your Lord, that I determine for you out of dust like the form of a bird, then I breathe into it and it becomes a bird with God's permission and I heal the blind and the leprous, and bring the dead to life with God's permission and I inform you of what you should eat and what you should store in your houses; most surely there is a sign in this for you, if you are believers.

50. And a verifier of that which is before me of the Taurat and that I may allow you part of that which has been forbidden to you, and I have come to you with a sign from your Lord therefore be careful of (your duty to) God and obey me.

51. Surely God is my Lord and your Lord, therefore serve Him; this is the right path.

52. But when Isa perceived unbelief on their part, he said Who will be my helpers in God's way? The disciples said: We are helpers (in the way) of God: We believe in God and bear witness that we are submitting ones (*to God*).

53. Our Lord! we believe in what Thou hast revealed and we follow the messenger, so write us down with those who bear witness.

54. And they planned¹ and God (also) planned, and God is the best of planners» (Koran, Sura 3 – underlined by us when citing, our commentaries are given in *italic*).

That's why the adherents of Christianity in all its modifications also have the ground for thinking, as the words from Koran are similar to the cited above words of Jesus Christ.

But the natural question arises: *Why should one agree with Koran in these issues and reject other faith traditions, perceiving them as false? What if Koran is actually a "satanic verse", as Salmon Rushdie stated, with the purpose to turn away from the true faith tradition (Judaism – in the perception of Jews, or Christianity – in the perception of Christians and etc.) and to disorientate?*

In attempt to answer this question all the texts seem to be equally unconvincing if not compared to the life itself.

3. Conjecture will not avail aught against the truth...

"One who is going to lead somebody to the belief needs an ability to speak nicely and to reason correctly, but he doesn't need a skill of making violence and threatening" – this is another citing from Manuel II Palaiologos used by Benedict XVI during his speech in the University of Regensburg. In the context, which it is used in, it is understood like a reproach to Muhammad with spreading Islam using force, and so this should mean that all Muhammad's teaching is surely false. Well, but making such blame Manuel II as well as Benedict XVI² forgot to tell and comment the following fact: before starting

¹ "The planners" – this is how the nearest so-called fellow campaigners of Jesus Christ – his apostles – are presented in Koran. Koran was sent in the 7th century, by this time all the dodges – the distortions of Jesus' teaching – had already formed the basis of traditions of historically set Christianity. The founders of Jesus Christ's churches were sure that they would never be unmasked. But then emerged Koran and all their "dodges" were revealed. Actually, God is the best of all planners.

² In one of the footnotes before there was Benedict's XVI opinion about that Koranic statement "There is no compulsion in religion" (2:256) is referred to the time when Muhammad had no power and was persecuted. From

the first *jihad* – a *holy war* Muhammad preached peacefully for ten years. And during that time everyone, who wanted, was able to get to know the meaning of his teaching and agree with it or not.

During that ten years Islam spread in the Arabian society peacefully since Muhammad’s preach met a demand of Manuel II and Benedict XVI. Muhammad reasoned righteously and spoke nicely and earnestly. And Islam that time wasn’t a kind of (if to use modern terms) “totalitarian sect”. Because Muhammad answered essentially all vitally important questions, which Islam followers as well as others asked him. *However not everybody liked that, what Muhammad taught.*

But Manuel II and Benedict XVI as well haven’t remembered about the morality: neither generally nor concerning specifically those morals, which are cultivated in the society by each of the historically formed traditional religions. And all theological talks and preaches become a kind of atheism without such specification. This is so because God himself has His own morality¹, and every man who wants to be in harmony with God should follow *Gods own morality* ignoring (or even breaking) historically formed cultural traditions. And this is a meaning of man becoming like God².

And though one can agree with what Manuel II Palaiologos wrote: “*For assuring a sensible soul, there is no necessity to use neither one’s hands, nor weapon, nor another meaning of threatening a man with death...*” – he had told nothing about how to defend against aggressive, “not sensible and imprudent souls” which don’t accept the “assuring preach”. And indeed, Muhammad and first Muslims faced exactly such problem: not everyone who disliked Muhammad’s teaching remained passive and sluggish.

Originally peaceful spread of Islam in the Arabian society met an armed opposition just because enemies of Islam had nothing to object to Muhammad neither during dialogues and public disputes nor fabricating arguments beforehand; and their attempts to bribe him for stopping his preaches were futile. Their resistance to spreading of Islam appeared as a trade embargo of first Muslims (it was an attempt of economical genocide) and as several murderous assaults at Muhammad. It made Muhammad and his followers to leave Mecca (recognized centre of Arabian culture) for provincial city of Medina where he could continue his preach from. And only after 10 years of the peaceful preach the first *jihad* was started as a *defensive war for Islam against the aggressors*. It wasn’t a motiveless Muslim aggression for seizing and conquering the rest of the world.

Muslims won that first *jihad* in the history. And for many of those, who fought against them with great obstinacy, that victory became a conclusive proof of that God and Rightness-Truth were on the side Muhammad and Muslims and not on the side of their enemies. After it many former opponents of Muslims sincerely adopted Islam. And those who rejected Islam were let to go away. There were no repressions of former enemies.

With all this Koran makes numerous warnings to those, who justify their aggressive and predatory actions with religious motives like “*jihad*”. Particularly:

“O, you who believe! when you go to war in God’s way, make investigation [be careful to discriminate], and do not say to any one who offers you peace: “You are not a believer” seeking the chance profits of this life [so that ye may despoil him]. But

this one can think that when Muhammad had got the power and military-political weight in his region, he refused such principle and started spreading Islam using force.

Such view on Muhammad’s person and deeds means that Muhammad was unprincipled hypocrite. And if he was a hypocrite, he couldn’t be a messenger of the Almighty. Thus Koran is his own figment or delusion of possessed. So all non-Muslims can *integrally reject* Koran and Muhammad, even without going into details of what is said in Koran and the Muslim culture forming. However, such view is really unfounded, and as the history shows it isn’t supported from Above.

In essence, this hidden and groundless accusation of hypocrisy for Muhammad is really insulting for him. But Muslims, as events were shown in mass-media, haven’t noticed this insult hidden in reticence. They were indignant with the citation from Manuel II Palaiologos . It seems like Benedict XVI hasn’t noticed it as well.

¹ “He (God) has ordained mercy on Himself” (Koran, 6:12).

² Well, but one should understand that becoming *like* God – is far from equating a man and God, it isn’t becoming God: a man is a man, one of God’s creations, when God is God, Creator and the Almighty. Nevertheless, some participation in His deeds is possible for a man. But man’s morality should be as close to God’s morality as possible for such participation.

with God there are abundant gains; you too were such before (i.e. you too were not believers – our explanation when citing), then God conferred a benefit on you; therefore make investigation; surely God is aware of what you do (i.e. you can never deceive God – our explanation when citing)". (Sura 4:94 based on translations of Shakir and Pickthal; in square brackets are notes by Pickthal).

"And if one of the idolaters seek protection from you, grant him protection till he hears the word of God, then make him attain his place of safety; this is because they are a people who do not know (the Truth – our explanation when citing)". (Sura 9:6).

Thus following Koran one finds that the mission of teaching the idolaters is supreme. And as referred to Koranic teaching, extermination of ignorant folks who don't know the truth is a great sin. And it is a sin all the more when under slogans of jihad – the holy war for defence of the religion and the Rightness-Truth – one destroys ignorant people, whom the Koranic afflatus hasn't been given to, or wages aggressive and conquering war. Naturally an irreproachable namaz¹ made five times a day will not save against "karmic" and religious retribution for such actions. It is said in Sunnah² that God's servant gets from the prayer only what he had understood. And if he wants to understand nothing, his life's sense is far from one given in Koran, and there are not perspectives for such "Muslim" save the worst ones.

As you can see, if to know the text of Koran, understand its sense and compare it with the life (including the history of forming the Muslim culture as well), Benedict XVI himself could reproach the Muslim world in general and its creation – terrorists-extremists – personally with renouncing the precepts for Muslims given in Koran.

And nothing, save his own misunderstanding of Koran and maybe some esoteric order discipline, prevented Iran's president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad from telling all this and something more from U.N.O. podium and from saying it to George Bush's face during their personal meeting.

However there is none of this. And an impression arises that "The Satanic Verses" by Salman Rushdie (first published in 1988), caricatures on prophet Muhammad in the European press (autumn 2005) and artificially inspired hysterical reaction of Muslim world for Pope's lecture in the University of Regensburg on September 12, 2006³ are the links of one chain. It seems that they are included into the long termed attempt to waken a new World War – the global conflict between bearers of the historically formed biblical culture in its different modifications⁴ and followers of the historically formed Islam. And it seems more

¹ Muslim prayer.

² The Sunnah is the second source of Islamic jurisprudence, the first being the Koran (Koran). See <http://www.usc.edu/dept/MSA/fundamentals/hadithsunnah/>.

³ On September 25, 2006, Pope Benedict XVI received ambassadors of 22 Muslim countries in his summer residence Castel Gandolfo.

«The Pope hosted Moslem leaders in a conference today, giving a five-minute speech that sounded conciliatory, at least from the short excerpts published (I can't find a full transcript). Although he didn't offer an apology for his previous remarks, the topic was working together to overcome historic enmities between the two faiths.

The feeling tone was good, too. The Pope "greeted [the envoys] one-by-one, clasping their hands warmly."

Iraqi Albert Edward Ismail Yelda seemed happy: "The Holy Father stated his profound respect for Islam. This is what we were expecting...It is now time to put what happened behind and build bridges."

Al Jazeera televised the speech in its entirety. The Vatican, in an unusual move, offered an Arabic translation of the text in its press releases.

So, according to Mohamed Nour Dachan, an Syrian-Italian-Moslem "The dialogue goes on...The dialogue is a priority for both Muslims and Christians»

Read here: <http://neo-neocon.blogspot.com/2006/09/parsing-popes-words-having-dialogue.html>.

We have taken information in Russian from: http://www.ng.ru/world/2006-09-26/7_benedict.html.

So at the official diplomatic level one can consider the conflict on the Pope's lecture (which was maliciously exaggerated and told to be an insult) to be settled. But consequences of that provocation will not disappear so fast as regards the unofficial relation of Muslims to the West...

⁴ The symbiosis of Judaism, Christianity and imprudently atheistic Marxism and liberal individualism.

and more evident that hierarchies of both cultures either understand nothing or are interested themselves in saving prerequisites for the conflict.

Benedict XVI, being a man who has devoted his life to the *theology (which cannot be separated from the history of mankind and each of the nations)*, had to know it not just by his lecture in Regensburg but much more earlier – by taking the cardinal's order¹.

Nevertheless, this is not an answer to the question whether the Koranic teaching is true. This just shows that Muhammad was convincing in his preach and was one of the most prominent practical politicians during the history of our global civilization. And such words are not about the vast majority of Muslims after Muhammad. And of course not about the extremists, who use Islamic slogans only for hiding real aims of those global policy bosses who manipulate with them (it is objective, i.e. it doesn't depend on declaration of those extremists).

The West in general (and especially followers of its traditional religions including the Russian Orthodoxy) for centuries is sure of its permanent political rightness and the global civilizing mission towards all nations of other regions of the Earth. And as a consequence of this, Muslim world, which rejects such civilizing mission, seems for western intellectuals to be very aggressive without a cause. However, naturally the West doesn't want to understand not just Koran but as well the Bible, which all its culture (including Russia that is the West and the East at once) is based on. The West doesn't want to know the matter of its civilizing mission! It fears to face the truth. Let's turn to Bible:

«You shall not charge interest on loans to your brother (your fellow Jew, as it follows from the context) interest on money, interest on food, interest on anything that is lent for interest. You may charge a foreigner (i.e. a non-Jew) interest, but you may not charge your brother interest, that the LORD your God (i.e. the devil, if one judges the essence of usurious parasitism according to one's conscience) may bless you in all that you undertake in the land that you are entering to take possession of it (the latter refers not only to ancient times and not only to Palestine, the land promised to ancient Hebrews, because it is a quotation not from a transcript of the ancient roll found at the place of excavations but from a widely published book claimed by all Churches and a part of the intelligentsia as the eternal truth supposedly passed on from above)» — Deuteronomy, 23:19, 20.

«And you shall lend to many nations, but you shall not borrow» — Deuteronomy, 28:12.

«Foreigners (i.e. subsequent generations of the non-Hebrews who have run into a debt which could be repaid by no means to the tribe of usurious coreligionists) shall build up your walls (today many Arab families from Palestine are dependant on the opportunity of working in Israel), and their kings shall minister to you («I am the Jew of kings» — was the way one of the Rothschilds answered the unfortunate compliment of «You are the king of Jews»); for in my wrath I struck you, but in my favour I have had mercy on you. Your gates shall be open continually; day and night they shall not be shut, that people may bring to you the wealth of the nations, with their kings led in procession. For the nation and kingdom that will not serve you shall perish; those nations shall be utterly laid waste» — Isaiah, 60:10-12.

The hierarchies of all the so-called Christian Churches, including Russian Orthodox, claim this abominable conception to be holy, while the canon of the New Testament which had been censored and edited as far back as prior to the Nicene Council (325 AD) proclaims it in the name of Christ as the righteous Will of God for all the times to come having no grounds whatsoever to do so.

¹ For comparison let's see Talmudic qualifying requirement: **«Members of Sanhedrin (Sinedrion – the Highest Council, which analogues are the Conclave of Cardinals with Pope in its head and Sinods of Orthodox churches) should be experienced in the science of magic and heathen theology»**, – Talmud (Sanhedrin, Menahot). Under the **“heathen theology”** in Judaism any non-Judaic theology is understood, including the Koranic, Catholic, Orthodox etc.

Thus the Pope and patriarchs of Orthodox churches, if they pretend on enlightening peoples with the Truth, should thoroughly know other religious dogmas for see and expose their errors in Life with dignity and honour and without insulting the believers of other religions.

«Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets (*the Law and the Prophets means the Old Testament*); I have not come to abolish them but to fulfil them. For truly, I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the Law until all is accomplished» — Matthew, 5:17, 18.

Since one considers the Bible to be the Holy book, and is assured that the Afflatus from Above hasn't been perverted in it, the racial-“elitist” fascistic usurious “Deuteronomy-Isaiah” doctrine of enslaving all the world has become the main political doctrine in the biblical civilization culture. Moreover, the New Testament programs the psyche of Christian churches followers for submission to the bosses of the biblical project for enslaving all:

«But I say to you, do not resist the one who is evil. But if anyone slaps you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if anyone would sue you and take your tunic, let him have your cloak as well» – Matthew, 5:39, 40. «Judge not, that you be not judged (*i.e. you have no right to decide what is Good and what is Evil in the Life, thus – resist noting!*)» – Matthew, 7:1.

This is the concrete meaning of the Bible (according to texts of Russian Orthodox Church's Bible, including Septuagint) which governs the entire Biblical civilization. The rest of the Bible is unimportant or attendant to that conception.

That what is written above is the global political doctrine of enslaving the whole mankind in a name of God and of destroying everyone who does not agree with it (and first of all of those who resist it with their thoughts, words and deeds, including military deeds). There is a place in it for atheists, who live with their material problems, and for those, who believe the historically formed Judaism to be the Truth, and for those, who believe to the historically formed Christian churches, which rejected and consigned to oblivion all what Christ taught his contemporaries.

And don't consider this global political doctrine to be a product of “occasional graphorrhea” of many people in many generations, but not a political creation of a certain group of persons – initiators of the project and their heritors. Even if it had appeared “by its own” as a result of a “spontaneous graphorrhea” of Biblical authors and editors, after some time a corporation of masters of this doctrine would have appeared, and they would have trying to get the world mastery on its basis. So, this doctrine must have its masters and bosses for ages. However they don't look for the world fame and don't wait for any gratitude for their deeds from the mankind. Thus they prefer to act indirectly or anonymously. Moreover the majority of people are so “clever” that they will object to be just “cattle” in this doctrine simply prejudicially without understanding the History.

So, without verbiage, the civilizing mission of the West is to enslave everybody. And that's why:

- If the Bible is from God, the best way is – to agree with it and submit the hierarchy of Life-interpretors on its basis;
- And if this doctrine of enslaving everybody is indeed the creation of power-seeking persons and is a malicious calumny on God, then to object it and let it spread till the global scales – means to be in the evident conflict with God!

However, how the cited words of different biblical culture representatives and other western mass-media publications show, the West doesn't realize neither the biblical doctrine of enslaving everybody, nor the peculiarities of policy based on it, nor the consequences of the policy aimed on the doctrine realization.

Koran resist against the realization of the biblical global policy. And Islam (even the historically formed Islam, which rejected the Koranic precepts, like Judaism and Christianity rejected Afflatuses given to Moses and Christ) follows Koran in it.

Thus Islamic world call the policy expressing the biblical doctrine of enslaving everybody ‘satanism’. And this agrees to the Koranic opinion on this policy realization principles (*our explanation when citing is given in italic*):

«275. Those who swallow down usury (*i.e. gets the loan interest, including the dividends*) cannot arise (*on the Judgement Day*) except as one whom Devil has

prostrated by (his) touch does rise. That is because they say, “trading is only like usury” (in other words: trading income is like the loan interest); and God has allowed trading and forbidden usury. To whomsoever then the admonition has come from his Lord, then he desists (taking up usury), he shall be pardoned for the past, and his affair is in the hands of God; and whoever returns (to it) – these are the inmates of the fire; they shall abide in it.

276. God does not bless usury, and He causes charitable deeds to prosper, and God does not love any ungrateful sinner!

277. Surely they who believe and do good deeds and establish regular prayers and regular charity they shall have their reward from their Lord, and they shall have no fear, nor shall they grieve.

278. O you who believe! Be careful of (your duty to) God and relinquish what remains (due) from usury, if you are believers.

279. But if you do (it) not, then be apprised of war from God and His Messenger; and if you repent [and turn back (to the Life and God’s precepts)], then you shall have your capital; neither shall you make (the debtor) suffer loss, nor shall you be made to suffer loss» (Koran, Sura 2, based on Shakir and Yusufali translations).

And this is not the only caution against usury in any of its forms, which is given in Koran.

However, there is no compulsion in religion. And every man after getting acquainted with the biblical doctrine and the Koranic opinion on it has an opportunity to decide by himself:

- Either the biblical doctrine of enslaving everybody and destroying those, who disagree with it, is from God;
- Or God prohibited usury and ordered to resist actively the spread of biblical slavery. (And the question of using weapons against the spreaders, *if they don’t heed wise and reasonable words*, is a question specified by certain historical and cultural circumstances).

As it is told in Koran about enemies of Islam (the meaning of the word “Islam” can be interpreted in the best way by words “God’s Realm at the Earth”, i.e. it’s told not about enemies of the historically formed Muslim ceremonials, but about the qualitatively different things – much more important!):

«And most of them do not follow (anything) but conjecture; surely conjecture will not avail aught against the truth; surely God is cognizant of what they do! (Sura 10:36).

God has written down: I will most certainly prevail, I and My messengers; surely God is Strong, Mighty! (Sura 58:21)».

4. Why are hierarchs of churches against the Rightness-Truth?

The main cause of why Judaism is rejecting Koran being a record of the Afflatus from Above and Muhammad being a messenger of the Lord is that Koran is blaming the biblical doctrine of enslaving the mankind for being satanism. Meanwhile there are no theological dogmatic discords between Judaism and Islam: in both teachings there is the Only God, He is a Creator and the Almighty. And He is the same God of Abraham-Ibrahim.

However the historically formed Islam hasn’t developed its own sociological doctrine of the level of global importance (alternative to the biblical one¹) during more than 1300 years after its appearance. Thus it constantly demonstrates its feebleness and is a pitiful sight in aspect of the global policy. And it is easily provoked to different hysterics and even to terrorism! The idea about that all other nations, for which Arabian is a foreign language, followed Islam in its traditional ritualistic forms is contrary to the Koranic Afflatus; and that was noted from Above. That’s why it cannot be realized with God’s assistance. In other words one cannot unify the mankind on the basis of spreading the historically formed Islam as rituals hold in Arabian language alien for non-Arabs. Moreover one cannot reach it with violence and

¹ There is no ready for use sociological doctrine at the level of global importance in Koran, but there is all needed for people to create it in harmony with God. However, it needs a creative work, but not a *worship of the rug for prayers, which many Muslims content themselves to and what they think to be the true Islam.*

threatening. So, it's vitally important that the world of traditionalistic and extremist ritualistic Islam understood it as quickly as possible.

But today (as one can judge from mass-media and Muslim theological works) the Islamic world doesn't understand the algorithms of its conflicts with the West, and the West doesn't understand it as well (may be except for its "world backstage").

Discords between Islam and Christian churches are beyond sociological doctrines, since neither side has its own sociological doctrine¹:

- Zealous Christians either work for spread of the biblical project and thus grow the Evil, or "do not resist the one who is evil"².
- Muslims-traditionalists live mostly with everyday needs and don't have a political will neither for spreading Good, not for resisting to Evil.
- Muslims-extremists are mostly possessed or zombies. Though they are the minority of world Muslims, but their actions are over-stressed by the world media and since are the most noticeable. However they also work for the biblical doctrine and do their part of the work. They create negative meaning about Islam and Koran outside the Muslim world. Thus their activity is directed right against the Koranic Islam. And are successful in their deeds as it can be understood from the publications cited in the current note and by general state of mass media of many countries for many years.

This ignorance and indifference of the most part of traditionally Muslim and traditionally Christian people in Russia to sociological doctrines formed on the unity of lifestyle. And *in the past*, it was the basis for peaceful co-existence and collaboration of Muslims and Christians in Russia.

The discords between Islam and Christian churches have purely theological-dogmatic character. That's why their truthful solution means primarily an alive belief to God, and God's participation in solving the discords, and living in good conscience. (Moreover both sides mostly agree that God talks to people through their conscience).

Islam on the basis of Koran strongly objects to the verity of dogma of Trinity and considers it to be a kind of polytheism. But it regards Christ as one of the messengers of the Almighty and esteems him as a prophet.

The historically formed Christianity cannot essentially object to Islam in theological questions:

- There is no text of the "Good Message³ of Jesus Christ to all people" in which Christ's teaching was written down in clear and understandable form. There are four Gospels in the New Testament, which are brief biographical notes about Christ's life and deeds among people. They contain only fragmentary parts of his teaching, since one could not avoid telling about what he had taught when talking of his life. If to collect these fragments all together one can see the text, *which is agree with Koran if to read directly*⁴, but quite different to teaching of Churches in a name of Christ and the biblical doctrine of enslaving the mankind.

¹ So-called "Sociological doctrine of Russian Orthodox Church" is a document estranged from life, and so religiously and scientifically ungrounded. And Shariat is not a doctrine, but the result of Muslim ruling "elite" timeserving to life under slogans of Koranic Islam.

² Matthew, 5:39. But Koran says: «Repel evil with that which is best» (Sura 23:96).

³ This is the literal translation of the word "Evangelium" (the Gospel).

⁴ Christ's teaching collected from fragmentary parts existing in the New Testament appears in the next form (*our commentaries are given in italic*):

«The Law and the Prophets (*"the Law and the Prophets" in the time of Christ are called now "the Old Testament"*) **were until John** (*the Baptist, the Baptist*); **since then the good news of the Kingdom of God** (*in Arabian language the Kingdom of God is called Islam*) **is preached, and everyone forces his way into it (Luke, 16:16). But seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things** (*in the context: the welfare at the Earth*) **will be added to you (Matthew, 6:33). For I tell you, unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will never enter the Kingdom of God** (*in the canonical version it is said "Kingdom of Heaven", but it surely must mean "Kingdom of God"*) **(Matthew, 5:20).**

- The Creed of Christian churches (The Nicene Creed)¹ is the creation of founding fathers of churches and of their supervisors from the “world backstage” of those years. There is no word by Christ and about his ideas in it!
- Christ has never told any similar to the dogma of Trinity. And as one can understand it from the New Testament, *Christ and Jews contemporary to him had no discords on the dogma of monotheism, common for Judaism and Islam*. The dogma of Trinity doesn't follow from the New Testament texts. And moreover, there are reasons to think that those texts were “censored and edited” before becoming the canonical texts of the New Testament, so that one could explain the Trinity as given in the New Testament in allegorical metaphorical form. And it took founding fathers of churches and their supervisors near 300 years to take and “edit” the original texts and formulating the dogma of Trinity².

The Lord our God, the Lord is one (Mark, 12:29 – there is not a single hint on Trinity). You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second is like it: You shall love your neighbour as yourself. On these two commandments depend all the Law and the Prophets (i.e. that Christ didn't mean that all prophecies of the Old Testament should realize – he meant “I say to you, not heaven and earth pass away, until everyone becomes a righteous man”). (Matthew, 22:37-40). Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the Kingdom of God (and here is 'the Kingdom of Heaven', but it should be 'the Kingdom of God' in the context), but the one who does the will of my Father who is in heaven (Matthew, 7:21). And I tell you, ask, and it will be given to you; seek, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you. For everyone who asks receives, and the one who seeks finds, and to the one who knocks it will be opened. (...) If you then, who are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him! (Luke, 11:9, 10, 13). When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth (John, 16:13).

You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you. But whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be your slave, even as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many (Matthew, 20:25-28). (In Koran the same: «then strive together (as in a race) towards all that is good» – Sura 2:148)

Have faith in God. Truly, I say to you, whoever says to this mountain, 'Be taken up and thrown into the sea,' and does not doubt in his heart, but believes that what he says will come to pass, it will be done for him. Therefore I tell you, whatever you ask in prayer, believe that you have received it, and it will be yours (Mark, 11:22-24). Pray then like this: "Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name. Your kingdom come, your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil" (Matthew, 6:9-13).

The kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed, (...) the kingdom of God is in the midst of you (Luke, 17:20,21).

In the works by Internal Predictor of the USSR (Внутренний Предиктор СССР) “Towards God's Kingdom...”, “«Master and Margaret»: a Hymn to Demonism? Or the Gospel of the Covenantless Faith”, “Dialectics and Atheism: Two Incompatible Essences” we explain that this is the true teaching of Christ and that it is in harmony with Koranic teaching.

¹ The Creed given in 1975 ecumenical version (from Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nicene_Creed):

«We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty maker of heaven and earth, of all that is, seen and unseen.

We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, eternally begotten of the Father, God from God, Light from Light, true God from true God, begotten, not made, of one Being with the Father. Through him all things were made. For us men and for our salvation he came down from heaven: by the power of the Holy Spirit he became incarnate from the Virgin Mary, and was made man. For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate; he suffered death and was buried. On the third day he rose again in accordance with the Scriptures; he ascended into heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father. He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead, and his kingdom will have no end.

We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the giver of Life, who proceeds from the Father and the Son. With the Father and the Son he is worshipped and glorified. He has spoken through the Prophets. We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins. We look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.»

As you understand there is no common thing in the Creed and the teaching of Christ cited from the Gospels.

² The Nicene Council, which accepted the first edition of The Creed and confirmed the New Testament canons, took place in 325 AD.

Another divergence of Islam and Christianity is referred to his life at the earth. Koran says directly and unambiguously (*our commentaries are given in italic, and underlined text is marked out by us*):

«And they did not kill him (*Jesus, as it is given in the text*) nor did they crucify him, but it appeared to them so (like Isa (*Jesus*)) and most surely those who differ therein (*i.e. those, who disagree with the Koranic testimony on it*) are only in a doubt about it; they have no knowledge respecting it, but only follow a conjecture¹, and they killed him not for sure (Yusufali: «for of a surety they killed him not»). **Nay! God took him up to Himself; and God is Mighty (Yusufali: «Exalted in Power»), **Wise. And there is not one of the followers of the Book but most certainly believes in this** (*in the death of Jesus*) **before his death, and on the day of resurrection he (Isa) shall be a witness against them! (Koran, Sura 4:157-159, by Shakir)».****

So from Koran one can understand that God answers with His unlimited mercy and power to the unlimited belief of man, who takes in good conscience (i.e. without a fear) God's will and all, what he doesn't know, as well. And it is like He promised it in Psalm 50:15: «And call upon Me in the day of trouble; I will deliver you, and you shall glorify Me», – and it has happened contrary to statements of apostles.

It is very hard to disclaim the Koranic statement 4:157-159 for Christian churches, since with it together they have to disclaim many God's promises, including given by Christ and written down by evangelists ones. In particular:

When Christ suggested apostles to pray together with him in Gethsemane, he warned them: «*Watch and pray that you may not enter into temptation* (text is marked out by us)» (Matthew, 26:41). However apostles – chosen and called ones – didn't understand the importance of what was going on and ignored Christ's warning. Thus they didn't keep themselves waking and praying, and *consequently* entered into temptation. That's why:

If to believe Christ, no their testimony about the following events is to be believed! *If not to believe Christ, then one can believe testimonies of apostles; and all historically formed branches of Christianity* (including the messianic Hebrews, who admit Christ to be the promised Messiah, but disclaim the dogma of Trinity) *are based on it.*

But the matter of the temptation, which Christ warned apostles about, is not the sleep as it is with all its dreams. The matter of the temptation is that apostles as all other, who hadn't prayed with Christ, became victims of vision of the execution, but didn't saw the ascension (the rescue), forestalling the execution.

It's paradoxical that those who follow the historically formed Christianity believe in the miracle of the Immaculate Conception, believe in the Resurrection of Christ as though after his death, believe in dogma of Trinity not mentioned by Christ... But they reject to believe in the miracle of ascension before the execution, and even don't ask themselves a question: Who did need that shameful execution of the righteous?

- Did God, who is so powerful that He can forgive sins of men even when they are impious² and don't belief, need it?
- Or was it the “world backstage”, who wanted the undivided power over the Earth on behalf of God and besides of Him?

The attitude of Christian churches hierarchies to that Koranic statement is clear: If there were no execution since the ascension had forestalled the crucifying, then they lose their usual sinecure.

But why do today's Christians – congregation, not the clergy – need, that the real execution of Christ took place in the past more, that the Sanhedrin needed it? Isn't it because the belief in atonement for their sins with the self-sacrifice of the just doesn't oblige them to self-perfection and lets sin more and more trusting in Christ's intercession or his judge?

¹ And as it is said in Koran and it was cited above: «Conjecture will not avail aught against the truth».

² Koran, Sura 13:6: «Most surely your Lord is the Lord of forgiveness to people, notwithstanding their injustice! ».

Moreover, another question appears. *If the ascension saved Christ from the execution, how are they going to answer to God for the calumny on Him? The calumny that as though He sent Christ to the Earth for impious men executed him here and his self-sacrifice became the "offering of obsecration"¹ to God, Who ordained mercy on Himself even without it (Koran, 6:12)?*

And all this is with the fact that the Koranic statement about Christ's ascension, that saved him from execution, was not the new thesis, which Muhammad proclaimed. This Koranic statement just explains much more ancient Solomon's prophesy about that ungodly would not see the mysteries of God, since their evilness would blind them². And it explains the cited lines of David's Psalm 49:15

In this life man can get answers on questions about Koran and Christian churches discords on dogma of Trinity and on Christ's course of life during his first coming to the earth only through his inner world. I.e. they cannot be save subjective and speculative (theoretical). However, subjective agreement with one of the two religious traditions³ is conditioned by the real morality of an individual. So, though there is no compulsion in religion, the chose of belief is predetermined by the real morality of an individual.

And man can become free from mistakes of this or that traditional religious teaching and from mistakes of his own chose as well, only in direct non-dogmatic alive dialog with God and living in good conscience after getting away all fears and greed which silence the voice of conscience.

5. The task is to prevent from unleashing the new world war on the basis of interconfessional enmity.

It is unambiguously told about the man's predestination in Koran:

«Behold, thy Lord said to the angels: "I will create a vicegerent on earth." They said: "Wilt Thou place therein one who will make mischief therein and shed blood?– whilst we do celebrate Thy praises and glorify Thy holy (name)?" He said: "I know what ye know not."» (Koran, Sura 2:30, Yusufali).

¹ Isaiah, 53:10; I John, 2:2, 4:10; Romans, 3:25.

² Solomon tells about aims of impious people in the "Book of Wisdom of Solomon" – non-canonical book, that is excluded from the most versions of Bible. However it can be found in all Russian Orthodox editions (http://www.bible-center.ru/bibletext?cont=synnew_ru&txt=wis+1&); in Latin Bible: Nova Vulgata (http://www.vatican.va/archive/bible/nova_vulgata/documents/nova-vulgata_vt_sapientiae_lt.html); and in English in **King James Version** (however not every site gives the full version of King James Bible, we cited it from here: http://www.vatican.va/archive/bible/nova_vulgata/documents/nova-vulgata_vt_sapientiae_lt.html).

«12. Therefore let us lie in wait for the righteous; because he is not for our turn, and he is clean contrary to our doings: he upbraideth us with our offending the law, and objecteth to our infamy the transgressings of our education. 13. He professeth to have the knowledge of God: and he calleth himself the child of the Lord. 14. He was made to reprove our thoughts. 15. He is grievous unto us even to behold: for his life is not like other men's, his ways are of another fashion. 16. We are esteemed of him as counterfeits: he abstaineth from our ways as from filthiness: he pronounceth the end of the just to be blessed, and maketh his boast that God is his father. 17. Let us see if his words be true: and let us prove what shall happen in the end of him. 18. For if the just man be the son of God, he will help him, and deliver him from the hand of his enemies. 19. Let us examine him with despitefulness and torture, that we may know his meekness, and prove his patience. 20. Let us condemn him with a shameful death: for by his own saying he shall be respected» (The Wisdom of Solomon, 2:12-20, *the orthography is left unchanged*).

Though Solomon directly says: "the son of God", but churches don't connect this prophesy with Christ. That's why in the orthography the words "son of God" and pronoun for these words are initialized with small letters, though in the New Testament they are initialized with capital letters. After the words of reasoning not aright ungodly men (ch. 2:12-20), Solomon (who is told in Koran to be one of the righteous followers of Islam) says about the consequences: « Such things they did imagine, and were deceived: for their own wickedness hath blinded them. 22. As for the mysteries of God, they knew them not: neither hoped they for the wages of righteousness, nor discerned a reward for blameless souls. 23. For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity. 24. Nevertheless through envy of the devil came death into the world: and they that do hold of his side do find it» (Wisdom of Solomon, 2:21-24).

And the Book of Wisdom of Solomon was excluded from the canons of Bible, and even don't print it in the majority of editions.

³ We mean not historically formed Christian or Koranic traditions; but Isaiah's (59:10) and Solomon's (Wisdom of Solomon) opinions on Christ's mission.

And the Book Genesis says about the same man's predestination, words differ but the sense is the same:

«The LORD God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to work it and keep it» (Genesis, 2:15).

And the New Testament says about the same:

«...since then the good news of the Kingdom of God is preached, and everyone forces his way into it» (Luke, 16:16). «But seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be added to you» (Matthew, 6:33). «You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. It shall not be so among you. But whoever would be great among you must be your servant, and whoever would be first among you must be your slave, even as the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many» (Matthew, 20:25-28).

In spite of this all historically formed confessions of so-called Abrahamic¹ religions, (*in teachings of which there were expressed the self-interest of ruling "elites" of ancient societies and aspirations of their supervisors from the "world-backstage", who wanted the unshared world domination on behalf of God but besides Him*), turn their congregations – every man obedient to them – away from preparing himself for fulfilling this predestination and fulfilling his part in the mission of being God's vicegerent at the Earth.

Nonetheless, one hasn't enough time to complete the establishment of the global tyranny on basis of historically formed texts of Bible during the period, when organization of people's psyche, their world-understanding and the speed of informational exchange between national cultures still gave such chance. The completion of the biblical project of enslaving the mankind was delayed:

- Particularly because of inner dissensions between already-slaves of the biblical project: the split of once united Nicene-dogmatic church on the Roman-Catholic and different Orthodox churches; the secondary splits in them – the Reformation at the Catholic territory, Nikon's persecutions against the Old Believers in Russia, various sects in Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant churches, etc.;
- And particularly because of external factors. The vivid dialecticism of the Hellenic culture became to conceive and remake the killing dogmatism of original Judaism. Thus the "world backstage" of those years preferred to support the non-creative, imitative Roman culture and to suppress the creative Hellenic culture. Some time later it took three centuries to neutralize Christ's teaching and to replace it with their own falsification in the religious cult. Then, like a bolt from the blue, the sending down of Koran and foundation of a new regional civilization on its basis. Some centuries later Genghis Khan destroyed many cultures – highly civilized but based on slavery: it was expressed in their *ethics, showing the vicious morality*. In 19th century biblical cults become being replaced with secular ideological totalitarianism of Marxism, which failed in the middle of 20th century. Thus Bolshevism in Russia showed its political will, and Stalin in "Economic Problems of Socialism in the U.S.S.R." pronounced the capital sentence to Marxism, and they still cannot forgive it to him².

In the past when some society had a tendency to get free from the power of the biblical project bosses, they (bosses of the biblical project) could re-establish their power over it (or over its depopulated territory) almost for sure by organizing the war between neighbour countries and that society. The war, as a meaning of diverting people from reflections about high concepts and meaning of life, serve such needs of the biblical project bosses even nowadays. However, since the crisis of their ruling has a system-wide character, they need not just a little regional war but a massive war that includes many regions – tending to get free from their control as well as particularly free of them. But in 20th century transnational (better to say: transstate) corporations (TSC) were created. A great war, covering many regions and many states

¹ Which consider Abraham to be the forefather of all their prophets

² Read about it in following materials of the Conception of Social Security: "Decapsulation", "It is Time I Should Start the Tale of Stalin...", "Ford and Stalin: How to Live in Humaneness", "Judas's Sin of the XXth congress of CPSU".

is a destruction of business for many of them, since their production is situated in many countries¹. That's why TSC are against starting a new world war, though some of them could be interested in starting local isolated wars for penetration into various regions closed for them before. They can accept a great war only as a forced absolute necessity. And governments of states from their side have to take into account interests of TSC, and so are less disposed to wage war one on another, if it is contrary to any interests of TSC.

In such conditions bosses of the biblical project of enslaving the mankind has the only possibility to wage a great war as a meaning of solving the system-wide problem of their power. That possibility is to intensify tension and hostility between followers of historically formed confessions. And the final aim is to extirpate Koran and Islam from the world culture, or at least discredit them for a historically long period.

It means that the plot is similar to one for organizing the 20th century's World War II, with only difference:

- That time Nazism in Germany had been grown up artificially, and later it let equate any liberation movement based on national consciousness to the Nazism;
- And now the extremism under slogans of Islam is also being grown up artificially, to defile and discredit Koran as an alternative to the establishment of global tyranny based on Bible.

And one of means to prevent the "world backstage" from implementing their plots – is to find out what is wrong or wittingly false in every religion in good conscience and extremely kindly, thus releasing mind and will of people from yoke of historically formed churches. God – Alive – will help men in that, if they are sincere in their wish to come to the Rightness-Truth and establish the Kingdom of God at the Earth.

Of course, the Dictatorship of conscience is the future of the mankind. But we should reach it leaving aside a new world war attempting to establish a tyranny of bosses of the Bible. And everyone makes his or hers contribution on creating this or that variant of the future.

*Inner Predictor of the USSR
September 20 – 26, 2006*

¹ Как известно в ходе второй мировой войны XX века авиация США не бомбила промышленные предприятия третьего рейха, если они были собственностью американских акционеров, хотя США и третий рейх как государства были в состоянии войны.