

## Krishna versus pacifism 4-1-15

letter to a believer in Krishna Consciousness

Thank you for finally admitting that you are not a pacifist and that Krishna and the Bhagavad Gita mandate war. But what right do you have to limit that to *wars of self-defense*? The BG makes no such distinction and Prince Arjuna was obviously engaged in a war for political power, not a war of *self-defense*. Then you add a prohibition against a *military draft* on your own authority. Like most people who pretend to follow *scripture*, you feel free to make your own additions.

The next thing you have to admit is that you are not serious about opposing abortion and that there is no foundation for it in Hinduism. Krishna himself sets a high profile example of the gross sexual immorality which inevitably leads to abortion. Krishna is one of the randiest gods in all mythology. The immoral gods of Greek and Roman and Egyptian mythology would be embarrassed to be seen with him. In addition to his innumerable wives and girl friends he is presented as forcing himself on his mother and his sisters. How in the world can followers of Krishna claim to have a high standard of sexual morality? Trying to derive a standard of sexual morality from one word in the Bhagavad Gita 17.14 is like Gandhi trying to hang his pacifist doctrine on *ahimsa*. Since the supposed speaker of the BG was a relentless sari chaser as well as a warrior, the attempt is doomed to failure. The *Mahabharata* says the bereaved wives of **Krishna** immolated themselves in Indraprastha after his death. Obviously, if the custom was associated with **Krishna**, that gave it great prestige and explains why *sati*--the widow expected to throw herself on the funeral pyre of her dead husband-- persisted to modern times. Krishna may be only a myth, but he is a pernicious myth in the way he exemplifies wicked customs.

Buddha's abandonment of his wife and child is obviously the wrong alternative. Mohammed helped himself to the widows he created by executing their husbands in cold blood. Then he scandalized his own hard to scandalize followers by claiming a personal exemption from sexual morality. Neither does the Hebrew Old Testament contain any reliable standard of sexual morality.

The place to find a forthright statement of sexual morality and respect for marriage is the teaching of Jesus Christ and his first followers in the gospels and epistles of the New Testament. And the early Church lived up to that standard. Which the modern church has mostly abandoned.

Because of sex selection abortions, India now has a great shortage of young women. Which leads to men patronizing prostitutes from whom they get AIDS. It leads to gangs of rapists in major Indian cities. A sensible person would have to conclude that Hinduism is the curse of India. You seem to be willfully ignorant of the realities of Hinduism. Read *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies* by Abbe J.A. Dubois.

In all honesty, you should abandon any pretence of opposing war and abortion. *Krishna Consciousness* provides no foundation for it. To the end of his life Gandhi was trying to read pacifism into the BG by way of *ahimsa*. His sentimental foolishness led him upon a forlorn quest to re-interpret other Hindu scriptures like the *Ramayana* and the *Mahabharata* to mandate nonviolence. His attempt to graft Christian pacifism into Hinduism and to teach *nonviolence* to Moslems led no where except to the terrible bloodbath in which a million were killed in the Hindu-Moslem riots which engulfed India when it became independent of Britain in 1946.

Gandhi's personal faith in *the spirit of love and truth* was degraded by linking it to 1. nationalism 2. a mass movement 3. trying to graft it into Hinduism and Mohammedanism. Primitive and non-state

Christianity--underground and *heretical* Christianity--is the only reliable spiritual and moral foundation for pacifism.

You claim that people eating meat is somehow the cause of war and abortion. But the vegetarians of India have less resistance to abortion than the meat eating Moslems. Hitler was a vegetarian. Was he a pacifist ? Not hardly.

India is a show case of the moral and spiritual failure of Hinduism and the failure of Gandhi to graft his Philosophy of Nonviolence on to Indian society. They obviously have no resistance to militarism, as witness all the money they are putting into the military. Nor do they have any effective resistance to abortion. Unlike the Moslems who at least still ban abortion. What basis is there in the Hindu religion for a pacifist or a pro life movement ? I see none. It is just silly to believe that a Krishna cult could provide the spiritual foundation for such movements.

Neither was Krishna a vegetarian, although they try to read that into the BG 17.7-10. There was his chance to state clearly: **don't eat meat !** and he missed it. And the various Krishna stories represent him as eating meat. You quote everybody and his brother as an *authority* contra eating meat--pagan philosophers, ex Catholics, very unorthodox Jews. You lack the one authority you need: **God says: DON'T EAT MEAT.** Because you are stuck with believing in *Krishna* as **God**.

Moderns, who have replaced **God** with **Evolution** as their moral authority, argue that human teeth were designed for fruits and vegetables, not meat. But, later on, the **Son of Evolution** led humans to the invention of knives and forks, meat cleavers and grinders, cook stoves, and stew kettles with lids. It is the fact that, especially after you have lost your teeth, you find it much easier to eat beef stew--with carrots of course--than raw carrots. **Evolution** can kiss my a\_\_ if he doesn't like it.

The caste system so central to the Hindu religion, which is sanctioned by the **Bhagavad Gita**, despite Prabhupada's attempt to explain it away, is even more pernicious than the slavery practiced by Judaism, which was preserved by Imperial Christianity. At least there was a possibility of escaping from slavery or buying your way out. It was only primitive Christianity and underground Christianity which provided the moral alternative for this ancient evil. [ see *Essenes and Christians* ]

I do not understand how any sensible person can have a faith in Krishna. I suspect your faith in Krishna was eroded long ago and was replaced by this fool's quest to make *vegetarianism* into a universal religion. Your obsession with vegetarianism and reincarnation produces a spiritual blindness which insulates you from understanding the spiritual and moral challenge of confronting the real evils in the world. You are going no where until you have sense enough to quit Krishna. I am sorry to be so blunt, but I don't have the time to wade through the nonsense you send me. I suppose you are sincere. Adolph Hitler was a sincere vegetarian. It is a very doubtful virtue.

My hero Ammon Hennacy was a vegetarian and his little daughter once asked him *why . . . Just sentimental, I guess. I don't like to kill animals and, if I don't want to do it myself, I don't want anyone to do it for me.* Then she said: *But maybe it just died.* Hindu vegetarianism has some such distinction, although you seem to have lost track of it.

That is the only good argument for vegetarianism I have ever heard. But Ammon is right that it is based upon *sentimentality*. Gandhi 's clinging to Hinduism and trying to make it *nonviolent* is an example of *sentimentality*. Adolph Hitler was a *sentimental* vegetarian. Why don't you ever quote him along with all these other fellows ? When he was living in the homeless shelter he used to scatter crumbs for the mice. But he was not sentimental about Jews or invading Poland etc.

Your basic argument for vegetarianism is that animals have the same rights as people. The corollary is that people have the same rights as animals--have the same right to a fish dinner as a heron or a crane. Have the same right as a fox or an eagle to catch a rabbit.

Your ecological arguments are specious. As to the shortage of grain, the U.S. government has paid farmers to **not grow** grain over the last 100 years to avoid surpluses which drive down the price. There is an argument to be made for grass fed beef over corn fed beef as being healthier. Large areas of the world, like the Great Plains of America, are no good for agriculture but naturally designed for grazing. There were 70 million buffalo on the Great Plains before the encroachment of the farmers led to the near extinction of the buffalo and to the Dust Bowl of the 1930s. The Plains Indians lived on the buffalo, made tepees and clothing from their hides and used nearly every part of the buffalo in one way or another. Was this somehow *un natural* or *bad karma* ? Silliness. Now grazing cattle have replaced the buffalo. No doubt there is a lot of waste in modern society but that is a different argument. The loss of natural predators means that the herds of deer and elk and antelope have to be thinned by hunting or they will over graze their range and starve themselves as well as bankrupting the ranchers.

Wars and corrupt governments lead to famines. India has one of the most corrupt governments on the planet and they are spending large sums building up their army and navy, thumbing their nose at Gandhi, as they did during his life time.

#### animal sacrifice and human sacrifice

I am baffled as to why you persist in referring to Judaism as a vegetarian religion. Not only was historical Judaism **not** a vegetarian religion, but, **animal sacrifice** was the primary way they maintained their relationship with *The Lord*. Don't take my word for it, read the 5 books of Moses. What else do you think went on in **The Temple** ? Which was the center of their faith. The dearest wish of at least some *Orthodox* Jews is the restoration of The Temple and the priesthood and the animal sacrifices. Of course, you can find all sorts of self-styled *Jews* who define Judaism as anything they wish to believe. They don't believe in God and they do believe in Israel and they go along with abortion. They light the right number of candles and call it *Judaism*.

That seems to be how you define *Hinduism*--you presume you have the Authority to edit It. Animal sacrifice was central to the original Hindu tradition. It was an essential part of their relationship with the Hindu pantheon. It persists to this day in the annual rites of the *Durgapuja* in honor of the goddess Kali. They were still sacrificing kids--human children, not just goats--well into the 19th century before the British government finally more or less stopped it.

Judaism was an ethical advance upon Hinduism and upon the religious cults of the neighboring Semitic tribes which still practiced human sacrifice. [ cf. 2 Kings 3.27 ] One of the seminal stories of Judaism features Abraham sacrificing a ram at the last minute instead of his first born son Isaac. The Moslems have their own version of the same story in which Ishmael, instead of Isaac, is the son who was about to be sacrificed. Meanwhile, in India and most of the rest of the world, human sacrifice as a religious ceremony persisted. Archaeological research shows that child sacrifice was a common practice of the Incas and the Aztecs and the other so-called *civilizations* of Central America.

People still devoutly believe in sacrificing their first born sons to *GodBlessAmerica*. And you with your *defensive wars* believe the same thing. And can't believe anything else so long as you are stuck with *Krishna Consciousness* and the **Bhagavad Gita**. Quit the Cult ! Appreciate the fact that Jesus substituted himself for all animal sacrifices: *this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for*

*many for the remission of sins.* Matthew 26.28. While also teaching *love your enemies* Matthew 5.44. Hebrews 10.4 adds: *it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats could take away sins.*

### Buddhism versus Pacifism

The article about **Buddhist Vegetarianism** is horse feathers. The claim that Asoka was some sort of pacifist emperor is based upon one inscription dug up many centuries later which advised his heirs to avoid further wars of conquest. He never dismantled the empire or the gigantic army of his grandfather which built that empire and which was necessary to maintain it. He didn't ban the eating of meat and fish, he only restricted it to reduce the grocery bill of the imperial court. You are hard up for examples of vegetarianism if this satisfies you. Buddha's last meal was pork and rice. Arguably he died from **failure to keep kosher.**

The claim is made that Buddhism is a pacifist religion. But Buddha was a *passivist*, not a pacifist. It isn't that he refused to go to war, he refused to do anything except sit under a tree and meditate. Before that, he walked out on his wife and new born son without even giving her a pat on the head by way of saying *good job.* That was his first step on *the road to enlightenment.*

Like other clergy, the Buddhist monks claim an exemption from military conscription. But Buddhism had royal patronage from the beginning and was a state religion from the start. Which is what mandates a military character. cf. *War is the Health of the State.*

The *Mahavamsa*, the major history of Buddhism in **Ceylon**, features the Sinhalese King **Dutthagamani** slaughtering the Tamils. When he expresses remorse for *the slaughter of a great host numbering millions*, the monks assure him: *From this deed arises no hindrance in thy way to heaven. Only one and a half human beings have been slain by thee, O lord of men. The one had come unto the (three) refuges, the other had taken on himself the five precepts. Unbelievers and men of evil life were the rest, not more to be esteemed than beasts. But as for thee, thou wilt bring glory to the doctrine of the Buddha in manifold ways; therefore cast away care from thy heart, O ruler of men.* ( Chapter XXV ) These monks are billed as *Arhats*--those who have achieved Enlightenment.

This king went to war with a relic of the Buddha on his spear. It resembles the story of Otho the Great who defeats the pagan Hungarians in a battle of the 10th century using the *holy lance* with a point made from the nails of the Cross. But **Military Christianity** only appeared in the 4th century and it persecuted the original **PACIFIST** Christianity which has persisted in underground and *heretical* churches to the present time. [ See *The Church of the Empire* on the **Radical Christian Press.org** web site. ] Like Mohammedanism, Buddhism was a state religion and a military religion from the start and, pretences aside, had that same character in the various countries to which it spread.

The Sermon on the Mount is the moral and spiritual foundation for pacifism. The example of the early Christians who were *martyrs*--witnesses--for a faith that caused them to refuse military service, even when they were killed for doing that, is the historical tradition upon which an anti war movement must be built.

*Terry Sullivan*

Take out your Concordance and look up the *fish* verses in the 4 gospels: Matthew 14.17-19 describes Jesus distributing loaves and *fishes* to 5000 people. In Matthew 17.27 he instructs Peter to catch a *fish* and pay the temple tax with a coin he will find in its mouth. In Luke 5.6-9 Jesus helps them get a huge catch of *fish* in their nets. See also John 21.6-11. In Luke 24.42-43 Jesus eats a piece of broiled *fish* to show them that it really is him, not just a *spirit*. In John 21.9-10 Jesus helps them catch *fish* and also cooks *fish* for them.

Lamb was traditional for the Passover meal, but the gospels mention only bread and wine in connection with the Last Supper. But there is no way that a sensible person can ignore the several gospel passages where Jesus ate fish himself or encouraged others to do it. You cannot replace Jesus Christ as the authority on what the Christian religion teaches about vegetarianism. You cannot replace the authority of the 4 canonical gospels with other miscellaneous writings. It should be obvious to you that you are wasting your own time and everyone else's with this futile quest to graft vegetarianism into the Christian religion.

Jesus did talk about what we should eat. Contra the strict food prohibitions of Judaism he says in Mark 7 *it is what comes out of your mouth, not what goes into it, that makes you UNCLEAN*. He was teaching contra the Pharisee who believed in the righteousness he achieved by what he didn't eat. The Jains and the Hindus should note this passage.

Of course we don't remember Jesus because he encouraged us to **Eat More Fish**. We remember him because he taught us to *Love God with your whole heart; Love your neighbor as yourself; Love one another as I have loved you*--addressed to his closest followers; *Love your enemies*. We remember him because he taught the sanctity of marriage and he and his followers set the example of strict sexual morality. Unlike Krishna. We remember him because he faced death bravely bearing witness against the evil of this world. One of his few modern true followers, Franz Jaggerstatter, did the same by refusing to join Hitler's army and he was beheaded in 1943. He sets the example of *bearing witness to the truth* that the rest of us must follow. He shows the persistence of that Spirit of Truth and Love and Courage which Jesus gave his first followers. cf. John 20.21-22.

I notice that, while you preach vegetarianism as a universal religion, citing everybody and his brother as an authority, you never preach Krishna. Which is sensible. I suspect your faith in Krishna was eroded long ago even if you can't quite bring yourself to admit it. The best thing to be said for Krishna is that he is only a myth, albeit a pernicious one, an old bawdy folk tale turned into a religious tract, like the Samson stories in the book of *Judges*.

Don't miss out on Jesus Christ. What he ate is not important. Who he was and what he was is important. Even if he ate fish, he is worthy of your respect as Krishna is not. His Holy Spirit is entirely relevant to confronting what is wrong with the world as Krishna is not.

letter of May 2nd 2018

There is a major omission in the book you sent me by Keith Akers: *Broken Thread: The Fate of the Jewish Followers of Jesus in Early Christianity*. The *Overview and Outline* lists an **ADDENDUM: THE LATER DISTORTION OF JESUS POSITION** following Chapter 10. Which is supposed to show that the gospel texts in which Jesus eats *fish* himself or miraculously provides *fish* to 5000 people *are the product of later tampering with the original message*. But this **ADDENDUM** is missing from the book and, judging from the page numbers, was deliberately omitted from this printing.

In the May 31st 2016 letter I wrote you I listed some of these *fish* verses: Matthew 14.17-19 and 17.27. Luke 5.6-9 and 24.42-43 and John 21.6-11. It is obvious that, if you cannot get rid of these verses, the central thesis of the Akers book that **Jesus was a vegetarian** just collapses.

As does the rest of his thesis that Jesus re-established the original vegetarianism of the Jewish religion. Which is even more unprovable. More than most religions, Judaism was historical. It developed out of the history of the Hebrew nation. Abraham sacrificed a ram instead of his son Isaac. The Hebrews smeared lamb's blood on the door ways of their dwellings so that the Angel of Death would **PASS OVER** and spare their first born sons while all the first born sons of the Egyptians were slain. That was the final plague by which they escaped from being slaves in Egypt.

The further argument Akers tries to make, that God originally intended All Nature to be vegetarian, illustrates the absurdity of **dogmatic vegetarianism**--the attempt to make vegetarianism the supreme moral and spiritual principle.

It may be that *the lion will lie down with the lamb* some day, but then you have to raise the question as to why God did not create a straw-eating lion in the first place if that is what he wanted.

And why he created all the birds that feed on insects and all the fish that feed on other fish. Will the robin and the worm have breakfast together some day ?

Akers seems to be an intelligent fellow with a capacity for scholarship and he writes well. But he wastes his time and ours with this fundamentally foolish book.

He has an arbitrary criticism of the Christians who preserve the idea of **sacrifice** in their bread and wine ceremony. He cannot recognize what Jesus accomplished when he substituted himself for the animal sacrifices of the Temple and made bread and wine the primary ceremony of *Passover*. Hebrews 10.4: *it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats could take away sins*. Matthew 26.28 *this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many for the remission of sins*.

**Sacrifice** is a basic way in which we relate to God and Jesus teaches us a new way to do it in the injunctions to *love one another as I have loved you* and *greater love than this hath no man than that he lay down his life for his friends*. Sacrificing an animal or a captive enemy is not the same as sacrificing your son--the dearest thing you own. Jesus set us the example of sacrificing himself.

letter of May 8th 2018

The Krishna cult apparently developed as an attempt to find someone in the Hindu pantheon who could compete with Jesus Christ as the incarnation of a personal God who loves each one of us. But Krishna is no competition. There is good reason to think that Jesus was an historical person, but, even if we treat the Jesus story as a myth, it is a spiritually and morally wholesome story. The Krishna myth is not.

Krishna is a *playboy*, a lover of pretty young women, especially *princesses*. But it is women who are no longer young and pretty, no longer *princesses*, who especially need the Love of God. It is Jesus who loves those most in need of it. The aging prostitute. The old woman with *an issue of blood*. And he loves them in a spiritual way, not a carnal way.

Krishna is presented as having 11 kids with his true love *Rukmini*, after he has left his former true love *Radha*. Then he marries *many queens*. A fellow who behaves like that deserves to be horse whipped not worshipped. Like Buddha walking out on his wife and new born son, he sets a standard of irresponsible behavior which some men are only too ready to copy.

The Krishna cult is a virility cult. The cult of the phallus permeates the Hindu religion and provides one measure of its degradation. In *Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies* page 628 Abbe J.A. Dubois says "The Lingam, an object of deep veneration throughout India, is the symbol of Siva, and it is under this **obscene form** that the god is principally honored." On 631 he writes that "the *lingam* offers an incontestable analogy to the *priapus* of the Romans and the *phallus* of the Egyptians. The fact is, all the founders of false religions had need to appeal to the baser senses, and to flatter the passions of their proselytes in order to attract them to their foolish doctrines and blind them to their impostures." That describes the Krishna cult.

The Egyptian phallus cult was associated with the worship of Osiris the sun god and his consort Isis. It was revived as part of the secret creed of the 18th century Freemasons who played a major role in the French Revolution. It is symbolized by the obelisks they erected. Then it was incorporated into the half hidden ideology of 19th century Socialism and Communism. We are still confronted with the *sexual revolution* which was part of their *abolish the family* ideology. Which is one cause of the erosion of family life in the modern world. Although the major cause is the **anti family economy** generated by that *love of money which is the root of all evil*. [ See page 18 of *Adam Smith and Family Wage* ]

The lack of sexual morality in the Indian religions attracted some peculiar British scholars who excavated and re-invented Buddhism in the 19th century. It continues to attract Americans who cannot tolerate the strict sexual morality that Jesus taught and which is the necessary foundation of family life.

Krishna is a super hero, a famous warrior. He uses his divine powers to kill other warriors. Jesus uses his divine powers to heal. He restores sight to the blind man and causes the paralyzed man to get up and walk. His teaching is summarized in the injunctions to *Love God with your whole heart, love your neighbor as yourself, love your enemies, love one another as I have loved you*. And He set the example of doing that. And gave his disciples the *Spirit of Love* which would enable them to do it. It is the sign of the real Christian community.

Krishna sets the example of a *god* who spends his time in hot pursuit of pretty young women, when he isn't killing for sport. The Krishna stories are an antique Hindu version of *James Bond Agent 007*. He offers us entertainment--the escape into fantasies--but he is a sorry substitute for a god.

The obsession with vegetarianism, or even *veganism*, for which Krishna cannot be blamed--he stole butter didn't he ?--the misguided effort to make it the universal spiritual and moral norm, arises from a tacit recognition that the Krishna cult is spiritually bankrupt. No one with any sense, or any sense of morality, can believe in Krishna as God.

***Terry Sullivan***

