

JESUS & THE UNABOMBER



THE HAUNTING OF THE HEART

ON INFANT CIRCUMCISION
THE HOLOCAUST OF MONOTHEISM

ERIC ANDERSON

Jesus & the Unabomber

The Haunting of the Heart

-on infant circumcision, the holocaust of monotheism-

Copyright © Eric Anderson 2020

Edition September 2020

Introduction

This exposé is non-fiction. The fictionalizations are stripped away that the signaling of the infant child may be detected.

It was after the fact that Jesus' mother was asked what light she might shed on the development of her earnest child. That is the only reason why the horror of his circumcision is known, because the report comes from the mother after the fact. Her report was that a disgusted witness to the act (Simeon*) indicated to her 'in so many words' that her son was ruined as a going concern (this is what Ted's mother reported of the infant Ted too, also after the fact). Mother Mary had helped to catalyze a *Unabomber* by allowing (under the threat of expulsion found at Genesis 17:14) the ceremony of partial child sacrifice (the infant circumcision

mandated at Genesis 17:10). In the law Genesis 1:26 (the error that Muhammad calls 'ascribing a partner to God') is defined as 'Constructive Fraud,' and Genesis 17:10 (infant circumcision) is defined as 'Aggravated Battery.' One may then see the infant child and then the message from that infant heart comes pouring through. The message from him is singular in the Gospel of Thomas, at Part 4.

Jesus was "*beside himself... a malefactor... a drunk & a glutton... who we think came to bring peace but who came to bring fire, and had wished that it were already kindled... who was the physician advised heal thyself... and who reaped where he did not sow.*" Jesus' complaint issues forth from the angry cudgel-wielding eight-day-old child within him. This is the unacknowledged context of his life. It is axiomatic that fully-informed parents yield an intact child.

*he would cause his mother much despair (Luke 2:35), so that the thoughts of many (infant) hearts would be revealed.

But for the absence of that one word (infant) in the Christian interpolation that is the second half of that verse, this 'holocaust of Monotheism' may have ended long ago, and that long dead child allowed to rest in peace.

Jesus & the Unabomber

The Haunting of the Heart

-on infant circumcision, the holocaust of monotheism-

Eric Anderson

CONTENTS

Part 1

Abraham's Error
(treatment trauma)

*When I kept silence my bones wasted
away through my groaning all day long.*

Psalms of David 32:3

Part 2

Malefactors
(didactic effort)

*Study to show thyself a workman
unashamed, rightly dividing the
word of truth.*

2 Timothy 2:15

Part 3

Blind Guides

(rote trance)

That would hurt him.

*Madame, are you in the habit of cutting
little children's things off?*

Gargantua and Pantagruel

You don't believe me but I'm trying to tell you. Each line must be an entity unto itself. You must say... the thing, the thing. Because you die from alcohol it doesn't mean you're any good. You've got to leave some words behind. I like you as a person, by the way. We're tough men together, through the horrors of life.

Charles Bukowski

(an interview)

*My own work, I'm giving my life for
it. That's all right. Do not fret about that
my dear, your own goodness abides.
For you it's not too late. You're no dealer
in men. You can still choose your side,
acting with humanity. But what's the use.*

Vincent van Gogh

(letters to Theo)

*Following the dog's
example, you will have
to be wise in sniffing,
smelling and
estimating these fine
and meaty books;
swiftness in the chase
and boldness in the*

attack are what is called for; after which, by careful reading and frequent meditation, you should break the bone and suck the substantific marrow in the course of it you will find things of quite a different taste and a doctrine more

***abstruse which shall
reveal to you most
high “sacraments” and
horrific mysteries in
what concerns our
religion, as well as the
state of our political
and economic life.***

François Rabelais

Gargantua and Pantagruel

PART 1

Abraham's Error

(treatment trauma)

**When I kept silence my bones wasted
away through my groaning all day long.**

Psalms of David 32:3

Scripture buries the lead.

When Jesus' mother Mary was asked, after the fact, if there was anything that stood out in her memory of Jesus' development, she reported that when she took her newborn son to the temple to be circumcised (*Luke 2:27*) there was a man there named Simeon. Seeing the child's

anguish, Simeon noted the trauma that Jesus had just received. Simeon knew right-away what had transpired and of the post-traumatic life that the child would suffer, and therefore, what his mother would suffer also ("*a sword through thine own soul*"). A lucid reader need only tap that artifact of scripture and the accretions of fantasy will fall away, and the birth of a Mad Genius is revealed.

That event is parallel to Ted Kaczynski when, after all, his mother was asked the same question (after the fact), and she too had a story to tell. If it were only true that "so that the thoughts of many (infant) hearts will be revealed," (for Simeon indicates expressly from whom the message comes; from the infant child), then the institutionalized horrors of cultivated-autism/rote-trance — all mistreatment of children is now illegal, except that which is institutionalized — as practiced

upon defenseless children, may then be released.

If we seek to learn through Jesus and Ted, instead of from them — the lesson comes through them from the infant child, and who the messenger is, is arbitrated by the greatest of all Gods, happenstance — as we naturally check and cross-check details in our effort to know the truth, we would not so readily overlook the lateral observations made by their mothers, and other contemporaries, of their early traumas, or of their overwrought, dysregulated adult selves.

Then we can know what Ted means when he says (about said rote trance):

Oversocialization is among the more serious cruelties that human beings inflict on one another.

Paragraph 26, Industrial Society and Its Future [ISIF]

If circumcision-at-beginning were not a

meme (this term coined by Richard Dawkins), and one observed the act, they would instantly see it for the trespass & battery, and for the ungodly misstep that it is. This begs the subject of cultivated-autism (often stated as cognitive-dissonance) *that religion always encourages while simultaneously claiming to pursue its cure* (i.e. they would “have their cake and eat it too” ISIF #185).

That observation of Ted's is easy to understand in light of knowing how medical personnel treated him in his infancy. And from knowing the early treatment of Jesus it is easy to understand why *he* says:

**Do not take for doctrine the
commandments of men.**

Mark 7:7

Jesus knew the difference between the god that was “before Abraham” (the god of nature), and the brain-spun god of Abraham that is found

in *"the letter that killeth"* (2 Corinthians 3:6). He knew this by observing the *"birds of the air and lilies of the field."* Nature was his benchmark in estimating *his Father's will*, much as Muhammad wrote his words in *'the book of nature.'*

"Jesus said (he was often warlike in his speech): Woe unto them, the [behaviorists], for they are like a dog sleeping in the manger of oxen. For neither do they eat, nor allow the oxen to eat." And this is Ted Kaczynski's complaint foretold in the most exacting way. In his criticism of *"leftism"* (i.e. *cultivated-autism*, as it is termed herein, or *rote-trance*), Ted observes that they are those who would *"eat their cake, and have it too"* (Industrial Society and Its Future [ISIF] #185).

Ted says *"Our discussion of leftism has a serious weakness. It is still far from clear what we mean by the word leftist."* It is an all-too-

common cultivated dissociative mental state wherein, for example, one would advocate against an intrusion upon the genitalia of infant girls in distant lands but be silent while that same trespass is perpetrated upon their own son's psyches, nearby. Ted is repeating the criticism of *blindness & deafness* that Jesus makes, that the behaviorist has a beam in his own eye whilst observing a fault in the eye of his fellows. They are *behaviorists who do not know how to behave*.

As Jesus' mother (*ex post facto*) related the story of Simeon's observation to those interested in her son's forensic evaluation, so too Ted's mother revealed the story of an institutional trauma inflicted upon him in the infancy of his life. She noted that when she received him back from an episode of medical treatment (institutionalized treatment), wherein he was detached from her and put in isolation,

that he was afterward “not the same child.”

Jesus and Ted as infants, were treated erringly. This treatment came through the elders and the educated; it was institutionalized. Their subsequent lives — with all the contemporaneous collateral chaos — were but their efforts to discover what that unremembered error was. If discovered, said error (perfectly analogous to the more recent Thalidomide error, for example) could be abandoned by society at large. Jesus did not suffer so that we don't have to (as evangelicals like to report) unless we properly observe the point of that suffering, and abandon the faulty meme (a behavioral inheritance), from our zeitgeist.

Infant circumcision is an errant meme. It is contrary to creation. It is an incidence of over-socialization (of commandment), that requires secular intervention in defense of a basic human

right. Circumcision takes good intentions too far, where those intentions then become pavement on the road to hell.

“The system is not properly loaded” during formula-feeding, circumcision, needle-stabbing, and fable-mongering/gaslighting. As is the case with all trauma, when the screaming stops, the sequela (residue) of the trauma remains, and is often only realized years hence. Are Jesus & Ted not bewildered when drifting from their careers, which is a manifestation that occurs years subsequent to their mistreatment?

As is the case in pushing needles into the muscle of newborn babies, the child suffers trauma even if the disease for which it is being treated is never encountered. The treatment-trauma manifests as a greater harm than the disease it is meant to thwart. Treatment trauma batters psychic viability when we neither know if its recipient will get the associated disease, or if

in getting it, the outcome would be altogether worse than the sequela of the prophylactic insult. The natural course of resistance, care, and growth is perverted, by the insertion of a trauma into the unwitting child's body. NB-To begin, besides nurturing, emergency medicine or treatment of extant disease, one ought to raise their child free of prophylactic intrusion for that child's first three years; let this be covenant with nature, and its God.

As for the divinity of Jesus (and Ted), when an adult does torture an infant and that infant, when it is grown, tortures adults, it might be considered divine in the sense that it is nature revealing to us that it is always on its sure course.

This is a common observation of the psychology of many a disturbed criminal (see Alice Miller), that their curdling compulsion is a natural extrapolation of their early life. It seems

divine in Jesus & Ted in the intensity of its manifestation, and in the causes for which they attempt to discover (the causal cultural trance/meme) and fight it, and in the unwavering determination of their younger selves to be heard.

The misloading of the infant's nascent central nervous system that occurs during circumcision is truly 'baptism by fire,' but why? Maimonides (c1200) demonstrates the simple-mindedness of the constrained pedant — whose learning bound him tighter rather than loosing his binds — as one who refuses to give up the wrong path when he observes for us of circumcision that "if the child were let alone until he grew up, he would sometimes not perform it."

It is easy enough observed that Abraham did not cause many Gods to become one (whatever their form, it is not changed by

human ideation), but he is credited with founding Hmonotheism (at Genesis 1:26) when he effectively ascribed man as partner to god. Ironically, making such an ascription is the prophet Muhammad's most severe and most repeated prohibition, though as with the Neolithic ritualistic torture of newborn babies that arrived with that ascription, he did not fault that ascription of man to God as monotheism's original sin. We are not able to look past sovereign nature and count how many Gods there are, though we generally take the natural world as a quantity of one. NB It is my considered opinion, as Muhammad was an admirer of Jesus, that had the Catholic church not hidden the Gospel of Thomas, Muhammad would have seen of it, and understood it, or that he did understand, as hygienic (desert-environment) circumcision in Islam is shifted away from the newborn child. Even so, I do not

find circumcision to be legislation in Islam (it is not spoken of in the Koran). There is no threat of expulsion in Islam for those who choose a wholistic approach to personal hygiene. NB-Just as I do not equate Saul/Paul with Jesus (or myself with Ted), I do not equate Koranic interpreters with Muhammad.

The act of infant circumcision tears asunder what God put in place in a fearful and futile attempt to wrest control of life from nature. Creation did not assign man as absolute sovereign. That place in creation belongs to nature. Infant circumcision is crude human understanding that caused both Jesus and Ted to be thrust into the condition of the half-sacrificed, for prophets are made, they are not born.

While it may be that God is superior to nature, just as we are taught, it is nature that is our immediate and unassailable superior in the

hierarchy of God-nature-man (i.e. Father-Holy Spirit-son, or Existence-Energy-Manifestation, etc.). It is nature that is absolute sovereign. The effort to go around nature is a subordination that has man skinning the genitalia of his own healthy children while the Gods of early folklore, laugh.

The compromised adult, existing in the least state of understanding of the Holy Spirit/Power Process — NB the *Power Process*, with interpretation, is Ted Kaczynski's lexicon for what Jesus called the Holy Ghost, or Holy Spirit — will argue that the baby doesn't know as though then nature must not know either. NB in nature, the entrance of trauma (where *The Body Keeps the Score*) is Boolean, and neither one of the two switches involved is either the belief of the interloper, or the discrete memory of the infant child. They are unable to grasp that nature itself (with no need for human

knowledge or permission), acts sovereignly.

Jesus was punished by the community in which he endeavored to unwind the cause-and-effect of own his life (for the benefit of us all, as it is said), and Ted is now, in like way, being kept in “everlasting habitation” though he seems not to have made friends with Mammon (Luke 16:9). Here then, it may be Mammon that need reconcile itself, if not with Jesus and Ted, then with the message that comes through them from the infant child within.

Ted's Ph.D. in Mathematics is the least sign of his intelligence, or suffering — wounded, dangerous, and like Jesus, seeking to kill what had killed him so long before. Would men as intelligent as these fight against the natural cycle of life? No, they simply fought some unnecessary element of abuse that they could not stop from happening to themselves, but might be able to prevent happening to others

who have yet no voice. To make sense of these men, we must realize their intelligence as that of nature, for their adult human intelligence reaches its zenith without either our or their apparent understanding (excepting for Jesus at John 7:22, and in the Gospel of Thomas at parts 4 & 53). Their incessant crying-out is unrecognized effort to say what the newborn child cannot say. And this is also the case in this writing.

If one considers natural cause and effect, they then might ask, "Ought not [Ted] to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?" (Luke 24:26)

This is not written to refute the Jesus of old, but to bring him to fruition. And here is the matter of that fruition, remembered:

**1) On the eighth day the child Jesus
was circumcised.**

(Luke 2:21)

2) “You circumcise a man on the Sabbath (though not by the instruction of Moses); what is it to you if I make him whole again on that day?” *

(John 7:22+)

3) “Forgive them Father, for they know not what they do.”

(Luke 23:34)

*Of all the oddities of “this dewdrop world,” one of note is that “circumcision was not practiced in the time of Moses” and that neither he nor Abraham experienced infant circumcision. They attempted to evade the unpleasantness that they experienced as (or witnessed of) desert-dwelling men undergoing *therapeutic circumcision* by compelling *prophylactic circumcision* upon newborn children, where the incognizance of it makes it the greatest of living hells.

Jesus explicitly calls out the trauma by the end of his life, especially in the Gospel of Thomas, which was hidden by the church, c300. So, let us credit him with some accomplishment greater than platitudes & parables so many of which are mere spiraling thoughts “*which you already know.*” (2 Peter 1:12).

And like Jesus, let us credit Ted, especially in that he is unconsciously identifying (or is an identifier of) a culpable institutional negligence that occurred before his own ability to remember it. Ted also accurately identifies his trespassers (i.e. technologists; hospital workers in a rote trance).

Jesus' infant crucifixion is reenacted on the cross and at last he asks that the perpetrators be forgiven for their autistic inability to comport effect to cause with any depth of perception. May we at least make the matter clear now, and release the error — a necessary prerequisite — so that all may truly and finally be forgiven. For after that release, *"Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained."* (John 20:23)

PART 2

Malefactors (didactic effort)

**Study to show thyself a workman
unashamed, rightly dividing the word of
truth.**

2 Timothy 2:15

Many disruptions of human performance though said to be of unknown origin, are early-onset stress disruptions. These disruptions are often explained away as genetic predispositions thus allowing the explainer to carry on under the influence of their desires — they manage the algorithm by ignoring the inconvenient variables, even where those variables are so

painfully obvious. Trauma induces damage. No one is without that genetic predisposition.

The court-appointed psychiatrist who evaluated “Mr. Kaczynski” (aka Doctor or Professor Kaczynski) could not or would not diagnose Ted as having the sequela (remnant of trauma) that his mother so clearly reported him having. How could that psychiatrist not see *‘Unabomber’* as sequela? How could being *‘the Christ’* not be seen as sequela? The psychiatrist seems like the circumciser who says, “it doesn’t hurt, I don’t feel a thing.”

Ted’s mother (Wanda Kaczynski) had long before observed characteristics of autism appearing in her son — symptomatic of post-traumatic stress disorder — just subsequent to his mistreatment by technologists (and forever thereafter). This might help us in our wondering at the onset of autism in Jesus, and in all children, who had at first been known to be

without it. In the face of horror, the body shuts down function in its effort to preserve itself.

The psychiatrist's court-ordered forensic evaluation diagnosed Ted with schizophrenia ("provisional... episodic... residual"). In that report — while at least recording the actual matter for posterity (just as Jesus' first injury is recorded in the Gospels) — the psychiatrist seems subject to a *forced tribal covenant* (i.e. over-socialization) that forbade her to speak outside of a strict syndicate paradigm.

Ted's entire life was sequela of the institutionalized childhood trauma that his mother reported, just as was the case with Jesus and his mother reporting the (by then) distant words of Simeon. Briefly, what follows is from Ted's court-ordered psychiatric evaluation:

“He was hospitalized at the age of approximately nine months, for several

days, as the result of an allergic reaction. Hospital course was apparently uneventful and he was discharged without known medical sequelae. Conflicting reports exist as to the significance of that hospitalization.

Information provided by Wanda Kaczynski, however (NB this 'however' is that conflicting report, and it is given by the only 'reliable witness'), indicates her perception that his hospitalization was a significant and traumatic event for her son, in that he experienced a separation from his mother (due to routine hospital practices).” *

**see article 'A Stranger in the Family Picture' by Serge F. Kovaleski and Lorraine Adams (June 16, 1996), for Wanda Kaczynski's more complete report.*

Psychological trauma is cumulative and can arrive in many forms, few of which are still present upon the full realization of said trauma

in its sufferer. Even more clandestine are other errors. Note that Jesus quickly changes the subject when one of his audience members observes, "Blessed is the one who suckled you." Speculate, if you will that he was fed from *new bottles* that were likely filled with goat milk, and so he missed the finishing school of gestation.

Which of God's mammals otherwise survives without the milk of its mother? What traumatic danger the infant must feel at such denial (see Peter Levine quote, below). Add the immobilization during the circumcision procedure (researchers now cite immobilization as a primary culprit of post-traumatic stress) and the many errors of taking thought are well on their way, astray.

People who lack solid early attachment to a primary caregiver, and therefore lack a foundation of safety, are much more vulnerable to being victimized

and traumatized and are more likely to develop the entrenched symptoms of shame, dissociation and depression.

In an Unspoken Voice, Dr. Peter Levine

“Nurse me, hold me, protect me, show me” are the endogenous manifestations of need in newborn children; not “deny me, cut me, stab me, gaslight me.” Every day endogenous striving puts us up against exogenous pressure where we ever seek to both calm our nerves and to stimulate our minds, and that day in itself is trouble enough (to quote Jesus). Cutting and stabbing trauma are so much more.

Infants are not evolved to carry the load of the institutionalized cutting and stabbing. Magical thinking must be charged the foul; exacerbated by religious fantasy. The post-traumatic man-child then operates at the

depersonalized level of life, where words exist at the lowest level of any computational process, which is why scripture itself is so unresolved in its supposed codification of life.

Jesus & Ted are compelled by nature (and its God) to make every didactic-effort, nonetheless. Their message is the report of the infant, and it must be heard. Education does not increase IQ, but constrains it, and for their culpable medical negligence, the MD paywall ought to be razed.

Note Jesus' drift away from his career as a carpenter, just as Ted drifted away from academia. They became list-processors, in extremis (see LisP); if they could just construct the right word-algorithm then everyone would understand. It is an iterative process, though, and at each pass they want to understand, too.

We can humor ourselves, but that humor

veils the true differential of scale between what we are and the undifferentiated place in which nature keeps us, squarely amongst *the birds of the air and lilies of the field*.

The benefit of fellowship obtains in the milieu of associating in mutual support, and little by what words are spoken (but that they encourage [John 1:1]), and not much by what words are printed (but that they comfort), and not at all by edict for "*there is no compulsion in religion*." Fellowship can be "*a real possession in the changing fortunes of time*." We seek sanctuary in fellowship, but in an epidemic of fear of the dangers of living, we steal comfort from newborn children. The philosophical naturalist ought to be the first person that understands the value of the provision of the feeling of sanctuary in the environment of religious fellowship (it is his self-same seeking). And the religious person, the first to understand

that newborn children deserve that sanctuary, also.

It is not the infant child who “barter guidance for error,” as is advised against in the Koran (2:16). Yet Jesus sees those barterers and calls them “*blind guides.*” The child does not yet have any ability to barter. It is the thought-taking adult who trades so poorly. “*And which of you with taking thought can add to his stature one cubit?*” (Matthew 6:27). Note that education does not have a positive effect on intelligence, for we would not cut our newborn children if it did.

Jesus and Ted want for their fathers, who are away, joined to the industrial economy; neither seems present for their child’s defense at the critical moment. Jesus’ choice of the word *Father* in place of the word *God* ought to be as telling as it sounds, for children with their father present — in all that word implies — would

never trade him for one imagined in the sky.

It is not just the sense that one is left at risk without the skillset of the pastoral economy, or without a natural "*sense of confidence in our ability to take care of ourselves*" (ISIF #68), but it is the sense that without our fathers we are also left without protection from the insults and injuries spoken of herein. The infant has no choice for nurture nor for defense but to rely on its oftentimes naïve (i.e. young and/or poorly guided) mother and/or father. But by the majority of learned people, truth is ever sought further along a dissociative path, instead of by simple association.

It is associative rather than dissociative, for example, if one observes that it is the equinox and solstice days of each year upon which the collective might express gratitude, for they are the *meta* (self-referential) days of our manifest world. The meta supersedes by infinite measure,

as the natural world supersedes man, the ceremonial days of human ideation. Nature is meta, parable/mythology is metaphor, scripture/mythology-literalism is meme (this is the Meta-Metaphor-Meme cycle). It is the most unfortunate Catch-22 that the meme of Jesus, as Christ, prevents the meta-message that is trying to erupt from the infant child. This is equally true of Ted. It is a blind holocaust to fixate on the murderer meme (or the Christ meme), miss the warmth of the storytelling of life & death (e.g. The Iliad), and skin the meta alive, all while continuing obsequious to blind guides. The status quo instinct is to want to protect the child's innocence; do they, or do they not want to do this? Christians almost score a 10, but they become obsequious before new sellers of indulgences, the technologists (who violate their own Hippocratic Oath), and achieve a score of zero, instead. They add zeroes and get for their

answer the number of zeroes added.

Our faith is best placed in the nature that Creation brought forth as absolute sovereign. In the matter of foreskin, it is time to return to the meta. It is the singular effort made herein, hopefully not confused by the other observations of human folly. And Jesus — and Ted — can be celebrated *after* circumcisers, scientific & religious — arrive home to the family of man.

Could God really be an angst-ridden writer of self-help books? It proves the uselessness of scripture to pray over and over again “forgive us our trespasses” while all while trespassing upon newborn children, or to parrot, for example, “do unto others,” while doing to children what no one wants done unto them, without their express, informed, permission.

It is the supreme usurer who would cut part

of God off another person and then hide behind man's law, that no one cut them. Maimonides said *"those who believe in the unity of God should have a bodily sign uniting them,"* but again he errs in the way of the simple-minded, and he perpetuates 'the final barrier to [Nature]' (Joseph Campbell).

Jesus suggests that circumcisers have a millstone hung around their neck and be cast into the depths of the sea; *"It would be better for him if a millstone were hung around his neck, and he were thrown into the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones."* (Luke 17:2 KJV) And again, if the practice of infant circumcision were not a meme and one was caught at it, what could anyone possibly think of them but that they had lost their mind.

If medicine would restrain itself to treating extant disease — NB infant circumcision probably first arose as a prophylactic 'ideation'

— it would not so quickly violate its own maxim to *'first, do no harm,'* for its prophylactic efforts require that it *'first, do harm.'*

If a prophylactic inoculate is administered orally, by drop, and the parent finds their way easily to its administration, they might ask themselves why it was easier to administer by drop when they are given a stabbing device with which to administer the next inoculate.

Medical doctors, in an extreme state of negligence (rote trance), have not determined how many times an infant can be stabbed before trauma is realized (the answer is none, it is scalar). One popular surgeon (re: CNN Transcripts, AC360, Sanjay Gupta, February 3, 2015) was heard to report that the “number of actual shots are higher..., and still you see the autism rates have continued to go up,” but he did not indicate that he heard himself making that one-to-one correspondence. While

correlation does not necessarily equal causation, in the light of such observation it is a culpable negligence not to suspend operations until it is discovered what does equal causation.

It is highly likely that the cumulative effects of treatment-trauma are involved. They are blind guides who have no depth of analysis. They follow as their religion, the over-reduced reductionist scientific method nonsense (it is the la segunda edad of life/householder-worldliness), discarding faith in life itself in search of new indulgence markets. Cutting & stabbing babies is simple and vulgar. It is macabre. It is over-mongered, and it is a literal trespass, already dark in its age. It was dark when it started. Ironically, it is pediatricians that need be kept from well children. Do not cut and stab healthy babies. It is trespass and battery, for which punishment is the only proper reward.

Of course, it is only natural that one does

not realize until their tercera edad, (when 'a bowl once again becomes a bowl' as the Buddhists say), that they had been involved in so much folly. May monotheism realize this now, in its age of retirement.

Jesus went over-the-top when claiming to be the only begotten son of God (the definitive symptom of mania is a claim of Messiahship). But this in him was also "provisional... episodic... residual" (see Matthew 12:32). And Ted went over-the-top too when posting bombs through the mail. **Jesus & Ted manifest the desperation of the infant child when it feels its world imploding.** They are both somehow the same; "I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I, if it be already kindled?" (Luke 12:49)

Jesus and Ted (as all children of a certain age) would have looked to adults as all-wise if not frightening creatures, and would not have

known better of the catalyzed labyrinth that lay ahead. They would not have known how their blind guides — “which strain at a gnat, and swallow [circumcision]” — were leading them astray, or of the impossibility of regaining the path of life’s fruition.

No one knows what lies ahead, but with the abstracted thought process that comes from trauma — the disposition of a predisposition that is in us all — Jesus and Ted became stuck in rumination, in post-traumatic discomfiture, that by-and-by manifested itself aloud.

PART 3
Blind Guides
(rote trance)

That would hurt him.
Madame, are you in the habit of cutting
little children's things off?

François Rabelais

“I wish the people who are circumcising you would go the whole way and castrate themselves!” (Galatians 5:12)

In life, there are little traumas with a lot of nurturing, and great traumas with little nurturing. Infant circumcision is worse than the older meme to kill a child (that was Polytheism in the meme phase of its cycle) — though it were already a mark of fearful neurosis to do so when

effected by deeply felt religious affectivity (i.e. while feeling one's hairshirt emotions) — for one ends suffering, and the other causes it to begin.

The loss of the partial child sacrifice meme will be like our own death; the time it takes for the world to adjust to our absence is as the time it takes for water to fill the void when our body is removed from it, and the water is made whole again.

So, “let us chastise them — as Pontius ‘what is truth’ Pilate suggests for Jesus — and let them go.” (Luke 23:16, etc.) It is related that absent the application of any inoculate, if a child were stabbed thus (in the like-manner of immunizations, stabbed repeatedly, in an effort to measure PTSD for actuarial science), post-traumatic stress would occur. *Every baby has its breaking point.* But the thought of conducting such an experiment immediately leads any

conscious person to the ethics that forbid it. Does this not tell the taker of thought anything about that modus of prophylactic intrusion?

Are we only left to “let the dead bury their own dead,” or to only issue a melancholy line of prose — “forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us,” or “forgive them father, for they know not what they do” — as at the end of this book? Could we not extend to incognizant newborn children the courtesy of protection against trespass & battery, as it now extended for cognizant beings? The future will (will always) make what is now the present appear as the dark ages. Current human knowledge is no exception. In this matter, may that future come quickly.

When circumcising an infant child, the circumciser is as far from Jesus’ Golden Rule as they can be. That is the clearest evidence that circumcisers suffer from the institutional

disease of cultivated-autism (rote trance). They have been educated into autism, and are beside themselves (*corruptio optimi pessima*). But nature could not care less about earnest man, and is not fooled. We are born and we die, and nature remains untouched in its sovereign position. In the interim, we need not mutilate our young, out of fear. Just as Abraham declared of born children that their sacrifice to God is subsumed, we also no longer need partially sacrifice newborn children, to appease the collective's idea of propriety. Nature and its God has **never** indicated otherwise.

The point to be made over and over again is that blind mistreatment of infant children loads their central nervous system in an unnatural way ("the system is not properly loaded") that as cognizant adult beings we seek quite naturally and desperately to avoid. These are unpermissioned acts performed upon our being.

Cognitive acquiescence is the violated standard in matters of so-called prophylactic medicine. There are no two things farther apart than to bring aid to the injured and injury to one who is in good health. What transpired at Jesus' circumcision (and Ted's infant medical treatment), is characterized here by Dr. Peter Levine (again from *In an Unspoken Voice*):

What ethologists call *tonic immobility*—the paralysis and physical/emotional shutdown that characterize the universal experience of helplessness in the face of mortal danger—comes to dominate the person's life and functioning.

Infant circumcision is an error so large as to encompass the entire field of human vision and for that reason to be indiscernible in that field (i.e. it has become a meme). Fable-mongering (aka gaslighting) is unnecessary in pursuit of the

benefit of fellowship, contemplation, and prayer. Gaslighting is unnecessary in the ceremonial and ritual pursuit of feelings of sanctuary, and pleasure (the aforementioned effort to calm one's nerves & stimulate their mind). The problem with fable and fable-mongering is wholly borne out in Mark 16:18; the egregious teaching that emotional fervor can act as a prophylactic against the drinking of poison.

Jesus and Ted give us the phenomenon of unconscious autobiographical observation. A very distinct portal, or tunnel, is created in Ted to the well-recorded infancy of his life, which helps lead us to understand Jesus, on the eighth day of his life. It is that early part of life's unnecessary insults that explains the amplified needfulness that is so symptomatic in those thus afflicted. And here the lives of Jesus and Ted are characterized:

It is very tempting to take the side of

the perpetrator. All the perpetrator asks is that the bystander do nothing. He appeals to the universal desire to see, hear, and speak no evil. The victim, on the contrary, asks the bystander to share the burden of the pain. The victim demands action, engagement, and remembering.

Trauma and Recovery, Dr. Judith Herman

I see the word *pain* and so come back to quote Maimonides again, “The bodily pain caused to that member is the real purpose of circumcision... it is a very very hard thing.” And it may also be a hard thing, but all of monotheism must announce *“we are rejoining the family of man, we no longer circumcise our young. Our faith is reverted to life itself. This writes our name in the book of life.”* NB Islam often uses the word revert in lieu of convert in this very same context (i.e. a convert is a person

reverting to the right way). NB This in no way negates the balance of one's cultural Wisdom Tradition (i.e. their religion).

It is the singular charter of the life of Jesus, not yet realized. Let monotheism succeed in this, or let it perish; break-up the old & new Bibles into the books of their individual authors that their readers not be so befuddled, so mesmerized. Those authors are only emoting, as do we all. To the birds of the air we must sound, in that emoting, as they sound to us while chirping their days away. And as leaves of grass we flourish, then wither away (Psalms 103:15, etc.). That is *the all* that is happening in those books.

Jesus finally observes that it is acceptable to blaspheme him but declares damnation unto those who blaspheme the Holy Spirit (Mark 3:29). **Yet that is exactly what infant circumcision is, blasphemy of the Holy Spirit, of the Power Process.** Mnemosyne

(remembrance) attempts to teach us through both Jesus and Ted.

Now note of those crumbs of the gods Jesus' intimate love of John, as demonstrated in the Gospel of John:

- and the disciple standing by, whom he loved John 19:26

- saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother John 19:27

- that disciple whom Jesus loved John 21:7

- the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on his breast at supper John 21:20

And finally (John 21:21-23):

-Peter, seeing him, said to Jesus, "But Lord, what about this man [John]?"

-Jesus said to him, "If I will that he remain till I come, what is that to you? You follow Me."

-Then this saying went out among the brethren that this disciple would not die. Yet Jesus did not say to him that he would not die, but, "If I will that he remain till I come, what is *that* to you?"

Note that it was not Jesus' hopeful servants/friends (John 15:15) who saved him from the madding crowd, but it was the behind-the-scenes efforts of Pilate, Nicodemus, the Centurion, Mary, and alas, Jesus' own father (or stepfather, whatever the case may have been), come from Arimathea (i.e. those "old in years" as noted in the Gospel of Thomas, at part 4). Never mind the loaded statement concerning Jesus' absence from his tomb (Matthew 27:64), lest "the last error be worse than the first."

It can only ever be human politics to argue what God *verbs* — what God *thinks, wants, asks, loves, hates, says, etc.* — when one cannot even

detect it in how a child is begotten by God (whole), or detect the horror it suffers at circumcision. God may have a *will*, but we are only allowed access to sovereign nature's way, which we observe in nature. Partial child sacrifice is a **worse error** than the whole child sacrifice it was meant to subsume.

Children being skinned alive on their eighth day, or at any un-permissioned time of their life by the authority of the elders — NB Muslim boys most often receive circumcision at the end of puberty and while much is stated as in compliance of Abram/Abraham in Islam, this is an instinctual and vast improvement in the matter of trauma, while still being trespass — is a **worse error** committed by further degraded peoples (in the Meta-Metaphor-Meme cycle of belief systems). And this is all over a growling effort of intimidation to hold a piece of taken ground from the next group of primates who

might wander by.

This is truth: infant circumcision is antagonistic to what the Power Process has brought forth, and hence, according to Jesus, it is **the worst blasphemy of all**. This is truth: nature is God manifest. And this is truth: that there is only one nature, always reconciling itself in the eternal present, “with a Power rising out of it” — as J.C. Powys observes in the last paragraph of his autobiography — “against which all the evil in it and all the unthinkable atrocities it brings to pass are fighting a losing battle.”

I have used the adult iteration of the newborn’s autistic voice, herein — the four developmental voices are the babbling/jargon of infants, then the one-to-one voice used with family and friends, then the social voice used in community, and then the podium voice, but the podium voice is a mere iteration of the first

voice, it is the voice of the rooting infant in its adult iteration, speaking from sense-memory of the time from whence its complaint issues forth. “It is nothing personal” I often find myself explaining, “it is just that it is personal.” I do not fault the new parent, but their elders and the educated for their free-ranging dissonance, I do. ‘If circumcision is not released [this Gospel] shall avail you nothing’ (Galatians 5:2). If it is released, it is because you, dear reader, step forward and write your own name in the book of life, affirming faith in life itself. For one must ask ‘where is the shred of dignity they are trying to save when shielding endemic shame (endemic sociopathy)?’ Where is it?

I hope that the matter is not lost for the use of fraught words, or — as in the Gospels and Industrial Society and Its Future — because of the complete absence of humor. Regardless, we are each weak unto greater powers, and

powerful unto weaker ones.

To close, here is an homage between them
(from *The Education of Little Tree*, by Forrest
Carter):

Will ye walk aways with me, [my friend]? Not far;
A year or two, at ending of your time.

We'll not talk. Nor tell the bitter of the years.
Maybe laugh, occasional; or find a cause for tears;
Or something lost, could be, we both might find.

Will ye set a spell with me, [my friend]? Not long;
A minute measured by your length on earth.
We'll pass a look or two; we both will know
And understand the feeling, so when we go
We'll take comfort that we kin the other's worth.

Will ye linger at our leaving, [my friend]? Just for
me.

Lingering reassures and comforts us who part.
Memories of it help to slow the quickened tears
With recalling of you, in later years;

And soften some, the haunting of the heart.