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We are His. He is not ours. Yet every religion monopolizes God.

In search of the ultimate truth about our origin and purpose, men grope in the dark, no further and no faster than their ignorance, and every kernel of knowledge glimpsed from God’s grand design becomes religious doctrine that is celebrated as the end of knowledge and divine wisdom but decays into dogma with the passage of time, never having been more than just fragmentary lore of the vast universe of which we are but an infinitesimal part.

Every religion sees aspects of God’s grand design and none has the capacity to see the unabbreviated whole, let alone relay it in words. Together they see much more than alone, but still no more than fragments. That is why we must accept that every religion is but an imperfect path to understanding something that is greater than our power of understanding and that we will forever try to understand. And because our understanding will always be incomplete, as it must since the universe is a work in progress and forever evolving, all attempts to own God and all pretenses to know His will by studying century-old scriptures must be condemned as an affront to God and as an imprisonment of the spiritual domain; a domain on which all freedom rests.

The only proper approach to God is one of humility and awe and insatiable curiosity towards the complexity and vastness of creation, towards the universe and all life in it, animate and inanimate. All obedience to men who pretend to know the will of God as well as adherence to religions who try to possess God destroy the very purity and honesty that lead to God, that make communion with Him possible. For if man is to connect with God nothing and no one can stand in the way: no person, no dogma, no tradition, no hierarchies, and no prior knowledge. God can only be understood and experienced in the here and now, for an instant in time, by one person at a time, as a reward for and in the solitude of seeking.

The understanding that religious freedom can only exist in the absence of organized religion, because the spiritual domain is the seat of all freedoms and God can only be experienced as a fleeting but powerful reward to personal seeking, is the next step in our spiritual evolution and will inevitably lead to the demise of all organized religions, a process that is well underway.

To free God from man’s ignorance and greed so that we can in turn be freed onto God, we must conceive a future where all religions converge into one without a clergy to stand between man and God. This very liberation of the spiritual domain from the shackles of organized religion, which has politicized God, is what OM Principle fifteen advocates.

|  |
| --- |
| PRINCIPLE 15  **ONE MAN ONE GOD**  No one man and no religion knows the will or nature of God. The spiritual domain and the divine that inhabits it must be freed from the arrogance of organized religion and surrendered to the individual and our innate spirituality so that we may all seek and find our own God. Spirituality thus freed will strip away the dogmas and hierarchies of organized religion and consign them to the past so that they will be looked upon as traditions we have outgrown and respected as historic necessities that helped us find unity and decency at the heart of the elemental universal consciousness that inhabits us and that we inhabit. Organized religions must cede ground to individual spirituality if human beings are to live in the image of God. |

Organized religions give people the impression to have found God, much like watching a porn movie gives people the impression to have made love. To seek God in a group is like gang raping a woman and calling it affection. Congregations are obscenities; mirrors to the perversities of man’s cardinal sins, the idolatry-of-self on public display: wrath, avarice, sloth, pride, lust, envy and gluttony.

One cannot find God in a group any more than one can digest one’s food as a group or process thoughts as a group. Just as you must process your own thoughts and you must digest your own food, so you must seek your own God. If you fail to digest your own food you will suffer physical hunger just as if you fail to process your own thoughts you will suffer intellectual hunger and if you fail to seek your own God you will suffer spiritual hunger. The first leads to death, the second to ignorance and the third to emptiness. Since only physical hunger is lethal, all people digest their own food. Since intellectual hunger is a continuous effort, we are all partially ignorant. And since spiritual hunger requires the greatest commitment for unknown rewards, the vast majority gives up.

Religion is the first science, now hopelessly outdated, and the first government, now long ousted. It is man’s original attempt to ask empirical questions in order to conceive *“the unknown cause and mysterious depth of things”* [[1]](#endnote-1) and to codify his inquiries, thus to make sense of the world and to transmit this knowledge from generation to generation.

What most people take from organized religion is not faith and certainly not righteousness but merely prescriptions and rules to simplify one’s life in the community. Organized religions help people mimic and parrot each other and in so doing create social common denominators to enable peaceful coexistence and to aspire to a common purpose. In this sense religion is also the first politics and not only the first science.

God, thus the Universe, since the Universe is synonymous with God in our modern understanding, is not a sentient being but the sum total of physical laws that keep energy forever on the move, forever changing. God is Energy. God, in the simplest terms, is Light and Light is Love. Understanding Light and Love is knowing Truth, thus knowing God. Clerics are forever trying to understand God and scientists are forever trying to understand Light. For Light or God is the source of all energy, thus the source of all life.

Our latest religion, Science, also monopolizes God and has also been perverted to serve as a political tool, which is why scientists and technocrats are now in charge of running society, having displaced the clerics, and why they have taken it upon themselves to decide who lives and who dies. Scientists and their little brothers, the technocrats, are playing God. Like the clerics before them they too presume to know the will of God, which they describe as the laws of nature. But like their predecessors, scientists only know God’s latest revelations to man.

What separate religion and science is their approach. Religion started with the grand questions and worked its way down while science started with the little questions and worked its way up. Since there is too much to know for a single man’s brain science has split up in various specializations, just as religion has split up in various denominations because the subject proved too difficult and the answers too varied. But the search continues, as it must, because that is what it means to be a living and questioning human being. The various sciences and religions have developed their own languages to reflect their growing perplexity as much as their growing understanding of their subjects of inquiry. But what they ultimately all look into is one and the same thing, the mysteries of the universe, which they approach from different angles and perspectives, with different glasses, microscopes and telescopes, depending how close or how far they look. In other words they all try to understand God and steal or appropriate his secrets. They do it because we, humans, are a curious lot and because life is challenging.

But whether it is scientific or religious search, we must strip it of man’s cardinal sins and to succeed we must make the search rewarding and possible for all, those who succeed and those who fail, ensuring that man advances on all plains – spiritual, intellectual and physical – and that he does so not at the cost but to the benefit of all.

Success on all plains ultimately depends on each and every one of us digesting our own food, for proper physical development, our own thoughts, for proper intellectual development, and our own feelings and aspirations, for proper spiritual development, and that the society we forge helps us do so. It depends in other words on our independence and on society being able to bind our healthy individual independence into a healthy social interdependence.

The spiritual domain freed of organized religion will lead to a healthy and vibrant spiritual life where every man seeks and finds his own way to God. God will never again be monopolized and profited from, which will lead to a spiritual, moral, compassionate and tolerant society. This will make possible a post-religious yet deeply spiritual world that will take us a step closer to universal brotherhood.

The intellectual domain freed of professional monopolies will lead to a healthy and vibrant intellectual life where every man seeks and finds his own way to knowledge. Knowledge will never again be monopolized, patented, and exclusively profited from, which will lead to a classless society and a vastly different distribution of labor. This will make possible a post-political world and will take us a step closer to direct democracy.

The physical domain freed of all but the most basic private property will lead to a healthy and vibrant physical life where every man has equal opportunity to seek and find his own way to the resources necessary for life. Natural resources will never again be monopolized and profited from, which will lead to an equitable and peaceful society. This will make possible a post-industrial world and will take us a step closer to universal prosperity.

From this three-dimensional freedom – physical, intellectual and spiritual – that we all want and need, will result a social construct that is truly civilized, in the sense that it allows for the satisfaction of man’s three elemental freedoms while at the same time forging a harmonious yet diverse society and a sustainable yet advanced civilization that is at peace with itself and with nature.

All it takes to accomplish this post-religious, post-political, post-industrial world is for all of us to give up the self-serving monopolies we hang on to and the false loyalties that divide us so we can reorganize accordingly and return to our origin, to Nature or God’s harmony. For there are no monopolies, no kings, no masters and no superiors in Nature. God’s harmony is the result of perfect intra-species equality and seamless inter-species coexistence, the symbiosis of life. You take what you give and no more. That is God’s way. That is Nature’s way. Anything else is a human distortion or a self-serving perversion, at best a result of our ineptitude to construct our society harmoniously and to live in the image of God.

Since we escaped God’s harmony because we found it too brutal, we have caused a chain reaction that has led to the current dire situation. Our actions have such destructive cumulative effect on Nature that all life on earth is in peril, including our own existence.

The globalization/depopulation axis around which the international order revolves since the end of World War II is man’s latest and most serious attempt to keep the peace, which has required that humankind establishes a state of harmony within and between nations and which in turn, we have recently realized, requires that we restore the lost equilibrium between Man and Nature. In thinking how to achieve this, our scientists and priests have compared notes with Nature/God and have discovered that Nature/God keeps births and deaths in perfect balance so the populations of any and all species are stable and do not disrupt the equilibrium of life. The problem our leaders have encountered is that we need to restore not just maintain the Man/Nature equilibrium. And to restore this lost life-sustaining equilibrium we have to reduce our population to a number that is sustainable; that is to say, to a number that does not disrupt God’s harmony, to use the language of religion, or the planet’s life support systems, to use the language of science.

Our theologians and scientists were the first to grasp this sacred knowledge and have imparted it to our politicians but have kept it from us, who are only now awakening to this consciousness altering revelation and who have yet to comprehend its brutal social implications, which will inevitably persist until such time as we all internalize and live according to this new conscience.

The universal diffusion of this knowledge means, in the long run, the end of all hierarchies of power: be they political, religious, military, professional or economic as it would render all of these vanity-indulging occupations equal to all other occupations and would force all their practitioners into a state of equality with the rest of the crowd. But that is not the original reason why they withheld this knowledge from us, although it is, in addition to fear, the only remaining reason in the present.

Neither our clerics nor our scientists believed we are ready for this forbidden knowledge. Clerics to this day justify their silence by thinking that God’s revelations are limited to the current capacity of humans to understand. The need to decide how many children we can have and to engineer a population reduction is, they believe, beyond our comprehension and therefore best left to a select few who will employ covert methods to ensure that we have only as many children as God’s harmony can accommodate. This view was well expressed by Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) who asserted *“the things of God should be revealed to mankind only in proportion to their capacity; otherwise, they might despise what was beyond their grasp”,* or byJohn Calvin (1509-1564) who wrote that God *“reveals himself to us according to our rudeness and infirmity”.*

Having actively transmitted my self-acquired knowledge of population control and the need for it to countless strangers across the world for the past two years and having encountered every imaginable mode of resistance to it, I can confirm that many lack the curiosity and/or the mental and emotional strength to deal with this world-altering concept. This, I am loathe to admit, truly is beyond the grasp of many who are either too weak to make decisions of life and death or too feebleminded to see the need for such decisions and who instead seek shelter behind one of the following three copouts: irrational belief in divine or alien salvation, scientific breakthroughs that will give us free energy and unlimited food, or wishful overestimation of earth’s bounty and the implied existence of unlimited resources.

They cannot or do not want to understand that God has already given us the knowledge we need to save ourselves by revealing to us the secret to our salvation and to his harmony, which is to keep births and deaths in balance. Nor do they understand that the scientific miracles we need to save ourselves have already been invented and are called contraceptives. Last, they would rather not admit to themselves that the earth’s bounty truly is unlimited so long as we switch to renewable resources and stop using natural resources faster than the earth can provide or replenish them. These three tidbits of knowledge are not literal enough for a population that has been raised to be intellectually and emotionally dependent on religious indoctrination and blind belief in fables and on political manipulation and unquestioned obedience to authority.

Scientists, for their part, find it easier and more to their advantage to sicken and kill then to educate and empower the general public. Biology Professor Erik Pianka has become the flag bearer of this mentality as soon as he endorsed the elimination of 90% of the human population through an airborne strain of the Ebola virus during an acceptance speech for the 2006 Distinguished Texas Scientist Award from the Academy of Science; a position that was enthusiastically applauded by hundreds of scientists present for the occasion.[[2]](#endnote-2)

A fellow scientist and attendee reports that *“Professor Pianka began his speech by explaining that the general public is not yet ready to hear what he was about to tell us”* to which end the organizers made sure that no video evidence is available by asking the camera operator filming the occasion to stop the camera and walk away so Dr. Pianka could speak in confidence.[[3]](#endnote-3)

Yes, both scientists and clerics consider God’s balancing of life and death forbidden knowledge and have appropriated it for their own ends, denying us the opportunity to evolve by receiving and embodying this revelation, and using it against us to drive us into extinction.

Since society is entirely man made, man’s creation, man has always had to play God to keep society going. He has no choice because God runs nature and man runs society. So he makes rules and breaks rules to make new rules again, as his knowledge advances and his society evolves. He has not yet found the perfect society. He is still searching, still creating and using God’s nature for inspiration. And the right to play God on earth is fiercely contested by scientists and clerics, each believing to understand God better than the other side, and each strengthening their hierarchies to have a better hold on the power to play God, assuming this right without asking the rest of us.

Clerics have a paternalistic attitude towards the common man while scientists have a condescending attitude. They both believe we cannot understand. They do not believe this because they gave us the opportunity to understand and we have disappointed them but because it is convenient to assume our incompetence so as to justify acting without our knowledge or consent. Both scientists and clerics have made and continue to make invaluable contributions to the common good but on the subject of depopulation, which both have approached and are pursuing the wrong way, they are dead wrong; so wrong in fact that they are committing genocide and crimes against humanity. And since this is such a vast subject that affects every human being on the planet and every aspect of our lives, the need to proceed covertly has perverted everything we hold dear and has annihilated everything we owe our success to as a species.

Clerics, who are our expired scientists, are wrong to misuse our trust by covertly assuming society-wide responsibility for holding the balance of good and evil in their sole hand so that man’s world, like God’s, stays in equilibrium, and in so doing deprive us of the right and opportunity to exercise responsibility over our God-given reproductive rights, which they have usurped by forcing scientists to find covert ways to prevent the moment of conception. In essence they deprive us of the knowledge necessary to live in the image of God and force us instead to crawl in the shadows of men. In so doing, they have turned religion into a force of evil instead of a force for good.

And scientists, who are our new clerics, are wrong to misuse medicine and science to covertly subvert a normal physiological function, our God-given ability to procreate, and in the process damage our general health and our children’s genetic and intellectual endowments, enfeebling our species and throwing evolution into devolution, as though they had a right to be the sole arbiters of life and death. In essence they not only deprive us of the benefits of knowledge accrued with the surplus food that we produce, but actively use their knowledge to harm us in intended and unintended ways. In so doing, they have turned science into a force for the preservation of evil instead of a force for the advancement of good.

How did this happen? In the previous chapter I showed the origin and spread of this cancer in the scientific community. Here I will show its origin and diffusion in the religious community.

The Second Vatican Council, which formally opened under the pontificate of Pope John XXIII on 11 October 1962 and closed under Pope Paul VI on 8 December 1965, attempted to renew Catholic doctrine to correspond with the modern world.

Traditionalists, however, consider the changes that were adopted to constitute apostasy; that is, renunciation of religion, since many of the changes are deemed heretical in the sense that they depart from established doctrine, which in Catholicism is supposed to be indefectible (meaning ‘immutable and always remaining the same’) and infallible (meaning ‘without the possibility of error’).

One such “heretical” change is:

*“Abolition in Vatican II and the 1983 Code of Canon Law of the traditional distinction between the primary (procreative) and secondary (unitive) ends of marriage, the placing of those ends on the same level, and the reversal of their order. The change provides tacit support for contraception, since the prohibition against birth control was based on the teaching that procreation is marriage’s* ***primary*** *end.” [[4]](#endnote-4)*

To traditionalists this signaled that the Church is no longer a trustworthy guardian of revealed doctrine:

*“We must therefore, as Catholics who affirm that the Church is both indefectible and infallible, reject and repudiate the claims that Paul VI and his successors have been true popes.*

*On the other hand we leave it to the authority of the Church, when it once again will function in a normal manner, to declare authoritatively that these supposed popes were non-popes. We as simple priests cannot, after all, make authoritative judgements, whether legal or doctrinal, which bind the consciences of the faithful.*

*We traditional Catholics, finally, have not founded a new religion, but are merely engaged in a “holding action” to preserve the Faith and catholic worship until better days. In the meantime, that goal will be best served if we address difficult issues with attentiveness not only to theological principles, but also to the theological virtue of charity.”*

Constrained by the rigidity of its faith and confronting such fierce internal opposition to a change as slight as the implicit acceptance of contraceptives, the Vatican backed off and instead of angering the rank and file and risking a schism within Catholicism it gave secular authorities its tacit approval to covertly poison the populace into infertility so as to prevent the moment of conception without people’s knowledge or consent, rather than have to compromise on contraception and abortion, which governments need to defuse the population bomb and reach necessary demographic objectives. As I have shown in the previous chapter, the Vatican’s tacit approval, given to secular medical authorities to covertly subvert the human reproductive system, appears in a single discreet paragraph, under the heading “Lawful Therapeutic Means”, in the 1969 encyclical letter [*Humanae Vitae*](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_25071968_humanae-vitae_en.html)*,* which states:

*“On the other hand, the Church does not consider at all illicit the use of those therapeutic means necessary to cure bodily diseases, even if a foreseeable impediment to procreation should result there from—provided such impediment is not directly intended for any motive whatsoever.”*

Caught between a rock and a hard place, the Vatican leadership made extraordinary efforts to satisfy all parties. The greatest sacrifice was made by Pope John Paul II and I explain it in chapter fifteen as follows:

Nothing shows more clearly how dangerously contentious the issue of population control is than the number of high profile victims on both sides of the divide. For while American President John F. Kennedy (d. 1963) and his brother, Robert (d. 1968), Chilean President Salvador Allende (d. 1973), Polish President Lech Kaczyński (d. 2010), and Romanian President Nicolae Ceausescu (d. 1989) were assassinated for opposing the regime of covert depopulation, Olaf Palme of Sweden may have been assassinated for the absolute opposite reason. Most bizarrely, Pope John Paul II survived assassination attempts for both reasons, though the first attempt, carried out on 13 May 1981 by Turkish gunman Mehmet Ali Ağca, was staged, while the second, carried out on 12 May 1982 by [Traditionalist Catholic](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Traditionalist_Catholic) Spanish priest [Juan María Fernández y Krohn](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Juan_Mar%C3%ADa_Fern%C3%A1ndez_y_Krohn), was not. The first attempt was staged because the Church needed a plausible interpretation for the last of the [Three Secrets of Fatima](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Three_Secrets_of_F%C3%A1tima), which foretells the end of the Catholic Church and the execution of the Pope and cardinals by people and soldiers in retribution for an evil done by the Church, which can only be its complicity in and responsibility for crimes against humanity once it agreed to go along with and to sanction covert depopulation measures by chemical poisoning, which is evident in the encyclical letter [Humanae Vitae](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/encyclicals/documents/hf_p-vi_enc_25071968_humanae-vitae_en.html) from 1969. The Church had delayed the release of the third vision of Fatima by 20 years because it needed time to fabricate a false interpretation and because it needed an event to base it on. To make the false assassination attempt more credible it was planned to take place on the anniversary of Fatima’s vision, at the exact date and hour. To give it even more credence, Pope John Paul II stated upon his recovery that it was Our Lady of Fatima that helped keep him alive, and a few years later, in 2005, he reiterated his false assertion, so as to dispel all doubts and suspicions:*“ Could I forget that the event in St. Peter's Square took place on the day and at the hour when the first appearance of the Mother of Christ to the poor little peasants has been remembered for over sixty years at Fátima, Portugal? For in everything that happened to me on that very day, I felt that extraordinary motherly protection and care, which turned out to be stronger than the deadly bullet.”* That the assassination was staged is also intimated by the fact that Pope John Paul II pardoned the gunman two years later, in December 1983, after visiting him in prison and then declaring, rather enigmatically, that: *"What we talked about will have to remain a secret between him and me. I spoke to him as a brother whom I have pardoned and who has my complete trust.″* The second assassination attempt also happened on the exact date and hour of the anniversary of Fatima’s vision, but one year later, and was committed by Conservative elements within the Church who opposed the Vatican’s complicity in depopulation and took issue with its attempt, through the Second Vatican Council, to reform the Church’s policy with respect to contraception and other teachings. It was a slap in the face of the Vatican and a public statement that the Vatican’s machinations to falsify history and change divine prophesy did not go unnoticed by the last remaining traditionalists within the Church who refused to go along with the liberalization and modernization of Church doctrine so as to allow the use of contraceptives. Father [Juan María Fernández y Krohn](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Juan_Mar%C3%ADa_Fern%C3%A1ndez_y_Krohn) served a three-year sentence after which he was expelled from Portugal and became a solicitor in Belgium, one of two remaining religious strongholds in Europe opposing population control (the other being Ireland). I have great sympathy for the Vatican and even greater sympathy for Pope John Paul II, who made a terrible sacrifice by taking a bullet to save the Church from the inevitable and foreordained demise caused by its obsolescence and by the fact that the Church cares more about its power and influence than about its people and the truth. It is nevertheless reluctantly and with a heavy heart that I invalidate their efforts. The truth, however, is the truth and it must be told, for only the truth can set us free.

No amount of moralizing can match the irresistible power of the instinct to procreate, which is deeply embedded in our genetic code for a reason, namely to ensure the perpetuation of the species. This obvious reality, however, has not detracted either the top clerics of every religion or the high priests of every science from attempting to impart their wisdom in pursuit of regulating or restricting our reproductive rights. And in the process the will and the voice of the masses were somehow lost in the loud clamor of the elites.

I started with the Catholic Church because it represented the last resistance point to birth control and the culture of death until 1969 when it too caved in and has since only been pretending to be anti-contraceptives and anti-abortion in order to deceive the public and maintain the façade of Catholicism’s infallibility and immutability, knowing full well that our fertility is being covertly subverted by governments who adulterate our basic elements of life.

Let us now look at the manner in which the clergy outside Catholicism took it upon itself to assume command and control over our reproductive rights and system, because I cannot find any reference to a vote on the matter in any country.

Anglicans first approved of birth control, for married couples only, at the 1930 [Lambeth Conference](http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/), but did not explicitly endorse the use of contraceptives, stating only that *“where there is a morally sound reason for avoiding complete abstinence … other methods may be used.”* So long as these methods of conception control are not used for *“motives of selfishness, luxury, or mere convenience.”* ([Resolution 15, from 1930](http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1930/1930-15.cfm))

This was a sea change from its 1920 position when the use of prophylactics was seen as a *“grave danger—physical, moral and religious,”* and their distribution *“an invitation to vice”,* consequently calling on good Christians everywhere to pressure governments to end *“the open or secret sale of contraceptives, and the continued existence of brothels”.[[5]](#endnote-5)*

By 1958, the Anglican bishops not only approved of contraceptives that are *“mutually acceptable to husband and wife in Christian conscience*” ([Resolution 115](http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1958/1958-115.cfm)), thus leaving the choice entirely to couples, but also of sterilization. They rejected, however, abortion. More importantly, the tone and tenor of the arguments reveal that the need for family planning was necessitated by more than just personal choice but also by the needs of society. This change of emphasis from individual choice to social necessity came as a result of great fears of assured mutual destruction at the height of the Cold War and prompted the bishops to not only loosen the restrictions on the use of contraceptives but at the same time to also issue no less than twelve resolutions on the subject of *“reconciling conflicts between and within nations”* to which end they favored, among other things: mutual understanding and calm reason in solving racial, political and economic conflicts ([Resolution 103](http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1958/1958-103.cfm)); international sharing of material resources ([Resolution 105](http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1958/1958-105.cfm)); the abdication of war and a comprehensive international disarmament treaty ([Resolution 106](http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1958/1958-106.cfm)), and strengthening the United Nations to better enforce its decisions ([Resolution 108](http://www.lambethconference.org/resolutions/1958/1958-108.cfm)).

The agenda of the 1958 Lambeth Conference of the Anglican bishops does not only read like the UN agenda and intimates that population control is necessary to avoid war in the nuclear age, but comes only one year after the [Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs](http://pugwash.org/), which marked the effort of prominent scientists, the high priests of modern times, to reduce the danger of nuclear war by seeking alternative solutions to global security threats, namely population control. That this is no coincidence but masterful planning is further indicated by the fact that the 1958 Lambeth Conference was organized by the only Freemason Archbishop of Canterbury the Anglican Church has ever had, before and since, Geoffrey Bishop, who held the office from 1945 to 1961.

The pro-contraception resolution of the Anglican Church’s 1930 Lambeth Conference was immediately echoed in the US by the Committee on Home and Marriage of the [Federal Council of Churches](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Federal_Council_of_Churches), an ecumenical association of protestant denominations that encompassed primarily Methodist and Presbyterian churches, which in 1931 called for family limitations and for the repeal of laws prohibiting the sale and use of contraception.[[6]](#endnote-6)

In a clear effort of trans-Atlantic coordination and Anglo-American cooperation, and again echoing England, the 1961 North American Conference of Church and Family held by the [National Council of Churches](http://www.nationalcouncilofchurches.us/) (NCC), an ecumenical partnership of more than three dozen Christian faith groups, did for America’s Protestants what the 1958 Lambeth Conference did for the Commonwealth’s Anglicans: lift all moral restrictions to the use of contraceptives. It even went a step further than their Anglican colleagues by urging reform of America’s anti-abortion laws. They did not however approve of sterilization.

By 1964 Asia’s Christian churches were also forced to face the question of birth control and did so at the East Asian Christian Conference in Bangkok, Thailand, where they too found contraceptives acceptable. Unlike America’s Protestants, however, Asia’s Christians did approve of sterilization and like Britain’s Anglicans they opposed abortion.

What the soul searching of Christianity’s clerics tells us about the role of religion in the methods used by secular authorities to combat overpopulation is this:

1. Clerics were asked to provide moral justification for birth control, thus for the individual’s actions with respect to procreation, so that governments could hide the rapidly decreasing fertility rates of westerners due to the use of covert methods of chemical sterilization (primarily fluoride) employed since 1950 (and in the case of Japan and the Baltic states since 1945) as part and parcel of the secret population control program chosen to serve as a substitute to war by the architects of the Global Depopulation Policy, the Allied Powers, who created the UN for this very purpose and who can be traced back to the eugenic movement which originated in France, Germany, Great Britain and the United States in the 1860s and 1870s.
2. Clerics were inducted into the depopulation lobby a decade after the program was begun by the military-industrial complex of the US, UK and the USSR, the three Allied Powers, at war’s end and quickly succumbed to the ideology of death and morally submitted to material realities without considering or attempting to inform the public so that population control could be legislated.
3. Clerics have maintained the code of silence as full-fledged members of the genocidal coalition in order to advance their own economic interests, preserve their religious hierarchies, and secure their tax free status despite being fully aware of the immorality of their actions, the perversion of their doctrines, and the abomination of their betrayal in the eyes of God.
4. The *“incoherence and ethical superficiality”[[7]](#endnote-7)* of their deliberations betrays the clerics’ need to transcend their dated religions and their willingness to prostitute themselves in order to give secular authorities what they need. It also shows that their moral decrees are not informed by divine revelations but rather by secular considerations; otherwise they would do what they say and would say what they do. All nations needed contraceptives and all Christian denominations duly approved their use. Asian nations needed sterilization and the East Asian Christian Conference granted it. North America needed abortion and the NCC abided. Finally, all Christian nations needed permission from the highest moral authority in Christendom to prevent conception by pharmacological means under the pretext of healing an illness – code for chronically poisoning the populace with fluoride to prevent tooth decay – and the Vatican reluctantly gave them that permission and then hypocritically framed it in such a way as to allow itself to backtrack and to deny.

That all religious authorities of Christendom succumbed to the culture of death shows not that they are immoral. It shows that the conditions caused by overpopulation are so dire and the threats so obvious that man has no choice but to control his reproduction, this being the lesser evil. What is immoral is the failure of religious leaders to abandon dated dogmas and sacrifice self-interest to give governments clear direction to legislate population control and the populace the clear commandment to assume responsibility for it. For centuries they have assumed moral authority but are failing to provide it at a time in our history when we most need it.

Let us now look at the behavior of the world’s other major religions with respect to population control.

The largest monotheistic religion, Islam, poses a serious challenge to the depopulation lobby because it lacks a hierarchy. Without a leadership to convince to issue top-down decrees in favor of contraception, family planning and population control, the depopulationists are forced to educate (or, as some would [have it, indoctrinate](http://www.missionislam.com/conissues/popcontrol.htm)) thousands of imams individually so that they in turn can persuade the public that interfering with their reproductive systems to limit the number of children they have does not offend God but is absolutely necessary for peace and prosperity.

Paradoxically, resistance to family planning in the Islamic world is not rooted in any specific religious text, for neither the Holy Quran nor the sayings (Hadith) and acts (Sunnah) of the Holy Prophet expressly forbid it, but rather in the pronouncements of some religious scholars who argue that only God can decide the number of children a couple will have and that procreation is a religious duty.

But such arrogant presumption and its imposition on the faithful is unwarranted since it violates the moderate nature of Islam and its principle of permissibility, which states that everything is lawful unless explicitly stated otherwise in the Quran, Hadith or Sunnah. In other words, the hardliners hide their lust for power behind self-serving interpretation of Islamic law and keep their noses in people’s bedrooms to exercise more control over others, much the same as hardline Evangelists and Catholics. That they do it for self-serving reasons rather than misplaced piety was amply demonstrated by the cowardly silence all Muslim leaders have hid behind when I presented them with hardcore evidence that all their theorizing about birth control is utterly useless since secular authorities subvert their people’s reproductive rights through covert chemical and biological methods and the official family planning programs are just for show or at best to serve as a plausible explanation for rapidly falling fertility rates. Had they been genuinely concerned about violating the will of Allah, rather than engaging in vacuous posturing, they would have and should have been screaming their heads off with outrage. Instead they have remained as quiet as a mouse.

While all Muslims forbid sterilization and abortion, the practice of *azl* (withdrawal or [coitus interruptus](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coitus_interruptus)) is well established as an acceptable form of birth control and goes back to the time of Muhammad, which has led Muslim scholars to formulate only three conditions to other forms of contraception, all of which are entirely reasonable: (1) that the birth control method must be used with the consent of both husband and wife, (2) that it must not cause permanent sterility, and (3) that it must not otherwise harm the body.

In the only Muslim country where the sacred and secular leadership rests in one and the same person, the Ayatollah, the highest ranking Shia cleric and supreme leader of the Iranian state, covert depopulation methods via endocrine disruptors have been in full swing since 1986, when they were reluctantly approved by [Ayatollah Khomeini](http://en.imam-khomeini.ir/), and continued to be faithfully and ruthlessly applied until late July 2012, when the current head of state, [Ayatollah Khamenei](http://www.leader.ir/) – prompted by the publication of my article, [The Effects of Overpopulation on Human Rights](https://www.academia.edu/4828306/THE_EFFECTS_OF_OVERPOPULATION_ON_HUMAN_RIGHTS), which first appeared in mid-July 2012, and by my shortly thereafter published book, [Water, Salt, Milk: Killing Our Unborn Children](http://www.thesleuthjournal.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Water_Salt_Milk_-_Killing_our_unborn_children.pdf), and that expose covert methods of depopulation for the first time since their inception – declared Iran’s contraceptive services to be [“wrong”](http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/world/story/2012-07-29/iran-baby-boom/56576830/1) and ordered state authorities to slash all birth-control programs, thus reversing a 26-year-old policy that brought [Iran’s total fertility rate](https://www.google.ca/#q=Iran+total+fertility+rate) from 6 down to 1.7 children per woman in just 15 years, the fastest and steepest decline in the history of the [Global Depopulation Policy](http://real-agenda.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/KILLING-US-SOFTLY2.pdf).[[8]](#endnote-8)

Almost as swift was the reaction of Israel’s religious authorities, whom I addressed in mid- September 2012 with an [open letter](http://community.ejc.net/profiles/blogs/letter-to-religious-leaders-1?xg_source=activity), along with all other religious leaders, and who responded by putting pressure on secular authorities to terminate the fluoridation of the nation’s water supply. The announcement was made on 29 July 2013 by the [Supreme Court ruling](http://www.fluoridealert.org/wp-content/uploads/israel_supreme_ct_july2013.pdf), as a result of a petition submitted 12 November 2012, that the government must stop adding chemicals into public water supplies within one year.[[9]](#endnote-9)

That the state of Israel started to subvert their people’s reproductive systems as early as 1974, when it first passed regulation permitting fluoridation, and that it finally mandated it in 1998, can only reflect decisions made with the participation of its religious authorities.

Bound by the commandment to “be fruitful and multiply” and even more strongly by the commandment to “choose life”, Judaism’s Orthodox rabbis are as restricted as Catholicism’s priests in allowing the free use of contraceptives or in tolerating abortion, which they see as dangerous sectarian abominations.

In this vein, Dr. Zahavy, an Orthodox New York rabbi, declared in 1960 that population control by birth limitation was an *“absolute contradiction to the moral motif of modern faith”* and *“anti-Godly”* when practiced on a *“communal scale”* as it *“negates a basic principle of the divine creative process upon which modern religion operates.”* *“By what right”,* he asks, *“does this generation take upon itself the task to decide who may propagate and who may not propagate?”*[[10]](#endnote-10)

Judaism abhors causal abortion but sanctions it in cases where the mother’s life is at stake, thus only for the gravest of reasons. Abortion for population control is therefore repugnant in Talmudic law.[[11]](#endnote-11)

With respect to birth control the Halachic view (i.e. according to Jewish law), which is heavily influenced by the story of Onan in the Book of Genesis, considers hormonal contraceptives preferable to barrier contraceptives because they do not prevent the semen from travelling its natural route. This interpretation seems to be accepted by Orthodox, Conservative and Reform branches of Judaism, though they vary in the strictness of its application. An orthodox rabbi presents the issue as follows:

*If there is a medical risk in pregnancy, or the woman is mentally ill, or she had a couple children one after the other (year after year) and she is weak and ill from it, then the best is to delay relations till after 20 or so days from the last period. In descending order, the next best, is the pill; then the spray, IUD, diaphragm, and in very extreme exceptional cases of health problems - a condom - (source: "Igrot Moshe" by R' M. Feinstein), E.H. II, 74). [[12]](#endnote-12)*

Furthermore, a man may not resort to contraceptives, abstain from procreation or get sterilized until he has fathered a child.

Talmudic law did not prevent Israel’s rabbis from tacitly allowing the state of Israel to employ covert methods of depopulation. The speed with which Israel has reacted to my warnings on covert methods of depopulation, however, seems to indicate that only a few rabbis had been coopted by the depopulation lobby and that the rest were kept in the dark.

The far greater culpability and deeper involvement of Christian religious authorities in the Global Depopulation Policy then is the case in Judaism and Islam is made clear by the West’s universal refusal to change course and abandon covert poisoning of its populace, as well as by the nastiness with which Christian authorities persist in collaborating with western secular governments to continue to hold my children hostage and me destitute until such time as, they hope, I will succumb to their genocidal system.

The judgmental ethic of monotheists with respect to issues of sexuality and their strict commandments against contraceptives and abortion are not shared by eastern religions: Buddhism, Hinduism, Taoism, Confucianism and Sikhism.

Eastern religions do not have established doctrines about birth control and therefore accept all contraceptive methods but consider abortion the worst. The discourse on birth control in Asia is thus primarily dominated by environmental rather than ethical issues.

Furthermore, it does not appear that Asia’s religious leaders have any clue about the covert methods of population control used by governments and that they indeed may never have been consulted on the matter by their secular authorities.

If they have been consulted on population control, China’s One-Child-Policy and India’s coerced surgical sterilization probably reflect the moral attitudes of the religious leaders of each respective nation quite well. But I very much doubt that China’s political leaders would want to share their decision making power with their nation’s weak and rather unimportant religious figures. Just as I doubt that India’s political leadership would have risked taking tens of thousands of Hindu priests into confidence with respect to coerced surgical sterilization, which is India’s method of choice for combatting overpopulation.

The Dalai Lama’s muddy pronouncements on population control reveal superficial knowledge and his ethical relativism seems willing to go along with anything secular authorities decide – in whose lap he places responsibility for population control entirely, therefore washing his hands of it.

During a [June 2013 visit](http://canta.co.nz/features/the-dalai-lama-visits/) to the University of Canterbury he stated:

*The real point of ethics is a sense of concern for others' well-being and respect for others' rights. These are the basics. We are social animals. Ethics means something good for oneself, for society. Something beneficial to others. There is no absolute. Everything is relative.*

He is commendable, however, for his willingness to at least vaguely and gingerly discuss the subject publicly to empower other religious leaders who are more constrained by their creeds to do likewise. In a 1993 New York Times [interview](http://www.sacred-texts.com/bud/tib/nytimes.htm) he stated:

*Question: To change the subject, you have spoken, as few religious leaders have, of the dangers of global overpopulation.*

*Answer: Well, the population problem is a serious reality. In India, some people were reluctant to accept birth control because of religious traditions. So I thought, from the Buddhist viewpoint, there is a possibility of flexibility on this problem. I thought it might be good to speak out and eventually create more open space for leaders in other religious traditions to discuss the issue.*

This however does not exonerate Asia’s religious leaders, be they Buddhist or Hindu, from personal responsibility for the crimes committed against innocent civilians by nations around the world in the name of the Global Depopulation Policy given that they have failed to provide much-needed moral leadership, acknowledge my plea and heed my warnings and that they have yet to make any public statements to restrain secular authorities or to prime the populace to embrace legal methods of population control and assume personal responsibility.

The cruel and disappointing reality is that not one of the world’s religious leaders defends life. Not one speaks the truth. All our religious leaders have become a part of the culture of death, some as active participants and others as silent partners. For the time being, I am the only moral authority left in the world, for only I speak the truth to defend life.

What is truly astounding about the lack of moral leadership across the world’s religious landscape irrespective of faith is that many of the worshippers they presume to guide through life are far ahead of the clergy in their understanding for the need of population control and in their acceptance for the use of birth control. Instead of the horse pulling the cart it is the cart pulling the horse, which begs the question ‘are the world’s religions obsolete if they cannot provide guidance on the one existential issue that so urgently demands it?’

The natural order of things is a lot of births and a lot of deaths, the one balancing the other so that population stays stable. But this natural order was disturbed by science and technology and all technocratic attempts to restore it have not only failed but produced additional and greater problems.

Because man has no enemies it is man that has been man’s predator, which is why men have been killing one another throughout the ages. No other species is its own predator or acts as its own containment unit. Only humans do this.

Exercising self-control over our reproduction brings us a step closer to living in the image of God. It allows us to solve conflict at its source by controlling our urges in the here and now for our own sake, for our children’s sake and for the sake of planetary wellbeing. This understanding is God’s latest revelation to man. But clerics and scientists have both monopolized this latest divine revelation for their own ends, even though many average men and women have also received this revelation, as have I, who am neither a scientist nor a cleric.

The universal call for tolerance and the widening dialogue for interfaith unity are the two promising changes I see in the world of religion today. But they are not enough. What we need is a fundamental extension of morality based on the latest divine revelation that to live in the image of God we must restore the balance of life and death for that is the secret of harmony, and that the only way to do it justly and humanely, is if we all assume that power and wield it as individuals rather than vest it in a single authority, be it religious or secular, which by necessity would have to become a force of evil to balance and equal our combined runaway force of good.

Praying together once a year , as was done at the World Day of Prayer for Peace in Assisi, Italy, on 27 October 1986, when for the first time in history 160 religious leaders from 32 Christian and 11 non-Christian faith groups came together, is not enough. Professing mutual respect and tolerance for each other’s religious traditions is not enough. Apologizing for past ills and present failures is not enough. For none of these praiseworthy gestures will save us from self-destruction.

No single religion on earth today has attempted, let alone accomplished, the fundamental extension of morality that history and material realities demand from us. Yet this very failure provides us with the opportunity to accomplish this extension of morality together and at the same time and in so doing unite the world’s religions into a single, whole and living faith and heal all our wounds.

Our new and common faith is not one of rituals, rhymes and rules and of wishful salvation from God, but one of reason, love and action and of active inspiration by God. We now understand more of God’s nature and must embody this understanding in our actions and thoughts and in our behavior towards each other, towards creation, and towards the unborn.

What we do in life does echo in eternity. So let us do what is right.
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