

An Innocent Persons Response to “The Da Vinci Code”

- by Sam Fryman

In a media world full of conspiracy theories, *some* of which just statistically speaking must undoubtedly be true, just what are we to make of this latest piece of “factional” material which seems to blur fact and fiction to the degree that nobody can any longer sort the truth from the lie, in this most controversial and heady cocktail of allegations, myth and pure fantasy rendered first into an internationally bestselling “novel” and now a super-hyped blockbuster movie starring the biggest drawing Hollywood stars like Tom Hanks?

For those who are expecting historical and theological answer to that question however, we wish to tell them immediately that such is *not* our purpose here.

Rather the question we are going to answer is – what exactly are the reasons why this sudden almost unprecedented obsession has been foisted upon an unwitting and mostly uninformed public at this particular time in our modern social history?

In answering that question, we are of course in danger of ourselves drifting into the process of manufacturing “conspiracy theories” of our very own.

So therefore let us ask ourselves first – *as is seldom done* – what exactly is a “conspiracy theory” anyway?

Clearly, “conspiracy theories” are always about *control* and *power*.

For example, if some unscrupulous business entity or corporation wishes to make a profit by doing something which may damage the environment, for example, the pollution of a terrain or dumping of toxic waste, as depicted in the Steven Segal movies *Fire Down Below* and *On Deadly Ground*, they will create some kind of “cover up” to stop the public and the relevant environmental authorities finding out what they are up to before it’s too late.

So then when some little *not powerful* person, such as an employee finds out what the company is up to, gets a guilty conscious about being involved in something evil or wrong, and tries to “blow the whistle”, the nasty people *in power* try to suppress this *truth*, and instead call it *a conspiracy theory*.

They do that normally by threatening, bullying, ridiculing or in the extreme case even *murdering* the “whistle blower”, the motive being in every case to *silence* he, she or they who would *dare* to speak the truth and upset the plans of the nasty, greedy and evil ones.

But in Western society in particular it has now become difficult or impossible to *un-suspiciously* murder or even silence the would-be “whistle blower”, except perhaps in the most serious of government cover ups connected with major international events like the Iraq war, and thus the main tool that has been used is *ridicule*.

That is, *discredit the person* so that no one will take seriously what he or she says, even if it is totally factual and one hundred percent twenty-four carat, solid gold truth.

And thus, the very term *conspiracy theorist* has been used as a largely negative label to place upon anybody who has dared to speak out against the status quo, and has made to seem more or less equivalent to “crank”, “nut”, or any other insulting term to place upon a person who is to be regarded by society as deluded or even of unsound mind, as depicted for example by Mel Gibson in the movie *Conspiracy Theory*.

But let us remember the truth is that there *are* some genuinely deluded and crazy people in the world, who for example like some “mental patients” believe they are Napoleon, Queen Victoria, Henry VIII or some other famous person from history.

If there is such a thing as reincarnation, some of these claims might even be true, but of course, like the Da Vinci Code novel itself, the whole of religious and spiritual thought, including the concept of reincarnation, is now itself regarded as a conspiracy theory, and as still a large proportion of the six billion or so people on our planet are regarded as having some kind of religious or spiritual belief, then surely the sanity of all such is now regarded with suspicion.

Above all, the mass of people have been made to fear what are known as “the religious fundamentalists”, particularly of the Muslim and Christian variety.

Scientists such as Professor Richard Dawkins have led an attack on religion in general, describing it in a recent documentary as the poisonous and deadly “virus of faith.”

So let us not at this stage ask whether this is a good thing or not, that is – to stamp religious thought and belief out of the world permanently.

But let us instead look at what *the effect* of this book and movie of now *very rich* author Dan Brown’s is on society.

1. It casts further doubt and *ridicule* on the established Christian Church and the Bible in general, including bringing into disrepute the organisation known as “Opus Dei.”
2. It advances the cause of feminism by proposing that the Church has denied the importance of the role of women, in particular by denying the alleged marriage to Mary Magdalene and her equally alleged daughter, who once again was allegedly supposed to be the true head of the Church and not St Peter, the first “pope.”
3. Its deliberate and elaborate mixture of fact (e.g. the actual *existence* of Leonardo Da Vinci and presumably Christ himself) and fiction, and its absolutely incredible advertising and distribution programs, have ensured that this subject has now gripped the minds to a lesser or greater degree of almost everybody in the entire Western world, especially those to whom “faith” and “religion” is an issue, either positively or negatively speaking, *thus keeping their minds off the bigger issues in society like starvation, poverty, torture, weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and war.*

Now none of the above is a “conspiracy theory” – these are *facts*.

That is firstly, the idea that Christ was married to Mary Magdalene and therefore *sexually active* who in “the authorized version” of the Bible was depicted as a disciple whom Christ “cast seven demons out of”, clearly mocks the conventional view and lowers the esteem of Christ, as if he was “the Son of God” he must surely be above an ordinary man’s sexual weaknesses and needs, mustn’t he?

Secondly, anything which says women are greater than has formerly been believed – for example, supposing it turns out that Shakespeare’s plays

were all written by a woman, as some feminists allege, furthers the feminist cause, so the idea that Mary Magdalene was not a prostitute, but Christ's most special and closest devotee, and even sexual partner, is clearly to put women on a higher plane than the Bible depicts her as, with its emphasis on "the fallen woman" whom Christ and religion has to "save."

Then thirdly, the *fact* that countless million Westerners are current obsessing on this Da Vinci Code, which in the final analysis, is just a lot of irrelevant theological speculation, not provable one way or the other, because *we don't have the facts* – which as usual, are long lost in the mists of time – then of course the inevitable consequence is that these same Westerners hypnotised by all this Da Vinci Code (likely) nonsense, are obviously unable to put their minds to the issues that really matter such as mentioned above – war, terrorism, crime, poverty, weapons of mass destruction, the breakdown of the family, etc.

Of course, that is a general *effect* of Hollywood and the entertainment industry in general – to keep our minds of the dark unsolved issues in society while the powerbrokers take all the vital decisions without us much noticing or caring, lost as we are in our illusions and pleasures.

So please not, we have not talked *conspiracy theory* as yet, because conspiracy theory like any crime requires *motive*, and we have not yet discussed *motive*, but merely *cause and effect* in a purely logical and rational way.

e.g. if a person is reading the Da Vinci Code book (cause), he or she is not therefore *logically* spending that same time and mental energy reading the works of David Icke or Gopi Krishna or whomever.

So up until this point in the discussion, we have not dealt in founding any "conspiracy theories" of our own, that is, indulged in *opinion, speculation*, but now we are about to do so.

However, as far as possible, we still intend to argue in terms of *fact*, and of *cause and effect*.

The problem with conspiracy theories tends to be dispute of what the conspiracy theorist regards as "facts", which most people are not in any position to verify.

For example, David Icke argues that there is this body of powerbrokers behind the scenes known as “the Illuminati”, and unless we accept this *premise* it is difficult to accept a great deal of the rest of what he says.

This is not to either condemn nor approve David Icke. Your author accepts he is simply not in any position to confirm or deny much of the material in some of David Icke’s works, but is just using his theory of “the Illuminati” to illustrate a point.

For the major “revelation” of David Icke’s work appears to be that the “secret rulers of the world” are *very organised*, and there is some kind of grand “master plan”, rather than just the loose coalition of very greedy, powerful and selfish people *undeniably visible* before our eyes, or reported in the newspaper and media reports.

Your current author’s view is that the greedy people are *not* organised in *an outward sense* as he will show in due course.

But as they say, “the devil knows his own”, so that those who are already in power tend to appoint people who share the same philosophy as themselves, so a natural coalition of “the evil” exists, just as those whom we would call “the good” tend to feel a natural affinity for one another.

Not that we should pigeonhole everybody or indeed anybody into these black and white extremes, as we are all somewhere in the middle, yet *gravitating principally towards one pole or the other*.

So now let us return to the points regarding Dan Brown’s work and the movie based on it that we have already made and elaborate upon them.

Firstly, as we have said, this book is *casting doubt* on the Bible. If any major aspects of the Bible are in doubt, such as the alleged omission of the marriage of Christ to Mary Magdalene and false depiction of her as merely a disciple from whom Christ had “cast out demons” is surely to cast doubt upon *the entire gospels*, and indeed, the Bible in general.

This is not to say that the New or Old Testaments are totally factual – for if we weren’t there ourselves, *which nobody alive was*, then *who can say?* – but the point is, ultimately this puts the whole of Western Christian religious belief on trial.

For if Christ was married, and the book didn’t tell us, then how can we be sure that the miracles were not fictional, or that the resurrection ever

happened, or that the “Ten Commandments” of Moses even were anything more than the fictitious ramblings of some ancient “incarnation” of Dan Brown?

So now we get to the issue of *motive*, and thus we enter the ground of “conspiracy theories.”

That is to say, your current author alleges that there are two major groups of “bad people” who are out to wreck the world for everybody else apart from (and even including ultimately) themselves.

- a) the Feminists
- b) the Capitalist oligarchs (i.e. big chiefs)

But unwittingly, millions of others, to some extent inadvertently even *all of us* are assisting them in one way or another, even if we think we are not.

That is, when we buy, read or watch Dan Brown’s book or the movie, we are in fact unwittingly taking part in this plan of destruction of society, if only in a small way, by

- a) losing our minds in fruitless and ultimately frustrating and inconclusive and irrelevant mystery hunting while we ignore the serious issues in a world that is going (literally in many cases) to pot
- b) joining in with the massed ranks of voices seeking to deny the “religious” and therefore aiding and abetting the descent of the world into a materialistic, egocentric, hedonistic, pleasure obsessed modern version of “Sodom and Gomorrah.”

Please note, by the *religious*, we do not mean blind belief in the resurrection or “Virgin Birth” or the alleged Biblical miracles like the parting of the Red Sea by Moses and so on.

What we mean, is that there is some kind of *spiritual goal* for mankind, some kind of destiny that will truly make him (and her) rise to the status of an “angel” rather than a beast, and *please note*, that *there are rules and regulations to lead him and her along that path.*

And in that last italicised fragment of the sentence, we alleged here – call it a “conspiracy theory” is you wish – is the real reason behind *the popularising of this novel and movie, the so called “Da Vinci Code.”*

Furthermore, it is yet another process in the destruction of “paternal”, “male oriented” religion, in which *the Father* is the main power, and its gradual replacement with a “maternal” or “matriarchal” kind of “spirituality.”

But we see this New Age “feminist spirituality” is rather different than the Biblical masculine type, with in the Old Testament, this angry male Bible God casting down fire and brimstone upon wicked people and so on, or in the New Testament even, this flawless loving Christ, who not only does not need to have sex with or emotionally depend upon women, as does our modern average man, but is above such “earthly weaknesses” and merely “saves women” without wanting to abuse them, as in his alleged casting out of demons from Mary Magdalene.

Let us speculate a little, without any pretence at knowing the real truth.

It appears *reading between the lines*, that Mary Magdalene was originally what we would now call *mentally ill*.

Especially in previous, but not too distant eras, millions of women were confined to asylums suffering from various “mental infirmities”, likely because women’s bodies and brains are *on average* more sensitive and complex in physiology than men’s, and therefore go into “disorder” more easily.

For example – *fact* – women *regularly* get serious mood swings due to menstruation and the menopause which men do not ever experience.

So imagine that Mary Magdalene was a very highly strung mentally ill lady, subject to the condemnation and primitive medical knowledge of those times, and along comes Christ, who somehow had a wisdom or a “spiritual force” – maybe for all we know indeed, some kind of visionary medical knowledge – and who cured her, made her well.

He as it were “cast out the demons.”

Not that we are denying “possession by demons” – *whatever that might mean*.

We are just saying, that such an extraordinary ability and great kindness, whatever the true cause of her malaise would have undoubtedly caused a great love, gratitude and devotion on her part, no doubt further intensified

by witnessing him performing other saving “miracles” for others also in distress both male and female.

So we therefore have a wholly plausible explanation (given we accept his “healing powers”) for Mary Magdalene’s constant presence in Christ’s life which has nothing whatsoever to do with marriage or a sexual relationship.

Indeed, if we look at modern intelligent women, we see that such *true* respect is accorded to men on a similar basis.

For example, several decades ago, in England, *The Times* newspaper reported a survey of young freshmen (women) at a Cambridge University college were asked what their ideal man was, and many said *Jesus Christ*.

Equally, British formerly feminist comedienne Joe Brand – now married with children – detailed in her satirical book on men *A Load of Old Balls* that she regarded Christ and Buddha as heroes.

So the message to men here, is that the vast majority of women do not actually *fundamentally* hate men, they just *hate what men currently are*.

They want men to see them as human beings and love them *primarily* in that way, rather than constantly demanding sex from them and obsessing on the female in a sexual way to an undue degree.

Again, this is not mere speculation, but based on a lot of “eye-witness” evidence and first hand “reports” and conversations your author has received and took part in, as well as the above media reports.

But of course, the serious man-haters and feminists don’t believe in the potential goodness of men, and likely the next book after the Da Vinci Code, will likely not only depict Christ as a married man, but likely – if they can get away with it – a child molester as well.

But let us try to resolve this issue *now*, before things get that far.

So we have pointed out that the feministically inclined women have got good reasons for wanting Christ “cut down to size”, and Mary Magdalene cast up high as some kind of spiritual icon, in the obvious advancement of women’s rights.

Incidentally, as a further small piece of anecdotal evidence, your author once – again, several decades ago – wandered unwittingly into what turned out to be a “feminist bookshop.” Inside, he found a whole section devoted to what the shelf title called “Women’s Spirituality” upon which he found copies of the I Ching and various other “New Age” materials.

So this is to say that these women were clearly identifying “spirituality” as a gender issue, something reserved for the more refined and superior beings on the planet, i.e. *women*, as opposed to all those beastly, violent and primitive sex obsessed “divine errors” called *men*.

So please note, how can we call “spirituality” – which surely must regard as equal in value women, men and all races – a matter to be appropriated by one sex or the other?

So a feminist’s answer to this question might well be: “ah, but men and traditional religions throughout history have done that very thing – placed women into the inferior role.”

Well, have they?

Because what is being a truly “religious” or “spiritual” person all about?

Is it about standing on the pulpit and spouting off, and everyone saying what a great sermon one gave?

Is it about being a cardinal or a bishop and wearing fine robes, or even in the clothes of a monk or nun, and everyone saying how holy you are?

That would not be *Christ’s* answer, or *Buddha’s* answer, we can rest assured.

If we look at what your author regards as the genuine spiritual texts as the I Ching (Richard Wilhelm translation) and words of such beings as Christ and Buddha, they always emphasise virtues like simplicity, kindness, selfless love, and modesty as being *the greatest spiritual qualities*.

The person like Mary Magdalene, who loves and is loved by Christ in a non-sexual way, is the person who is closest to him, and not necessarily some cardinal in rich robes.

But the importance of the Church, despite its corrupt façade of wealth, palaces, and sexually confused priests unnaturally denied wives, has been merely *to preserve the essentials of the Christian message*.

Surely, it is this Christian message of *love thy neighbour as thy self* which is important, and not some elaborate mystery mongering and concern over whether Christ was a man or a woman, married or not, and “which disciple was the greatest.”

So yes, men have been given “the place of honour” in most religions, including the Jewish, but that is merely *function*.

In the author’s view, the greatest person in the world is *a great mother*, because to do her job properly, she probably has to be the most unselfish person in the world. But on the other hand, if she creates a wonderful child, which no doubt will one day return its love to her in full measure, what greater reward can there be than that?

Which of us really wants to be the captain on a ship, and have all that worry, all those sleepless nights, thinking of the safety and welfare of the crew and passengers and ship, having nightmares about hidden reefs and icebergs, or would be rather be a happy passenger, relaxed and let someone else worry about the hazards and just enjoy the trip?

So to seek to occupy the place of honour – as women are now doing in all kinds of ways, even in “religion” as priests, is certainly about vanity, about pride, but it is really a thing that a wise woman would want to do?

Yet some of these ladies will say – “oh but if I am a woman priest, I can care so much for the people, guide them in a spiritual way.”

Well, why not instead be a doctor, or a teacher, or a good mother, and see if you can *succeed* at such a *real job* first, we would ask them in all earnestness?

And as to the other attack on conventional religion, as aided and abetted by this “Da Vinci Code”, we have the capitalists and materialists, who are really pretty much the same group whether high or low.

Conventional religion with its long list of THOU SHALL NOTS and its suggestions about “modesty”, “moderation”, “unselfishness” and so on, it clearly the enemy of capitalism and materiality, whose basic slogan in

GET YOUR NOSE IN THE TROUGH, or MAKE HAY WHILE THE SUNSHINES and so on.

Because if we don't buy all the goods in extravagant quantities that the capitalist society wants us to – understand, we mean all those sales reps and managers and big bosses who have to keep up the payments on their Ferraris and Rolls Royces and mansions – the capitalist system comes to a grinding halt.

If we aren't given slogans to pamper ourselves guiltlessly like “BECAUSE YOU ARE WORTH IT” and *obey them*, likewise, out capitalist system will come to a grinding halt.

So *religion* has got to go.

We can on the other hand be what is called “spiritual”, which means we buy a lot of books on Buddhism, chant mantras, stare at *mandalas* and *yantras*, do aromatherapy, Feng Shui and so on, so we can think of ourselves as “advanced beings” and “on a higher plane” but *without obeying the rules* like being kind and fair to our fellow man and woman and moderating our personal desires and possessions.

But we can't confront the people of the Western world who feel like gluttons and indulge in orgies of drink, gambling, drugs and illicit sex while the Third world slaves and dies in war to support the Western lifestyle, so instead we give them something for their empty and misguided minds to chew upon – e.g. *The Da Vinci Code*.

A part of this “plot”, this “conspiracy theory” which we have not yet focussed on is the drawing to attention in particular this kind of elite group of Christian “activists” called *Opus Dei*.

The Da Vinci Code has now brought this relatively little known group out into the open, and there has been a general depiction of them as capable of desperate acts, such as murder of opponents of their beliefs, which has little support in *known and commonly accepted fact*.

However, there is one well known MP (minister of parliament) connected with this organisation in the – she will not herself say if she is a member or not, but her brother is – who is currently the UK Education Minister, a rather young woman in her 30s named Ruth Kelly.

The point here, is that this Opus Dei has the mission of not merely “talking religion” on Sunday and ignoring it in our real life for the rest of the week, but of actually *putting Christian ideals* (as *they* see them) into one’s everyday life.

So for example, in Ruth Kelly’s case – whether or not she is actually a member, she must be at least *influenced* by her brother’s membership and her own acknowledged Roman Catholic faith – this has apparently had the effect that she has abstained in the parliamentary votes on policies the government has supported, such as gay rights and abortion issues which are against the generally accepted tenets of the Bible.

So again, for all those in society who wish to live without any constraints on their morals or human freedoms whatsoever, such people who are associated with organisations like Opus Dei, or even suspected of being so, are *the enemy*, cannot be tolerated.

And the media is largely dominated by people of this kind, who might call themselves “libertarians.”

For example in England, we have a renowned screenwriter of BBC television dramas called Andrew Davies, who amongst more serious dramas like Charles Dickens’ *Bleak House* makes spicy TV adaptations of novels like *Tipping the Velvet* (featuring near nude lesbian love scenes) and *The Chatterley Affair* (a semi-fictional dramatisation of the D H Lawrence *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* obscenity trial, including a totally fictionally devised adulterous love affair between two jurors).

Freedom in the eyes of these “libertarians” is very largely tied up with *sexual* freedom. That is freedom to have as much sex and with as many partners of the opposite gender or even his or her own

For most of us – speaking on behalf of men at least – that kind of sexual freedom does sound like a paradise of sorts.

However, there is only one problem with it. Few or none of us can have that kind of sexual freedom without wrecking society, because it makes us a threat and enemy to our fellow man.

Some will argue, justifying their ideas with theories like Darwin’s of “survival of the fittest” that this is merely natural, it is up to the individual man to use his wits, cunning, social standing and physical prowess to bed

as many women as he can, whether they are “free” or even someone else’s girlfriend or wife.

This is not a rare event in Western society, but a very common one.

And how can we even have “friends” in such a society, when if we are male, our male friend is secretly hoping to seduce our wife or girlfriend, or if we are a woman, if our woman friend is secretly hoping to seduce our husband or man friend?

Of course we cannot.

So this principle of “survival of the fittest” which is all that is left when *religion* is taken out of the equation, cannot coexist with friendship, peace and social harmony.

Every child must be taught, and every adult must accept that they must limit their desires to have a *civilised* community and society.

But the “libertarians” and “anarchists” who promote *total freedom* do not see or accept this, and as their philosophy is now dominating society, we have a very troubled society and world.

For this greed not only resides in sexual behaviour, but also in acquisition of material goods, so that most of the Western nations now consume vast quantities of natural resources in comparison to the non-Western countries, and sadly the non-Western countries now wish to emulate the Western ones and will eventually experience the same chaos or worse, just as has overtaken Russia since the collapse of the former Soviet Union.

So we are saying that to spend one’s time puzzling over the detail of the Da Vinci Code is really a futile effort, as it’s true purpose is just to corrupt and confuse society further for the reasons we have explained.

It is a major assault and desperate attempt by those in the media and behind the scenes in the capitalist and feminist worlds, to demolish the crumbling edifice of “faith” altogether, in particular to keep those of a religious inclination such as the Opus Dei people, from actually *doing* anything about the state of the current society.

Apparently, according to the Opus Dei official website, the depictions of self-flagellation and so on in the movie, bear little or no resemblance to

modern practices, though your author feels that it is time to put spirituality and religion on a proper scientific footing, as he has explained already in his various books on kundalini, most of which are based on the works of Gopi Krishna.

So does this seem like conspiracy theory the reader is here being offered?

This accusation of a kind of feminist-capitalist-libertarian conspiracy, designed to bring religion down?

Well, unlike David Icke, your current author is rightly or wrongly not claiming such a campaign against religious or spiritual values is particularly well organised, just as criminal gangster gangs do not generally all march to the same tune, but are rather rivals.

But generally speaking, we have a society in which the more ruthless and those with inherited wealth get into power, and they appoint those to position of influence, they support the publication of the books and distribution of the movies and so on, of those who would *support the status quo*.

That is, the privileged and rich quite understandably want to stay privileged and rich rather than share things out more, and the privileged famous, such as celebrities, quite understandably want to stay privileged and famous, while the rest of us live and die in obscurity.

So is all this some kind of conspiracy theory?

Well, it is time to put some *evidence*, and the evidence the author wishes to place before you is a clear indication, and almost astonishing in its content, in supporting the very points we have been making, and no doubt if he or she keeps his or her eyes open, the reader will easily find far more of the same to support it.

This is the verbatim content of the words of a British writer and comedian named Ben Elton, before an audience including Princes Charles, William and Harry, delivered as a kind of “stand up comedy” routine, yesterday before a British TV audience of many millions (likely around 10 to 15 million) in a 30th anniversary celebration of a charity set up by Prince Charles, called *The Prince’s Trust*, which seems a good charity set up by Prince Charles with the interests of the young at heart.

But please, listen to this amazing “stand up comedy routine” which the clearly witty and clever Mr Elton delivered before the British Royal Family, a live and TV audience and your astounded author.

EXCERPT FROM BRITISH TV – BEN ELTON SPEAKING AT THE PRINCES TRUST 30TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION ON 20 MAY 2006.

“The monarchy – as I was saying, the subject of the monarchy – now there’s one aspect of it I do have a problem with. This whole “defender of the faith” thing. Prince Charles has already said he wants to make it “defender of faiths.” Which sounds reasonable, I think that’s OK in a multi-cultural society but personally, I think faith gets enough defending as it is. Don’t you? It’s like any old bigotry and intolerance – it’s all right as long as it’s somebody’s faith...Fatwas, female circumcision, Creationism! There are people in America going to court to force schools to teach Genesis as fact – that God’s built the world in six days. Haven’t these people ever been to Ikea? I reckon the judge should stick them in front of a big pile of flat packs and say – that is a child’s desk and bedroom unit. “You’ve got six days. Build it! There’s a flippin’ Allen key.” It takes six days to get it out of a shop in Ikea!

The new creation theory incidentally is called “intelligent design.” These fundamentalists say “consider the awesome beauty of the female...the, the human form Check out its incredible complexity. How - they argue- could such a thing of wonder and beauty possibly be the result of evolution as Darwin and indeed *all the evidence* suggests. Surely, such a thing could only be the result of such an intelligent design?

Now for me, all the evidence points in *exactly the opposite direction*, because if the body is the result of Natural selection, then it’s pretty awe-inspiring – almost enough to make your believe in God! But if somebody’s designed it...then, there’s a few questions I’d like answering.

Like for instance, which brilliant designer ordained that the only erection that a man can absolutely guarantee he’s gonna get is the one first thing in the morning which is no use for anything except weeing on the ceiling. Intelligent design? I don’t think so.

What about reproduction? Consider it, OK? Go on - here’s the designer working out his designs at the dawn of time, right, for reproduction? Well, you know, I thought we’d start off with a man and a woman, you know? We’d get the seed from the man, the egg from the woman, put ‘em together, grow the baby inside the woman, what do you think, what do you think?

Well, it’s not bad. You know, I suppose it has a certain beauty and logic. Although, quite frankly, if you are starting from absolute scratch it would be easy to pick babies off trees or dig them out of the back garden.

But OK. Let’s run with it. So the baby’s inside the woman. So, how are we gonna get that out then? How’s that gonna be? What? Little door in the stomach? It is coming

out that way? OH – though the fanny! (i.e. rude slang for female sex organ, or vagina). Oh, it's gonna come out of the fanny!

Hang on a minute! Can I just check the designs for the fanny...the designs for babies...little bit of a size difference, isn't it? Oh...the fanny's going to stretch...I see...or tear...fair enough...

It's strikes me that whoever did this designing, may not be intelligent, but he's certainly A MAN!

(MOSTLY FEMALE LAUGHTER)

It was always the girls who got the special treatment eh?

It's morning in the garden of Eden, and God's pitching his designs to Eve – “oh, you're gonna love this! OH, I surprised even myself with this one – it's my best yet! I'm calling it MENSTRUATION. Alright? And for a week, every month for forty years you're gonna have stomach cramps, hot and cold flushes, you're gonna want to knife everyone you meet, and...your fanny's gonna bleed. What do you think?” (LAUGHTER).

I'll tell you what I think...I think schools should stick to teaching Darwin, now that would be a faith worth defending. All right?

And now...(APPLAUSE)...OH....a little bit of politics! You've been lovin' it weren't you?

But now...we need a little bit of rock and roll...so now...a man who has personally sold over 17 million records....the first single for three years...but it's been worth the wait...this guy is great...it's Ronan Keating!

(APPLAUSE and SCREAMS).

EXCEPT ENDS

So is this not an absolutely amazing piece of mass propaganda?

This chirpy cheeky cockney comedian, tells us that Creationism is rubbish, and mixes this up with sympathy for women's issues, more or less disproving the idea of an intelligent creator, on grounds of “cruelty to women.”

He also mentions the male morning erection, saying it couldn't possibly be the product of an “intelligent designer”, but without the vaguest awareness of this being – as your author has explained in his other works – a sign of nocturnal kundalini activity, and not always anything to do with sexual dreams or a need to urinate, as your author can confirm from

very long personal experience as no doubt can countless millions of other men if they care to observe themselves carefully and systematically.

So what were this man's motives?

To mock religion – especially of the “fundamentalist kind”, including a direct attack on the modern Muslim concept of Fatwa – which incidentally your author does not agree with, but neither does he agree with insolence towards religious leaders or prophets – and of course to ingratiate himself with *women* and thereby maintain his status and fame by consolidating the status quo.

And the motives of Dan Brown are not it seems, judging by the content of the works – alleging greater status for Mary Magdalene, lower status for Christ as sexual man, and attacking Opus Dei as a politically pro-active “religious organisation – are more or less the same.

And we see Mr Elton finished his comedy routine by saying “what we need is some rock and roll...let's join together and worship this multi-million selling pop star.”

Forget God. Forget Christ and the Bible.

Worship women's sexuality. Worship rock and roll.

Has your author written a conspiracy theory?

He doesn't think so. He thinks it's all fairly evident cause and effect (except for the *kundalini* which not enough people have adequate *personal experience of*, but they could try reading Gopi Krishna's works).

Underlying these denials of religion and faith and morality, and demanding total freedom from any moral restraints, is not the love of life and liberty and pursuit of freedom that these “libertarians” claim.

What is underlying it all, as in the case of the feminists, is not desire for freedom, but *hate*. Contempt for what is pure and good.

Contempt for moral authorities like Christ and the Prophets, and respect for secular authorities like our corrupt governments and big business leaders.

For as Ben Elton himself said later (again as “joke”) – “people have said, you are doing this bit of service for the Princes Trust just to get a knighthood. And I said – no way – if I wanted a knighthood, I’d go about it the proper way. I’d just buy one off Tony Blair like everybody else does.”

Is this conspiracy theory?

The verdict is yours.