

Smashing The Da Vinci Code

Sam Fryman

Though our regular readers may be aware that we have already commented upon the so called “Da Vinci Code”, in our earlier work *An Innocent Person’s Guide to the Da Vinci Code*, and though we stand by everything we have said there, we are going to confess that we made an error in underrating just how deep this phenomenon was going to go and how broad its agenda truly was.

Thus, those who *have* read our earlier work should not be “turned off” from reading this one, as we are not going to merely repeat the same material once again, but are going to broaden the issue to what is known as *the sacred feminine*.

Firstly however we want to point out a few things that the average reader will not likely have had the time nor energy to consider, burdened as most of us are with a near slave state of work and responsibilities in this current needlessly oppressive modern society.

The key element of this Da Vinci Code theory is that it suggests that Mary Magdalene was the wife of Christ and the Christian church has been in denial and suppression of this fact, to keep “Patriarchal religion” in place.

Well, let us perform a *what if* on this theory, that is playing *Devil’s Advocate*.

Let us suppose that Christ did indeed whether officially married or not have “a love relationship” with Mary Magdalene.

(the [Share International](#) Maitreya site incidentally, whom we have suggested may be the true harbingers of Christ’s “second coming”, flatly deny this as nonsense, saying Mary Magdalene was merely a disciple of Christ which confirmed our earlier opinion which *preceded* this announcement of theirs).

That would not make Mary Magdalene any more important in the establishment of any religious organisation that followed Christ, any more than anyone really cares about the personal ideas and writing aptitude (apart from *the feminists* no doubt) of *Shakespeare’s wife*, Anne Hathaway.

Equally, supposing they had a son or daughter – who cares which, it makes no difference – that does not necessarily make such a person the equal of their father, any more than Beethoven’s or Bach’s or Einstein’s or soccer genius George Best’s or Pele’s son or daughter is the equal of the genius of the parent.

Religious or spiritual “succession” is not remotely necessarily any kind of similar phenomenon or parallel to earthly succession of royals and kings.

Indeed history has proven conclusively even in the case of royalty that the sons and daughters of kings and queens and emperors are often not remotely as capable as their parents.

Even in the case of our modern kundalini “prophet” Gopi Krishna, he had several children, who though no doubt above average in intelligence, have not shown the genius of their father and show no signs of making any similar mark upon history.

So that there is some “bloodline” relating to Christ such as the Merovingian mentioned in this Da Vinci Code, has no *religious* or *spiritual* significance whatsoever.

In Hindu India once again, nobody would vaguely assume that the line of “succession” from one guru to another would be based on such a hereditary link.

For example, the Maharishi, who brought *transcendental meditation* to the West says the knowledge was handed down a long line of “Masters”, few or none of whom were blood relatives, but on the contrary had to maybe search the whole of the land or go up into the Himalayas to seek out the previous member of this succession whom they were to follow, who was likely some holy or wise man whom they had never seen nor met.

The same is true in the case of the Yogananda story as in the free-to-read-online *Autobiography of a Yogi* we have elsewhere mentioned.

We can never tell where genius is going to come from.

Annie Besant, one of the leading members of the Theosophical Society, in the early 20th century plucked famous philosopher and “guru” J Krishnamurti from some remote Indian town at an early age out of a family of eleven children as a flea-ridden boy, whom she brought back to England and groomed to become “the World Teacher.”

But instead of becoming her puppet, he started teaching in a way that neither she nor the Theosophical Society had imagined he would, by in fact denying the value of all organised religions and saying that the quest for freedom had to be essentially a personal one, devoid of any kind of indoctrination of beliefs.

Thus many *scientists* found some kind of bond with him, for his insistence upon a wholly rational approach to “spiritual” or philosophical thought, devoid of any kind of blind belief.

However, in the case of Dan Brown, author of *The Da Vinci Code*, we find a wholly different yet superficially similar process of rise to fame.

That is, he also had a female mentor, Blythe Newlon, whom he eventually married – a woman twelve years his superior in age incidentally, which most men would think *more than twice* about doing – who took him from the position of a failed songwriter and pop singer to being this internationally famous best selling novelist, who made a number 12 listing on *Forbes* magazine’s top 100 most influential celebrities, at which time they estimated his annual income to be something like \$76 million per annum.

(you know, just look at how you can be paid a fortune, how you can be rich beyond your wildest dreams, how the devil will promise *and* give you the whole earth, should you only be willing to bow down to him *or her*)

But unlike J Krishnamurti, *a purveyor of truth*, on the jacket of his 1994 work *Angels and Demons*, Dan Brown credits and thanks *his* female mentor Blythe Newlon “for being my tireless co-writer, co-producer, second engineer, significant other, and *therapist*,” rather than developing a separate authentic identity of his own.

So as we see is so typical of modern life, we have *woman as therapist* being dominant over and directing the man, yet another role-reversal, just as the book itself attempts to do a role-reversal on the whole Christian tradition.

(incidentally, this woman had with Dan Brown co-written a book *187 (Kinds of) Men to Avoid: A Guide for the Romantically Frustrated Woman* – I mean, how many kinds of men can that leave??? – one of whom was any man who had written self-help guides for women as indeed your author has done – *An Innocent Woman’s Guide to Men* – which implies really doesn’t it, that *men are not allowed to counsel women*; yet amazingly this bizarre early Dan Brown effort which seemed to contradict itself as co-written by a man therefore, was written under the pseudonym *Danielle Brown*, and thus we see the utter hypocritical and mixed-up logic of this husband and wife writing team from the outset, as symptomatic of *what was to follow*).

If readers doubt our interpretation of the nature of their relationship, we will just quote from the following UK Observer newspaper article of 12 Mar 2006:

“He [Dan Brown] had even recorded a song about telephone sex and another with a sado-masochistic overtone called ‘Sweet Pleasure in Pain’, which has certainly raised some eyebrows about the nerdy guy and his powerful wife.”

And later in the same article:

“Throughout *The Da Vinci Code*, Brown holds up the notion of the ‘sacred feminine’ and omnipotent goddesses. His heroine, cryptographer Sophie Neveu, is brave, sexy and assertive – to be played by Audrey Tautou in the forthcoming film. And the confection that Mary Magdalene was Christ’s wife and that her remains represent the Holy Grail has Brown’s hero Professor Langdon, to be played by Tom Hanks, crumpling in awed submission at the end. Brown’s last line says it all: ‘With a sudden upwelling of reverence, Robert Langdon fell to his knees. For a moment he thought he heard a woman’s voice... the wisdom of the ages... whispering up from the chasms of the Earth.’ ”

Thus we see here firstly the most unashamed feminism with “omnipotent goddesses”, “brave, sexy and assertive female heroes”, and the male “hero” of the novel crumbles in awed *submission*, feels an “upwelling of reverence” which makes him *fall to his knees* and imagines he hears a woman’s voice which the author states as synonymous with “the wisdom of the ages.”

Please bear all this feminist propaganda in mind as we proceed.

Another part of the “evidence” given for this most grandiose of conspiracy theories, that is used to draw the unwitting would-be reader in, is the notion that Leonardo Da Vinci had this “secret” about this alleged marriage of Christ to Mary Magdalene, which as we have explained, is pretty much an irrelevance anyway.

That is, if Christ had wished to make Mary Magdalene the first pope, *he would have said so*, he would not have made *St Peter* the rock upon which his Church would be built, as *all* the accepted gospels report.

St Peter and the other apostles were *chosen on merit*, just as the Maharishi was accepted and taught *on merit* by Guru Dev, as the story goes.

(you know, give it another ten or twenty years, and if this feminism carries on, they will be claiming Mia Farrow or some other woman the Maharishi is alleged to have “fondled” as the true inventor of transcendental meditation, and the female genius who developed its world wide popularity, and find (or Photoshop invent) some picture showing the Maharishi with Mia Farrow beside him *as evidence* – that is likely the order of sheer nonsense that this Da Vinci Code is attempting to peddle on the world population, and sadly *so far* somewhat successfully).

But let us consider this painting, *The Last Supper*, that is being used to suck the unwary, spiritually desolate, bored, and likely female or female-enslaved reader in, which alleges that the disciple John whom is supposedly beside Christ is actually female, and is *Mary Magdalene*.

Well, firstly, if we look at Leonardo’s *faded*, over *five hundred year old mural*, which had so deteriorated was described as having unrecognisable figures by Leonardo’s biographer in 1556, *just sixty years after its completion*, we see that it is *no kind of evidence at all*, and indeed if one looks at the unrestored version, St John looks no more female than does Christ himself.

For example take a look at

http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/504271_john.html

which to the author suggests that the *restorers* have been extremely mischievous and have misrepresented the original intentions of the artist.

For apart from the almost unrecognisable figures, which may have been restored in a way totally unlike the original painting, we have to consider Leonardo’s own personality and motives.

In doing that, we should make a very serious observation that virtually nobody ever bothers to do in this regard:

LEONARDO’S PAINTING OF THE LAST SUPPER IS ENTIRELY A WORK OF IMAGINATION, AND DOES NOT NECESSARILY HAVE ANY BEARING ON OR RESEMBLANCE TO THE REAL LIFE LAST SUPPER OF CHRIST AND HIS DISCIPLES, AT WHICH DA VINCI WAS NOT ONLY NOT PRESENT, BUT WHICH HAPPENED FIFTEEN HUNDRED YEARS EARLIER.

You know, Dan Brown and his apparently co-writer wife, are using *a work of imagination* to base their theory on.

But of course, the cunning thing is that they are saying Leonardo only did this – alleged inclusion of Mary Magdalene – because he was privy to this great secret that some secret order or other had, this so-called “Priory of Sion”, which itself is also regarded by many as a complete hoax.

But even were we to accept the restored picture as correct, and this “Priory of Sion” nonsense as true – which we *don't* feel there is adequate grounds to do in either case – if we look at Leonardo's religious art in general, as with so many artists, we will note that he is at times *mischievous*.

For example, there is a famous cartoon by him in the British Museum which shows Mary and Jesus with St Anne and her child John the Baptist, pointing her finger up towards heaven, as an explanation of this *virgin birth*, and there is mockery in this picture, it might be given the caption: *As if! You must be joking!*

(it is possible to find this cartoon by entering the words “Leonardo cartoon” into a search engine image search such as Google's)

There is also a similar painting of the adult John the Baptist with this same mocking smirk pointing up to heaven.

There also seems to be fairly substantial evidence that Leonardo may have had homosexual tendencies, in which case “role reversal” would come naturally to him.

For example, there is no record that he ever married or had children, he expressed open distaste for the sexual act, and he seemed to be unduly fond of a very handsome young male companion whom he travelled far and wide with.

So that he should make of one of the male apostles *a woman* should come as no surprise to us, even though we doubt he did that in any case.

Equally, even if we accept that the picture shows Mary Magdalene beside Christ, why would that necessarily have any significance?

For example, once again, few people will know that the painting is immovably fixed upon a wall in a convent. He may have simply placed the female or sexually ambivalent apostle there, whether Mary Magdalene or not, to appeal to the sentiments of the nuns of the convent, who would no doubt be delighted to be able to identify with a female figure sitting next to Christ.

So we freely admit these alternative explanations are all *totally speculative theories*, and we would not remotely ask the reader to believe in any of them, *as Dan Brown and his followers are doing*, yet they appear to us equally or more likely than the conclusion that has been used as the basis of this Da Vinci Code.

But we are not making any claim of truth, just pointing out that to take such flimsy data, lost in the mists of time, and try to make any *sound* case out of it, is a master class in perverse hoaxing bar none, whose only beneficiaries as we explained in our earlier writings on this topic, are either feminists or those libertines, criminal exploiters and suchlike virulently opposed to the traditional Christian Church, aside from obviously the now fabulously rich Mr and Mrs Dan Brown themselves, the true “Emperor’s New Clothiers” of this villainous piece.

But we were still a little puzzled about the degree of the venom of the attack on the Catholic organisation known as Opus Dei, which perhaps ultimately is the last line of defence of *real religion*, meaning that which actually tries to put Christian principles *into practice*, rather than merely going to Church on Sunday and living very differently in moral terms for the rest of the week, as most people do.

For we asked ourselves what was to be gained by this further destruction of the Christian religion, which it is clear had already been undermined in numerous other ways, such as the constant allegations of immorality and child molestation against priests, and thus vast numbers of Westerners in particular already regarded more or less as nonsense and a joke.

And then we saw a recent UK TV Channel 4 documentary called *The Sacred Feminine* which attempted to use Dan Brown’s material in support of its cause.

In this program, one comparatively young lady was shown carrying out a “Wiccan” ritual, called “the Great Ritual”, and this Wicca practising lady on the documentary explained that *the Great Ritual* was actually *sex*, the union of the male and female sexual principles which resulted in the creation of life.

And due to the fact that the Christian church has been long opposed to these kinds of practices, it became clear to us that rather like a Roman Emperor’s “Pretorian Guard”, that as the last line of defence of traditional Christian religion, Opus Dei is made the subject of attack.

For this lady alleged that symbolically this “great ritual” was revealed in Dan Brown’s work as “the ritual of the grail and the dagger”, at which point with the unwitting reporter in her bedroom, after saying some kind of words of mumbo jumbo she produced a very dangerous looking dagger and proceeded to put it into a kind of chalice.

Well, really, we would suggest to all male readers and even sane female ones that playing around with daggers in the bedroom is really not a good idea, and we would guess that likely any man whose woman produced a dagger in the bedroom would if he had any sense be making quickly for the door.

But the broader point is, in this scientific age, should we be descending into all these middle ages types of rituals at all, as these kind of pagan belief systems would have us do?

Of course not. It is ridiculous, and as with this ritual with the dagger, is potentially dangerous, as are most of these black or arguably even “white magic” rituals, because

they are encouraging us to bow down before false authorities, and cast our commonsense to the wind.

As we have elsewhere pointed out, all this seeking for powers and use of “rituals” is an exercise of *the seeking of the powerless for power*.

For example, if instead of us being called John Wilson, average nobody living in Nobodysville, we create a cult and we call ourselves *Grand Magister Wilson, he of the Glorious Cosmic Countenance* or whatever, we develop this feeling of *empowerment*, we can strut around in ridiculous capes or robes, and put a crown on our head as if we were a king or whatever to hide the fact we are *nobody* – as indeed most of us are – behind this illusion of being *a somebody*.

Likewise with women. If instead of us being Mary Jones, an average nobody of Cabbageville, USA or wherever, we can say, I am *the High Priestess Mary-belle of the Divine Cult of Isis* or whatever.

(and you know, as we are *a high priestess*, just one step away from *the goddess*, you mere ordinary mortals, and in particular *men* should bow down before me)

So we can then perform all kinds of “sacred rituals” and make sacrifice to the Divine Mother Goddess and so on.

And you know, if we follow this kind of *madness* to its ultimate conclusions, eventually these self-deluding people will be demanding that we *all* kneel before the Divine Mother Goddess etc., in order to assure themselves that their grandiose and deluded fiction is real.

For to them we must say as did the wonderfully acted part of Boris Balkan in the movie *The Ninth Gate*, when entering the assembled crowd of “devil worshippers”:

Mumbo jumbo! Mumbo jumbo!

We are well aware that some readers have considered our discussion of *kundalini* mumbo jumbo also, but we have given them one or two *scientific experiments* to carry out in this connection, for example detailed in our work *The Scientist and the Guru*, in order to at least give them some reason to suspect that *such is not the case*.

For as we have explained previously, the whole world is really going via so many of the “New Age” pseudo-religions into a warped kind of spirituality which leaves aside the fundamentals that Christ, Mohammed, Buddha, Confucius, the author or authors of the ancient Chinese book of wisdom *The I Ching*, the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali and all the true spiritual teachers have always focussed on – i.e. *moral philosophy*, as summarized for example in Moses’ *Ten Commandments* or Christ’s law of *treat thy neighbour as thy self*.

But this New Age *mother goddess* worshipping religion is generally speaking not concerned with this essential topic of *personal reformation*.

For most women now, and the feminists in particular have had a very serious gripe with *men*, and the word is that *God is some kind of man*, and therefore *the enemy from the outset*.

Therefore this “outdated” Bible God with his commandments *has got to go*.

At least, *the male god*, that is.

For though many of the feminists would have liked to see religion removed from human thought altogether, after they realised they still had this irritating problem of *death*, when they wanted their egotism and vanity and hate and misery and envy to continue into eternity, they thought up the strategy of making God into a *woman*, or rather as we have said a *Mother Goddess*.

Of course, this Mother Goddess was not at all like the old fashioned Masculine God, who demanded that you follow his commandments and so on.

Oh no – this Mother Goddess they invented would let you do whatever you liked – at least *She* would let *women* do whatever they liked, but likely impose all kinds of savage punishments on men, not only for disappointing and abusing women and children, but *just for existing* really. But *She* cares about *women*, which is the main thing, and Her form of caring is really summed up by about one single commandment:

Indulge yourself.

(or as Aleister Crowley put it, *do what thou wilt shall be the whole of the law*).

You know:

If it feels good, DO IT.

The more sophisticated and intelligent women feminists, do of course go in for all this New Age stuff, which mostly *they convert into a business*, you know, like Tarot Reading, Astrology, Feng Shui, “Spiritual Healing”, “clairvoyance”, “past life regression therapy” and “colour therapy” and so on and so on – they are the modern *money changers in the temple* whom Christ drove out, but *have returned* – but in the end when they have extracted the money from their naïve victims, with the proceeds they just return to the same old commandment of:

Indulge yourself – bathe in sensual and vain pleasure, babe. You’re a wo-man, and don’t it feel so good babe, and you know what, we don’t need no men at all, sisters are doin’ it for themselves nowadays, babe. And we don’t want that evil old child molesting weirdo God tellin’ us what to do no more.

Christ came, following on from Moses with this concept of *one God*, rather than all these perverse idols from bygone ages of ignorance and savagery, some of which these “Mother Goddess” advocates cite statues of as evidence of her existence; but then just because ignorant people worshipped fertility goddesses, no doubt under the pressures and desires from women who were not respected or powerful because they

had no children, does that mean that modern scientifically educated men and women should return to worshipping and bowing down before these primitive icons and idols also?

It is obviously a regression to a “blind belief” system, and thus cannot be considered as the activity of a mature intelligent modern mind.

All this is simply being invented by discontent women and their puppet-like male supporters like Dan Brown, who presumably due to poor or abusive relationships with their fathers or other men in their lives – like the female psychologists we pointed out in our earlier *How the Feminists Stole Psychology* – have rejected the concept of maleness and male authority altogether and are attempting to replace it with a female kind.

They want to persuade all us men to join them in their worship of the “Mother Goddess”, the “Sacred Feminine”, which of course is worship of *themselves* by proxy.

Their *reward* for us if we will together with them bow down before the feminine principle is “the great ritual” of *sex*.

“I am “the great mother”, little boy, come hither into my “queendom”, bow down before me, and enjoy the pleasure that is divine union *with woman*.”

Well, for those of us males who have had this “divine union with women” we can report to those others in any doubt that it is rarely if ever *divine*.

Sex generally speaking is overrated as an experience, it is merely in the final analysis Nature’s irresistible trick that ensures that we reproduce.

Please consider *logically, rationally*: though we don’t mean to be unnecessarily sexually overt or crude here, in what way do we imagine that the experience of having an orgasm or ejaculating is any different when our sex organ is inside a woman’s body, as opposed to stimulated by our own hand or whatever?

It is only different to the extent that we *may* become more excited by her body or desire for us, and that we are possibly – though not necessarily – stimulated in an unpredictable way *by her*, which likely any suitable *male* sex aid could do for us just as well or better, should we be so desperate; and whatever else we think is happening during the sex act is *purely in our mind*.

That the sex act is absolutely the pinnacle of existence and virtually the only reason for living for men is a lie put about by the feminist dominated media and pornographers who *wish to dehumanise and enslave us*.

We are made to feel like second class citizens if we are not getting sex from a desirable woman, but again, this attack on our pride is just another means to enslave and dehumanise us, to make us subject to women’s authority and power.

And as to so called “sacred sex”, there is no mystical revelation in the sex act whatsoever, we cannot find *any* kind of personal freedom, let alone *the divine*, by

surrendering our ego and whole identity to another imperfect person, and those men who have had any substantial experience of women, will know by now that – let us put it kindly – few or none of them are any more divine or perfect than men.

But in stating such a line, we will of course have committed *sacrilege* in the eyes of all these women wishing to be worshipped, which only confirms how *undivine* they really are, spitting fire and vitriol at such criticism, more like devils than angels, to perform a verbal “role-reversal” on Dan Brown’s earlier work.

The point being overlooked is that *we are evolving*.

Christ and other prophets such as Moses before him came to put an end to all this blind worship of gods and goddesses like the whimsical and often thoroughly immoral Greek and Roman ones.

Their outlook was therefore *superior* to all these primitive and sensual cults like those of Bacchus who worshipped wine and performed orgies and so on.

You know – just imagine Catholic priests and Nuns performing their ceremonies and duties naked. It is laughable and ridiculous beyond belief.

One of the principal reasons for wearing clothes is the in most cases very necessary and socially desirable function of *keeping our selfish sexual nature under wraps*.

(e.g. so if men get erections in public looking at women with short skirts or whatever, at least nobody notices and is therefore offended by that).

Please don’t tell us that one can attend such events with naked women dancing around or whatever, and expect no male is going to get sexually excited.

So where does the Da Vinci Code relate to this?

Well, we find according to the online version of *USA Today* magazine speaking of Mrs Dan Brown, the former Blythe Newlon:

“It was *her* idea to include concepts of the sacred feminine and the holy bloodline theory, which contends that Jesus and Mary Magdalene married and had a child.”

As no doubt it was likely her idea to try to demonise Opus Dei as a bunch of mad perverted fanatics.

So it is clear this has nothing to do with religion *per se*.

It is the same old feminist gripe of envy and hate of the male, wishing for women to be worshipped as if they were goddesses, when they are just ordinary human beings, just as are men.

Why is Christ’s message of *love thy neighbour as thy self* not enough for them?

That is, if women want to consider God as female, as long as they are following his or her commandments, you know – *the same ones* as Christ's and Moses' – then *who cares?*

But it's because as we have explained, they very much are *not* following those same commandments, but rather they are using *worship of the feminine*, or *the sacred feminine* or whatever to glorify the concept of femaleness, of female sexuality and so on, that we take issue with them.

But as regards the desire that women have to be worshipped, as we see expressed for example in the last line of this Da Vinci Code, we will offer them a *true means* to being worshipped – in a legitimate sense – if that is what they wish.

For in this Da Vinci Code, which focuses so much on Mary Magdalene, whom the rumours say was either a reformed prostitute, or a woman from whom Christ cast out several demons, we hear so little do we not about the mother of Christ, the so called *Virgin Mary*, whom Christian women of former eras to this feminist one had worshipped and taken as their ideal and *role model* for generations.

Whereas now we see that women in their millions are being encouraged to follow a very different *Madonna*, that is *the pop star*, who from the very beginning of her career has shamelessly used her sexuality to promote herself, her first big hit being *Like a Virgin*, who was *touched for the very first time*.

i.e. her first major hit was about *the first sex experience or defloration of a virgin*, who then as she explained was not so *shiny and new* anymore.

(and you know, if men want to buy a car that's *shiny and new*, then how can they honestly say they wouldn't prefer a woman *as girlfriend or wife* who was the same, contrary to all the propaganda coming from the female dominated media of course, that tells us that it doesn't matter, and offers even young girls sick and corrupting mantras like – *so many boys, so little time?*)

So we see that women have been in the space of just a few decades *converted* from following the ideal of *the Virgin Mary*, to following *Madonna*, with her more or less pornographic book carrying naked photos of herself and general use of images and ideas of kinky sex and so on.

In short, we see that the role model that our modern society is offering to the great mass of women has been changed *from Madonna to whore*.

Well, if women truly want even *respect*, let alone *worship*, we would suggest that they return to the ideal of the *Biblical Madonna* as per the *Virgin Mary* – full of fidelity, devotion to children, care for the sick, and pure and selfless love, rather than desiring to be a high priestess of the cult of Isis or whatever, or worshipping and emulating power and publicity hungry icons like the modern sexually overt pop culture *Madonna* and her numerous imitators.

For Madonna has herself unsurprisingly dabbled in this New Age nonsense, and is currently busy trying to save Africa by adopting a black poverty stricken child, as if it were that easy.

(We would not actually criticise Madonna's efforts, which apparently include financing an orphanage, if we believed she would be a good *Madonna* to her *child*, but then who of us in our right minds would really like to have *Madonna* for a mother?)

But all is not lost – for example a former leading feminist icon, British authoress Fay Weldon this week in promoting her new book, has confirmed almost our exact words from our earlier works *A Men's Liberation Guide to Women* and *An Innocent Woman's Guide to Men*, on the subject of sex differences.

Now in her relatively old age, she has said that she considers the only route to happiness for women is *virtue*, as in Aristotelian terms, which she pointed out in her new book called *What Makes Women Happy?*

So as to *The Da Vinci Code*, in a recent work we suggested that there might one day be a new Microsoft operating system or piece of software so clever that it does an automatic keyword search study of the Internet, statistically analyses the results, and writes a best selling novel for us based on that, upon the publication of which we become rich.

Well, we think that such an unlikely computer program has been preceded by Mr and Mrs Dan Brown.

They have thrown a lot of enticing ingredients into the pot based on what is currently grabbing people's attention – the sexual role-reversal promoted by feminism, religious fundamentalism, conspiracy theories, power mad religious cults, perverted sex, Sudoku (the puzzling mania aspect) and so on – and made a “devil's broth” out of it, stealing the most iconic piece of art in history, *The Mona Lisa*, for its cover, and its most famous genius in history (apart from perhaps Einstein) creator's name *Da Vinci* for its title.

Apparently they even put some kind of genuine code cracking puzzle on the cover of the book, for which one lucky winner or another was given a considerable cash prize on TV.

It is a *business success* and marketing marvel bar none.

Whoever thought all this heap of fabulous illusion up (i.e. as we have been told, *Mrs Dan Brown*) – some or much of which they say is also not surprisingly stolen from an earlier novel *Holy Blood, Holy Grail* as is typical *business practice* – we have to give credit as *a marketing genius*.

The minds behind this religious con of epic proportions could indeed sell refrigerators to Eskimos also, we sincerely believe.

So the only remaining question is – now we know *the real truth* behind this utterly bogus “Da Vinci Code” – i.e. as a means to smash the last vestiges of the Christian Church and replace it with some kind of feminist “Mother Goddess” kind of “religion” – are we also going to take our ice cubes on holiday with us to the North Pole?

For the truly laughable thing is that they are actually advertising the recently released DVD version of The Da Vinci Code movie now under the slogan “*exposing the greatest cover up in history*” – whereas as hopefully even our most doubting reader can now see, what we are really seeing in this allegation of Christ marrying the (take your pick) formerly mentally ill woman or reformed *whore* – as if it really mattered anyway – is likely the greatest *con* in history, they are trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the masses and even “intelligent” people with, who have bought this time wasting piece of fantasy and misinformation in their countless millions (over 60 *million* book sales to date worldwide, translated into 44 languages – unbelievable!)

This is the great irony of our age, and why the world is ready to blow itself to pieces – the donkey is placed upon the throne – you know, *the one with the cloven hooves* – and like the infant Christ, the true king is consigned to the donkey’s stable.

We thus suggest to every thinking person in the world to not give this piece of feminist anti-Christian, indeed *blasphemous* propaganda one more single second of your attention, and by spreading the word about what shameless and baseless baloney this more appropriately named “*Da Vinci Cod*” really is, not let these pseudo-spiritual hucksters and hoaxers make a jack ass out of any of us ever again.

Also by the same author

A Mens Liberation Guide to Women 4th edition

An Innocent Woman's Guide to Men

How to Meditate

Kundalini - Preventing the Apocalypse

A Mens and Womens Liberation Update

The Myth of the Teenage Rebellion

What Is Intelligence?

Kundalini - A Personal Experience

Feminal Farm - a short satirical novel

The Innocent Persons Guide to Law

Understanding Female Sexuality and Porn

Freedom of Speech & Maitreya

An Innocent Persons Guide to the Da Vinci Code

How the Feminists Stole Psychology

Hearing Voices and Psychic Phenomena

The Psychology of Soaps

Is Competition Necessary?

On Drugs and Alcohol

The Importance of Thinkers

The Demonisation of the Innocents

The Psychology of Prejudice

Science and Fear

The Scientist and the Guru

Respect for Age

A Waste of Paper

Saying No to Peer Pressure