

# THE RIGHT COVENANT WITH GOD

Preface :

30 years ago we wrote a book on the Gnostics and our conclusion after studying them, was that the psychological state of mind and body of the individual determines his concept of a good or a bad God.

If the individual lives in a Third World country

with misery and overpopulation and dictatorships and diseases,

he will think by a natural way that God is bad.

But if you live in a rich country where life is wonderful and you make money and you enjoy all the gadgets that the current technology supplies, you , without any doubt , you will never think on God,

as the atheists use to do,

or perhaps sometimes you will think on Him as very good with you.

The psychological state of your mind and your body is so important,

when you think on God as good or bad,

that 30 years ago I left the studies on Gnosticism, unable to

research on them further from this conclusion.

Now I have found a way to exit from the blind alley where I stopped 30 years ago.

The way is simple, so simple that I wonder why I hadn't thought about it before.

This is the way to develop further Gnosticism:

we must think that God is subject ,

like the humans, to depressions and euphorias, that He is cyclotimic as many other men,

that He spends days when he is happy with Himself and His creation, the universe,

and he spends days when He is very doubtful about Himself and His creation

and even thinking that He is a fake and a bad god,

a bad imitator of an Upper Pure Light God,

as the Gnosticism believes.

God is subject to many psychological changes, according on how is going His universe

with all its inner processes, physical, chemical, subatomic, radioactive...

Some days His universe is running well and ordered and other days His universe enters into a chaos and catastrophe,

as when a galaxy clashes against another

or when a black hole sucks everything around him.

God experiences phases of good humour and hope and other phases of depression, melancholy and despair.

When things go well in His universe, God is good,

and when things go awry, He turns to be bad and mean.

We are translating a lot of human characteristics to God, we know, and scholars like Lluís Duch forbid to do it, in what he calls the abuse of "anthropocentrism" in theology when we fit in God many human characteristics.

We disagree with Lluís Duch.

We think that the only reason why the religion exists is because men have compared themselves with God,

since the days of Stonehenge and before.

This is what it means a religion:

to look after some kind of relationship with the creator.

The first generation of religions, the primitives religions of cult to the Sun, the Moon, the Earth, the woman, the horses, the bulls, the spirits,

were followed by a second generation of religions, such Hinduism, the Greek religion, Judaism and the germanic and scandinavian religion,

where the gods had human characteristics and the way how the men of those times related with the gods

was by sharing the same flaws and witts with their gods.

So there is a "reduction to Zeus" since the ancient Greeks which can be applied in all time,

a " reduction to Zeus" where whatever problem that we face when thinking in how could be God,

is reduced to imagine that God has our exact same characteristics,

and that when a man wants to be famous and powerful, it is , according to the Ancient Greeks, because he wants to become a god.

For Judaism, men are the image of God, so all of our flaws and traits must be too in God, at a due scale.

Jehovah is good or bad, lavish or jealous , cruel or avenger.

To the German religion, Odin- Wotan is the strongest warrior, the wiser and a builder and a destroyer at times, good and bad.

In Hinduism , Shiva is too a builder and a destroyer at times, good and bad .

In those religions of the second generation

( considering as the third generation those sincretic religions such Christianity, Buddhism and Islam )

their gods were imagined as just humans but bigger and stronger.

They had the same flaws, diseases, thoughts, ambitions, vices and successes than the humans, but at its own cosmic scale.

Zeus was a rapist, a liar, an unfaithful husband, a bisexual lover .

The other Greek Gods had their own lot in faulty behaviours.

The god of the Gnostics is a blunderer, a bad apprentice, a bad imitator of an upper god,

a too proud creator of a faulty universe

because he is an ignorant

that there is another upper god above him.

His universe is bad, plenty of traps and problems.

The god of the Gnostics follows that tradition of setting on God all the human behaviours.

In fact, the same Zeus or Odin-Wotan could be the god of the Gnostics , as they were very flawed beings.

If we translate to God all the human characteristics,  
absolutely all of them,

we should translate to Him too,

all the diseases which happens in our world,

from those caused by microbes

to those caused by chemical disorders in our body or  
defects in our genes.

So God must suffer too diseases, and those diseases must  
happen in His universe.



It would be an interesting mental exercise to imagine how could be,

the more than 3.000 diseases known by our human medicine,

at the God's scale:

chemical disorders in planets and galaxies, degeneration of matter, defects in the basic information cell of the universe, other beings attacking His universe...

We should imagine too that all the parts of our body, absolutely all of them,

have a correspondece in God's body,  
the universe.

So what would be the kidneys of God ?

Or His heart ?

or his neurones ( some say that the Jews are the neurones of God, as the Jews have gathered all the information about God in their holy books ) ?

or what would be the liver of God ?

We must remember than in Old Greece and Rome and

along the Medieval ages,

it was traditional for the medicine of that time to relate parts of the human body to the parts of His universe.

So God suffers too bad days of sadness

and we resents them here in our planet ,

as all the humans know that to live in this planet means to suffer good and bad days,

epochs of fat cows and other epochs of lean cows,

years of natural disasters and years of good harvest,  
centuries of peace and centuries of war,

love and hate come and go as Empedocles said.

Our life in this planet , as stated in many traditional sayings of many countries since ever,

is a never secure ship where everything can happen,

nobody is safe

and the political changes

and the weather changes

and other changes can come suddenly without warning.

We know about ourselves than we are faulty, plenty of vices and weaknesses,

the same Bible in its books of wisdom relates all the vices of the jews,

we are liars and thieves,

ambitious for political power and for money,

we are bad with some people

and friendly with other,

we are racists with some but we welcome others.

As men know very well how we are, we imagine that God must be the same way,

because we feels here in this planet the good and the bad days of God.

God do suffer pain and pleasure,

jealousy and bias,

fancies and the effects of His same physical laws

, and it explains why here in this planet we act the same way,

as we are a copy at scale of God.

The chiefs, the military leaders, the dictators, the tyrants, the kings , the managers, the presidents of big corporations tend to think :

if they are good and bad according to the day or the time, it is because God is so too,

and

they justify their behaviour by saying that they are just " instrumens of God in this planet " or Gods in this world.

Most kings have justified their acts by saying that they were " god's servants " .

The worst criminals of History have felt that they were acting like God, the greatest criminal ever.

And at the same time those human kings had their good days too when they showed their best face to their country with speeches about their love for their country and its countrymen and his will to improve it.

They were acting like God, a God good and bad at times.

The same do the managers at the factories ,

they can be good or bad

according to the benefits of the business

or the state of the economy in the country.

They can be good or bad according to their sympathies  
towards some employees

and their ill feelings against others.

The authoritarian father thinks the same way.

He can mistreat and boss his wife and sons and  
daughters saying :

" because life is so,

good and bad ,

pleasant and painful ".

The gangster kingpin thinks the same way,

his henchmen can be rewarded or punished according to  
his will or fancy,

according to if he is happy after a good booty  
or if he is unhappy by a failure in a robbery.

And he justifies himself saying :

"life is so and so,

God acts the same way I do".

For the old Hebrews,

it was necessary to propose to God a covenant,

by which if the jews worshipped Him in due way and if the  
jews were good people,

God would be good with them

and Israel would enjoy long periods of prosperity and  
happiness.

Will Eisner tells it with his own style, in his comic-book  
"Contract with God":

the good jew expects that God will be good with him if he  
acts good all his life,

since his childhood,

but one day a disease kills his daughter and he considers

that God has not fulfilled the hirement with him,  
and he turns since then a bad person.

Will Eisner "Contract with God"







The covenant or hirement with God cannot be one of this kind,

as we know that God suffer periods of good and bad will, like us.

So the right covenant with God

should be one of this other kind,

which by other way is the spontaneous agreement that most people sign with God, consciously or not:

"WE humans we sign an agreement with God by which we accept His changes of humour,

His fancies, His pshycological problems, His bad mood when he is sick or suffers some problem or deffect,

and we accept the influence of all His behaviours in our planet,

the same way we have done in the past millions of years,

facing the good and the bad times,

the richnes and the poverty,

the diseases and the health  
as they come and go, as usual. "

This should be the right agreement between the humans  
and God, accepting Him as how He is, with all of His flaws.

The Gnostics never accepted a flawed God  
and they died waiting for the coming of the other Upper  
God.

They were wrong, they should have signed an agreement  
with this flawed God ,

by which we accept Him and His flaws.

But rebellion also happens.

The old Greeks rebelled against Zeus by creating a human  
which had developed to its most extreme possibilities,  
his human strength and mental abilities.

It was Heracles, who was not a god but a half-god,

a human who had tried to develop to its limit all the human capabilities,  
his physical strength overall.

Heracles rebelled against a flawed Zeus and he began a lot of works to change this planet,  
to suit the human needs and interests  
and not Zeus' ones .

Heracles changed the flows of rivers, populated lands,  
ruled better other countries, visited other shores and  
brought their primitive dwellers to a new epoch,

Heracles symbolized the man who forgets God and wants  
to turn this planet a garden and a paradise for the human  
needs.

All the scientists, technicians, researchers, engineers,  
are Heracles,

as their ultimate purpose is to change this planet,  
and thereafter His universe,  
to transform it into a safe place for the humans.

The rebellion follows in our days,

with thousands of scientists researching in all the fields of science,

at many universities and medical centers of the world.

But Heracles degenerates easily , like God,

and he can be builder and destroyer too at times,

good and bad with his family,

it teaches us that when a man wants to become an Heracles,

he can imitate too the worst parts of God,

as when an imitator of an artist imitates too the worst things of that artist.

Heracles was not other thing that a man gifted with as many characteristics of God as possible,

and he suffered too the ups and downs of God , by sharing with Him the same troubled psychology of God.

The rebellion can take place too by other way:

Herman Melville was wrong when giving to the white whale, Moby Dick, the symbol of being the bad God himself.

IN FACT, MOBY DICK ONLY WAS ANOTHER CREATURE  
OF THIS WORLD

AND SHOULD NOT BEING USED BY MELVILLE AS A  
SYMBOL OF THE BAD GOD.

THE OCEAN IS BY FAR MUCH MORE DANGEROUS AND  
OVERWHELMING THAT MOBY DICK

AS A SYMBOL OF THE BAD DOD

AND MELVILLE SHOULD HAVE KNOWN

THAT THE OLD GREEKS HAD ALREADY THOUGHT ABOUT  
IT ,

WHEN CALLING THE OCEAN :

POSEIDON.

Poseidon was the Greek god of the sea and he was very  
angry at times or very peaceful at other times.

No other element simbolizes better the power of God that  
the ocean amidst a hurricane.

The many ton heavy masses of water can sunk easily  
whatever man-made ship

and the same man cannot survive in the sea for more than some hours before dying of hypothermia and exhaustion.

Man is nothing as compared with the immense ocean, itself a symbol of all His universe where man can die so easily.

Poseidon was the perfect image of a god, for the Ancient Greeks, with his changes of mood, a God who could be good and bad at times.

So Melville was wrong when calling Moby Dick the symbol of God,

Moby Dick was in fact just another creature of His creation fighting to survive.

Captain Ahab should have rebelled, then, against the ocean and not against Moby Dick.

But if you want to change the ocean into a safe place for humans,

you must first find a way to control the weather and thenafter you must build a lot of artificial islands everywhere to shelter the castaways of the maritime disasters.

One day it will be real.

An ocean filled with artificial islands where nobody could die drown.

And the following step after filling the oceans with artificial islands,

will be to fill all His universe with safe satellite - islands where the humans could shelter,

after finding some way to control the processes which happen in His universe and which do harm humans. .

It means hard dreaming and science-fiction for us the humans of the XXI century.

But according to Anselm of Canterbury, everything which the humans can think or imagine or dream, will be real some day.

If we can think on God as the greatest thing ever, it must exists as such.

If we can thing on some utopia or new invention, it will be real some day.

Just remember or how Godel, Turing and Neumann



imagined computers, informatics and internet about 100 years ago, and how now they are real.

It seems that History is a process, very slow indeed, by which humans conquer, step by step and grade by grade, at the price of huge efforts and toils,

this planet and later His universe,

changing it towards a different universe re-made to the human needs.

Utopias, dreams and imaginations lead this process called History ,

and according to Anselm of Canterbury,

we will always imagine or think or dream

some new step or utopia or invention

which we would need or fancy,

and some day that new utopia or invention will be real.

We are a machine which thinks on utopias ,

but we cannot imagine utopias for the year 40.000 , it is impossible for us,

we can only imagine utopias for the next century, taking as faulty models the present systems of economy and politics,

and imagining better systems for the future.

We can propose new inventions and utopias only from the current ones after realizing their faults,

so we advance very slowly , by grades, each grade being an outdated system or technology.

The writers of science-fiction are unable too on imagining political systems or new inventions for the century 50.000 , they can only imagine new utopias or technologies from watching the flaws of the present ones.

If Anselm of Canterbury said that we can think on God as the greatest

and that He must be the greatest

or otherwise he shouldn't have the perfection of being the greatest in our mind,

we can think too on God as being bad or faulty and subject to psychological ups and downs,

because we observe His effects here in our planet and because we suffer the same psychological problems than God.

If we can think on God as a psychological patient, it means that it can be possible that God be this way.

The Gnostics never thought about it,  
they just wanted to get rid of that bad God,

but we have find a way ahead in our research on  
Gnosticism, after 30 years of stagnation,

by saying that God must suffer too the same psychological  
processes than we humans we suffer, because we can think  
about it.

And Anselm of Canterbury said that if you can think about  
it,

it can turn real , soon or later.

If you can think that God is so faulty and problematic as  
we the humans are,

it must be AS WE SAY ,

or otherwise He wouldn't be related with us at all.

And we should think, like the dualists, that God has  
nothing to do with the humans

and that there is no possible relationship with Him,  
in no way at all,  
as He is so different from the humans that there is nothing  
to compare or to relate with him.

This is the usual creed of the materialists.

But if you accept , like Anselm of Canterbury, that our  
thinking is related with God's thinking

and that our thinking determines how is God,  
then you must accept that God is the greatest one,  
because we can think it,

**AND IF HE WASN'T THE GREATEST BEING, WE COULDN'T  
THINK IT,**

and **WE CAN THINK TOO** , that God is so faulty as we are,  
because we can think it.

Anselm of Canterbury was , in fact, a follower of the  
European barbarian tradition, coming from the old  
Germanic religion,

by which Anselm imagined God as the greatest and  
strongest warrior, Odin-Wotan,

and Anselm was , as a barbarian, a very ambitious man, always desiring new things and objects which his mind could think or dream...

like the always unsatisfied barbarian of Schopenhauer , always frustrated because his will demanded incessantly new objects of desire for him.

By this way, Anselm of Canterbury was a rebel too, as the scientists will always find some new frontier in their research,

some new device needed to invent

or some new organization for the human society.

If you can think it or dream it, it can be real some day.

So we are turning the psychological state of mind of God

( we mean the lower bad God of the Gnostics )

and the psychological state of ourselves the humans,

we turn it a sort of a intelligible platonic form, like the platonic idea of Good,

which according to us, depends too on our and God' s psychological state.

When God and us feel good,

His universe seems good,

but when God and us feel bad,

His universe seems a big mistake and a blunder.

The platonic idea of Good absolutely pure and not related with any material good of our material world,

the absolute pure Good,

it arises too from the psychological state of mind of God and of ourselves,

as the pure platonic idea of Good cannot be deemed as the Good for itself,

as nobody knows what could be the Good absolutely pure and as a platonic idea,

but we can conceive what is the Good for what is good for God,

for the humans and for His universe

as it is impossible to think on what could be the absolute

pure Good, not related with our material world.

By this way,

the Good and the psychological state of God's and humans' mind

are the same thing

and cannot be defined one without the other.

We put psychology at the uppermost place amidst the platonic intelligible forms

and we believe that psychology exists before God , before the humans and before His universe,

like the other intelligible forms,

and that psychology was participating in the creation of the world,

a world which sometimes seems right

and other times wrong.

Psychology as a platonic intelligible form

is a pure idea which exists before God and His universe

and which intervenes in God and His universe

by participating in the material things,

such in our mind and God's.

Therefore it is impossible to say if His universe is good or bad

or if God is good or bad

because it depends on the intelligible form of the psychology ,

and God's mind and body as well as the humans mind and body

work according to the psychology

and when the mind and body of God or the humans fails, the universe seems bad

but when they work well, the universe seems good.

So the God's mind and body

and the humans mind and body

are related or participated by the idea of psychology,



which is related with the idea of absolute Good, which cannot be conceived by the humans but by relating it to the psychology.

We enter into a vicious circle where the state of our mind and body decides our concepts on the universe

and at the same time psychology is put as an intelligible idea ,

which rules our state of mind and body.

Material world and ideal world meet by this way,

the materiality of our mind and body

and the ideality of the intelligible idea of psychology.

The Skeptics said this, by their own style :

we cannot judge the reality because it depends on

if we are healthy or sick ,

rich or poor,

drunk or sober,

tired or fresh,  
from a country or from other,  
taking drugs or not.

The particularities of the human perception have always  
make think to the Skeptics  
that the reality is not like our senses show it to us.

If we turn psychology a platonic intelligible form, we  
resolve the aporia which the Skeptics and the Gnostics  
couldn't resolve:

can men judge if God and His universe are good or bad ?  
We say that men cannot judge it,  
but neither can God.

In fact we say that it is impossible to know what is the  
pure intelligible idea of Goodness.

For centuries it has been accepted that

Goodness was what enhanced life, light, heat, pleasure,  
balance, peace, action, movement, proportion, harmony,

symmetry

( as evilness was deemed as darkness, coldness, death, pain, war, stagnation, unbalance, lack of symmetry and proportion ) .

But that definition of Goodness was too much dependant of relating it with material things.

We say that there is no possible definition of the pure platonic intelligible idea of Goodness without a comparison with the material goods,

and that there is another intelligible form called psychology which alters and intervenes on what Goodness could be.

If we were psychologists instead of philosophers it would be easy to understand why we put psychology at the head of the intelligible ideas, as the most important one.

But we are philosophers and if we praise psychology is only by logical deduction.

So, as a conclusion, what we are saying is

that we cannot conceive the absolute pure idea of

Goodness,

but by relating it with the psychology,

which is for us a platonic intelligible form.

The idea of Goodness depends on the psychological state of God and the humans .

I am sure that some psychologist has said this thesis before, fond of the power of the psychology as science.

Talking again about the rebels,

we must mention Bakunin.

His rebellion was against the employers,

whom he regarded as imitators of the bad God.

The employers, like this bad God, used the workers

as slaves to get rich them and to enjoy a big material life.

The employers, like this God, were tyrants

and the duty of men was  
to free themselves from God's  
and the employers tyrannies ,  
to become the humans the masters of their destiny  
and to be never more the slaves of God.

The rebellion of Bakunin has failed in the past XXth  
century because,  
as the anarchist experiments along the Spanish Civil War  
showed very well ,

soon appears someone who wants to be the tyrant of the  
place

or the ruler or the chief

or the member of a club of privileged inside the anarchist  
tribe,

demonstrating by this way that all men imitate God  
willingly or unconsciously,

and all men, even the anarchists, want to be powerful and  
privileged above the other men ,

this is the reason why the anarchist experiment of Bakunin always fail.

This anarchist rebellion against God doesn't accept that the humans suffer the same flaws, vices and passions than God

and soon or later the anarchist tribes fall because their leaders corrupt in some way ,

desiring more power or money or stealing or killing other men.

The right rebellion, in fact not a rebellion but a new covenant with God ,

should accept that God is faulty,

with a moody psychology,

and that we men we are like Him .

Job , in the Bible, accepts it,

after relating all the evils which God sends to men

and all the fanciful traits of personality of this God.

It is of no use to rebel against God,

says Job,

because He is too much powerful,

but we can still accept Him with all of his particularities,

which are present too in us the humans,

and we must accept his comings and goings,

his scorns and his favourites,

his sulky days and his glorious days ,

we must accept God as how He is,

and by the way we accept God ,

we accept too ourselves as we share with Him all of His defects.

This is the right covenant with God:

we know that life is a lot of up and downs,

of rising self esteem and falling egos,

of brilliant days and miserable days,

of good times and bad times,

of health and sickness,

we know that God's Universe is plenty of good and bad things,

there is the light and the heat but

there is too the void and the darkness,

there is the good life and there is the wretched life ,

there are places which are called Paradise Valley and others which are called the Hell's Kitchen,

we must accept that the universe is how it is

and that its creator God is how He is.

Job ends his writing in the Bible , accepting God with all of His good and bad things.

The Ancient Greeks did the same way with Zeus, they knew Zeus was a son of a bitch most time,

but even so,

the Greeks accepted Him and His way of being.

There is no other way in His universe , except by rebellion,

and the rebels , we have numbered them before.



So the Gnostics never thought that their bad , lower God was in fact ,

Zeus or the fallen angel the Devil of Zoroaster and the Christians,

a faulty God responsible of everything which is not right in His universe

all that we the humans we don't like, like the mosquitoes ,

but the Gnostics never accepted to humble in front of this faulty God

because they were as faulty as Him, for being an imitation of Him,

the Gnostics were too proud and preferred to complain on the evilness of this world

meanwhile they waited for the coming of the upper truly God, the pure light.

The Gnostics never knelt in front of the lower bad God and never accepted the life of ups and downs that this God had created for His universe.

We think that they were wrong, they were rebels, that's all.

We think that the right way of relating with this God is by accepting His moods and fancies,

in a new and righter covenant

not much different of the attitude of the Stoics in front of the evils of this life and this universe:

they assumed all of them

and accepted their part on the fate of the universe

where everything happens by some reason, even the bad things.

So, following their own style, the Stoics accepted too the fancies of Zeus.

The Stoics never talked on a bad or good universe, they only accepted that all things in this universe are related and that evil things happen for some reason,

for the goodness of some future event.

For the Stoics, psychology had no part in deciding if our

universe was good or bad,

the Stoic universe is just an universe where everything is related with everything

and the individual must accept, willingly or by force,

his part in the chain of events.

We are like the Stoics, we accept the things which happens

as unavoidable and necessary

by accepting that God is the way He is,

with all His flaws.

In fact , we don't propose something new,

as this attitude towards God is the same followed by the old Greeks towards Zeus

or the old Germans towards Odin.

The traditional poems and sayings of many nations tells us the same truth:

"El hombre propone y Dios dispone"

"No diguis blat al sac

fins que el tinguis ben lligat " ,

the future is uncertain and everything could happen.

The Greek tradition is deeply scientific and always asks for more to know .

The Greeks would ask : why there is an universe where things evolve or change by very small grades,

by the painful efforts of many generations of men,

by the contribution of many individuals,

each one helping with his sand grain,

why they are needed millions of years for an improving of this universe,

why History is the development of such evolution of the universe thanks to the work of countless humans,

along millions of years,

why God couldn't do it another way,  
easier way, faster way,

when we know that God can create and evolve an universe  
in just a flash of time ,

why then , men are like machines who propose new  
utopias and inventions which they dream on,

why God needs the human machine to turn real all the  
possible utopias and inventions ?

How could be the end of all this process,

perhaps what the Christians call the paradise,

where all the possible utopias and inventions have been  
realised,

and there are no more to develop,

perhaps when all the universe will be adapted to Men's  
needs ( as a materialist could think)

or perhaps when all the material things have been  
transformed into souls ?

Anselm of Canterbury thought that all which was thinkable,  
could be real some day.

But some day men will have no more dreams or projects  
as all the thinkable will be realised,

with everything thinkable turned real,

always with the intelligible idea of Good  
as the guide of all the men's projects,

because this idea of Good can be understood

as what is good either for the material life of men

or for turning men into souls

or for turning the universe a safe and happy place for men  
( no other concept of pure Good appeals to us ) ,

as men only can think on what is the pure Good by

thinking on what is good for men and for our existence.

God thinks the same way , He can only think on the pure Good

only by thinking on what is good for Him and His existence.

But He can get everything he thinks,  
in just an instant and just by thinking on it.

Why God needs men then ?

Men can think on utopias, new inventions and new theories but with a limitation:

we can only think a grade or step ahead  
on what is the state of the art at present.

We cannot think on travelling faster than the speed of light because we don't know yet what it means to travel very fast,

close to the speed of the light.

We cannot think on political utopias where everybody acts well and don't bother the others to live their own life , by envy or jealousy or by evilness,

because in our present world we are very far yet to fulfill fairplay and equality of opportunities for everybody , as mafias and monopolies abound.

We can only think on utopias and inventions which follow the present wants,

we can only think on new inventions from those we do enjoy at present

or from those we do suffer for being faulty.

The cars and the planes have been developed this way, part by part, improvement after improvement.

Mankind advances grade by grade, step by step , dream to dream

and we cannot walk by tackles because we are unable to think how could be the following utopias fo the next centuries ,

but after reporting the flaws of our present civilization.



It demonstrates that we humans ,  
we are a machine which makes evolve the universe, very  
slowly,  
by the mechanism of our ambition or of our desire of  
better political regimes or better technology ,  
and whence we get what we want,  
we begin to covet new utopias and new inventions better  
than the present ones.

Grade by grade, mankind creates an Universe to our  
measure.

And it is impossible to imagine how could be the end of all  
this process which we call History:

perhaps the paradise of the Christians,

perhaps a happy material world for the materialists,

perhaps turning pure souls.

We can only think on how to improve our present political  
systems and inventions, from its present flaws.

It is this the reason of the existence of the present faulty God,

to be reported by us the humans in all of His flaws, for those flaws be corrected ?

Anselm of Canterbury would say that the end of our History will be

when we become pure souls in the paradise.

But perhaps by then we would think on something more, on becoming a god,

or a better god than the faulty present God, without His fanciful psychology.

Bakunin wanted a mankind transformed in God instead of the present God,

a mankind which had turned all the universe our home, for our needs and interests,

and to achieve this status ,

mankind should be able to control everything of this universe, from the last subatomic particle to the most gigantic cosmic clash.

We have still a lot of work ahead.

And perhaps by then Anselm of Canterbury and Bakunin  
would decide that they want more,

they want now...

who knows, perhaps to become Gods at last,

Anselm of Canterbury 's argument is the justification of  
the infinite ambition.

You always want more because your mind can always  
imagine something greater than you.

An ambition very barbarian, by the way ,

as when Schopenhauer said that the barbarians always  
want more of everything

and they turn angry and frustrated because they cannot  
get everything they want.

Jehová the angry and cruel,

Zeus the rapist, thief, bisexual liar,

Odin the war-like constructor and destroyer at the same time,

The men of the ancient times understood that the only possible relationship with such difficult gods was to accept them as they were,

good and bad at times,

standing their good and bad days,

standing too the men who are imitators of such God,

the employers, the managers, the chieftains, the military leaders, the kings, all of them so terrible as this God.

God suffers good and bad days and men suffer all of them too.

God suffers psychological changes and men suffer them too.

God's universe is always changing , with good and bad epochs.

God suffers the same diseases and problems we suffer,  
if He is a hunchback, his central part of his universe is  
twisted ( His chest )

and nuclear reactions fail among the chemical elements,  
at the place which is the most strong and stable of all His  
universe ( the atomic laws).

Other diseases of men can have its version in God.

Perhaps some day we will be able to trace all those 3000  
or more diseases and defects that we the humans do  
suffer,

to trace them in God.

All the events in the universe form an extremely complex  
body with many parts working together in harmony , until  
something fails.

In front of all those tyrant-gods,

from time to time there is a trying by some men

to develop individuals so strong and able as God is

( by developing at their limit the capabilities of the human

mind and body, as there is a limit between the humans and God ),

and then appears Heracles, constructor and destroyer like God,

good and bad at times,

but who will be punished soon , like Ajax, by the gods for being too proud and for despising the gods.

Heracles is the man who has decided to imitate, to the limit of his possibilities as a mere human , to imitate the gods with all their divine characteristics.

When Heracles is an artist , he is happy when he gets ideas for his creations,

when he creates and finishes a work,

when he gets new ideas for new projects ,

and often he gets new ideas when he feels well with himself,

ordered in his body and mind,

strong, healthy, balanced and in harmony with all the parts of his body and mind.

Men who want to be Heracles, look and care after first for their well being, their physical wellness ,

and they look after to be creative, original, to realise their

projects as works, inventions, theories, or products.

He will be happy by then , feeling like God.

Heracles was conceived by the ancient Greeks as a builder of civilizations.

He could populate a whole country by seeding hundreds of women in a month

( like most Arabian sheiks who marry hundreds of women and have thousands of sons ),

he could transform a countryside by changing the flows of the rivers,

he could tame thousands of wild horses.

The works of Heracles could follow for ever to the transformation of the whole universe.

This Heracles as an artist needs to be creative everyday, to feel that he is like a god ,

and such man conceives as perfections of God

to be creative, to be strong, to be big, athletic, with a proportionated body .

All the artists look after that moment when they have reached to realise the work they were after,

and then they feel happy like a God.

Kubrick said once: "to make a movie is very difficult, it is like riding a rollercoaster for years but once you have got to put together all the parts of the movie, there is no greatest happiness in this world " .

The musician plays and composes better when he feels well with himself,  
with his body and his mind,  
when he suffers no diseases and he feels good,  
and his music is in some way the expression of his wellness ,  
translated to music.

But when there are diseases, diarrhea ( which means the loss of the bowels' rhythm) ,  
when there is disorder in his mind, ill feelings, mental disonances, cacophony in his speech,  
then he plays bad.

His music turns to be a chaos without form, moved by random.

And most electric guitar players believe that God plays



guitar at 1000 miles per hour , playing very fast, and they try to play so fast too, believing that they play like God by then.

We have said that God and men share the same diseases.

The universe is the body of God and , like in our body, the diseases are useful to show parts of this body which we and God don't know well.

When there is a disease, we begin to learn about the gland or organ or process which fails.

The same does God when something fails in His universe. He learns about His universe when something goes awry in it.

There is a breakdown of the harmony, proportion order, rhythm, symmetry and balance of His universe, and it has consequences in our body, according to the Greek physicians.

When something fails in the God's body,

it comes chaos, disorders, cosmic cataclisms, unbalance,

war, tyrannies, stagnation, lack of movement, lack of action.

God suffers those diseases and begins to think that He is a bad God

and that His universe is a bad creation.

The psychology of God determines too His opinions on Himself,

as it happens too in us humans.

It is impossible then to decide if God is bad or good and if His universe is good or bad

as it depends on our psychology... and on God's psychology.

For some religions, men are no other thing than the neurones of God.

Each man has some talent or particularity of his own and the reckoning of the thousands of millions of existing men since ever, this is the mind of God.

The human brain and body have the potential to be

developed in some unique trait, each one different from the other men' s traits .

At the same time, each man-neurone of God is not compatible with other man- neurone,

as he can be only the way it is by his unique trait and cannot be another way.

All the thousands of millions of men-neurones build the omnipresent brain of God.

Each man devotes his life to some work and contributes, by this way, to the improvement of the universe.

Heraclitus said once,

that the dog regards his human master as his god,

and that we the men regard God as our god in a way which is the same way that the dog does with us.

We imitate our master God in all of his acts

and we do what our master God leaves us to do.

The way God is,

it determines the way the men are

and the acts we can perform.

The same way, the dog imitates what his master does  
and the dog does what his master allows him to do.

We live in the universe devised by God and we cannot do  
other things than those allowed by His universe .

God has created His universe with such physical laws that  
we are forced to live under those physical laws,  
and if  $4+4$  are 8, we must accept that  $4+4$  are 8 .

One of the most important questions which the Medieval  
Philosophers mused about,

was if God was forced as well , to fulfill the physical laws  
of this universe

or if else He could do miracles, so say breaking those laws.

If God is forced also, to follow the material laws of His  
universe,

then he should follow too the ethical and politic laws of  
His universe,

which say that all being of His universe craves to become

a tyrant to enslave the other beings for his own only benefit.

God then , like all the other beings of this universe, is forced to become a tyrant and to enslave the humans for His own profit.

God cannot be then the pure Good , as the Medieval Philosophers believed.

God is forced to obey all the laws of His universe, including the political and ethical laws which state that all the beings of His universe try to become tyrants.

God lives inside His universe where they apply not only His physical and chemical laws,

but also His ethical and political laws, and He must fulfill them too,

and He must be, like the others beings of His universe, mad for power .

Therefore this God cannot be the absolute pure Goodness, as He is, like the other beings of His universe, a son of a bitch who only thinks on becoming a tyrant.

But what is then the pure Good,

if we have said before

that the idea of psychology and the idea of pure Good are dependant one of the other ?

And that the platonic idea of Goodness depends too on how well made are our body and mind as well as God' s.

By intertwining the platonic intelligible form of Goodness with the goodness of our material body and mind and those of God,

we deny , like the Skeptics,

that we can get a platonic idea of Goodness without calling for some material good to help us to conceive it,

and at the same time we accept that we need a pure platonic idea of Goodness to relate to it all the material goods, and to define them, as Plato said.

Goodness , AS A PLATONIC INTELLIGIBLE FORM , can only be conceived by comparing it with the goodness of our body and mind, and those of God,

because when our body and mind are fit, and God's are fit too,

we conceive the Goodness as His universe well managed, and in the opposite case we conceive it as a hell.

Williams James was the only psychologist who wrote something about all this, when he said that the psychology of the rich and the poor was different and so were their visions of the world.

We are proposing then, a "Post-Gnosticism" where God is no longer bad, but very fickle, very unpredictable, very mischievous

and the humans we are so too, as we are an imitation of Him.

There is a strange relationship between this faulty God and we the also faulty humans,

we negotiate with God and so He does with us, on every subject of His universe and sometimes He wins and others we win.

Life goes on, as many moralists have said recently, amidst an "ethical relativism"

where nothing is absolutely good or bad,

male or female (due to the new discoveries in Genetics),

peace or war ( as there wars of low intensity and peace with terrorism ),

rich or poor,

sane or insane,

democratical or dictatorship like ( as there are many dictatorship decissions in the democracies ) ,

driving to action or to boreness,

balanced or unbalanced,

change or stagnation,

development or ecologism,

capitalism or communism,

all of those Phitagorean contraries are no longer such,  
as there are many in-between grades in them.



In our time, we see that some countries such as China are communist and capitalist at the same time,

we see how some democracies force their citizens to obey some laws as if they were living in a dictatorship

and that some dictatorships enjoy a greater standard of happiness than most democracies,

we see that it is impossible to cater for millions of citizens if there is no industrial development by petrol and gas ,

we see that man and woman are not contraries but different

( sharing many characteristics but not sharing others, so they are not really contraries )

and that Pythagorean contraries such as black and white, in our time get many shades of other colours.

Night and day, where the night is not really the contrary of

the day but a different time with other events,

light and darkness where darkness allows other processes to happen,

heat and cold where our body and mind act differently in summer or in winter,

body and soul where the body has its own reasons and the soul lives its own life not related with the body's ,

one and two ...are just one and two in our time and not the origin of a whole theology.

Our current World is by far much more complex than Pythagoras World.

Our World regards many variations and combinations between the two contraries.

The couples of contraries of Pythagoras are, in our time, not so contraries ,

as the contraries are even in some characteristics and totally different on others,

and therefore there are characteristics of those couples of contraries which cannot be related at all with the other contrary

and so their relationship is absolutely impossible.

Man can seed thousand women along his life as his job lasts only some minutes,

but a woman needs 9 months to carry a faetus and many years more to raise him, so a woman cannot bear more than about 20 sons along her life.

Man relies most of the time on his muscular strenght to make a living and even to get ideas, meanwhile woman relies in her feminine biology and other feminine characteristics, to think and work.

So man and women are not longer contraries as in Pythagoras time, we are different with some characteristics which we share and others which don't relate us at all.

And so on with the

other couples of contraries of Pythagoras.

So is our epoch, living in an "ethical relativism" or "elastic ethics" where each individual manages as well as he can his own life and businesses,

according to what it is possible to do in our time, given that without development and huge amounts of petrol and carbon it is impossible to keep running countries such the USA

and that the problems of the Third World and their

immigrants cannot be resolved by lowering the quality of life of the Western rich countries,

and so many other problems without solution in our time and which forces us to live in a perpetual negotiation with God,

with His universe

and with the other humans who share with God, His same defective behaviours .

In this sense, and as Feuerbach would say , our conception of this blunderer God of the Gnostics

resembles a lot the "Stockholm syndrome" into which many Christians have fallen along the centuries,

after suffering all kind of evils, diseases and pains ,

remaining faithful to their God despite all their thistle sown miserable life ,

pardoning Him for all their tough life ,

as if He were not the culprit of all it.

**OUR "POST-GNOSTICISM" PERHAPS IS JUST ONE OF THOSE SURRENDERS WHICH MANKIND TAKES, FROM TIME TO TIME, TOWARDS A BAD GOD.**

We end to accept Him and His universe with all its evils and we even apologize Him for being the way He is .

We know that when we act this way,  
all the scheme resembles a lot the only option that for  
most people stands,  
to face a bad parent or a bad relative or a bad ruler or  
manager, which is to accept it as he is and to suffer him.  
Millions of people have carried their sad lives by living this  
way since the prehistory.

Masochism also intervenes here as Feuerbach would say,  
most of the time those poor people have been sentenced  
to carry a hell for a life

by other evil humans who were either their parents ,  
( and from hence such people translated the concept of  
their punisher God from the concept of their evil parents )  
or from other people of their profession or trade who  
took advantage from the lack of success and  
opportunities of those damned ones .

For many people of the past centuries, life has been a hell  
due to the evilness of most of their countrymen,  
who wanted them out of the business or out of the  
competition to get a good job ,

or because the evilness of parents and other relatives who were slobs or who wanted them out of the inheritance of money or properties.

The penal code describes hundreds of evils that men can exert over the others and all those evils are inspired by God.

In our time, our lives sail around by negotiation with the many perils of the world,

we negotiate with other political parties,

we negotiate with employers and trade unions, we negotiate with other countries,

we negotiate with developers and ecologists,

we negotiate with the powerful and with the dishonest,

everything is negotiated in our time

and our relationship with this difficult God is too a negotiation.

Sometimes we get a bargain and other times we get nothing.



TRIBUTE to EISNER (FROM A COURSA GOVIM) SIM AND GOMES

EF GOTT REQUIRES THAT  
MEN HONAIR THAIR  
HAKRIMMINTS ~

THAN!

ESS!  
NO!  
GOTT!  
ALTSO  
SO OBLIGATED??





