

# How To Dehypnotize A Believer

(Or, How to Plant a “Truth Virus” in the Matrix of Religion)

*"If somewhere within the Bible, I were to find a passage that said  $2 + 2 = 5$ , I wouldn't question what I'm reading in the Bible. I would believe it, accept it as true, and then do my best to work it out and understand it." ~ **Pastor Peter LaRuffa***

## **Fighting Faith Directly Is Pointless**

The only point to (religious) faith is *the resolve to hold onto an agreed upon belief* against any and all evidence, or reason, against it. It has no other utility. If there were sufficient evidence or reason to support a belief, it wouldn't require faith to be believed.

Knowing this, you are therefore wasting your time to argue the *content* of any belief held in faith. For instance, it does no good to argue whether Adam & Eve were real. It does no good to argue if there was a world-wide flood, or if Jesus ascended to heaven, creationism, or if God is Jehovah.

You're wasting your time. Let it go! There is no point to arguing the *truthfulness* of scripture with a faithful believer. Your reasoning and arguments can be logically flawless; that fact unfortunately remains utterly irrelevant!

The believer does not hold a belief *in faith* because he believes it *true* (or logical), but rather the believer holds a belief *in faith* because that was the AGREEMENT s/he made, and promised to keep.

And each time they “weather the storm” of reason, logic, evidence, facts, or any attack on the thing believed in faith, it only serves to *strengthen* the agreement.

## The Agreement to Believe

How does hypnosis work? The short of it... You *agree* to play a role.

*“It seems to me that [hypnosis] is best understood as a process by which the subject allows herself to become highly responsive to the hypnotist, in a way similar to the responsiveness that we tend to exhibit when we go to a doctor or interact with most authority figures.”<sup>1</sup> ~ **Derren Brown***

If you were brought up in America, and subject to church or religion in general, you might remember an event called “being saved.” If so, think back to that event and you will likely discover the agreement.

In my own situation, a woman (she was truly an angel, too!) corralled us kids and “saved” us. It went sort of like this: “Get on your knees, close your eyes, and ask Jesus to come into your heart. Ask him to forgive all your sins and *allow* him to be your everlasting lord and savior. Do this earnestly, and with all your heart, and he will come and enter your heart if you are sincere.”

Afterward, she asked us individually if we felt anything. I distinctly remember the others saying yes. But being the honest person that I was, I couldn’t really vouch to that affect, and I remember feeling somewhat not included, for not having lied. But I was quite certain that the others hadn’t felt anything either, but just wanted to appease her expectation and not let her down. But she worked with me on more than one occasion. I think we were all less than ten years old.

Being “saved” usually happens when we are too young to apply any mental filtering mechanism, like critical thinking, but we are always eager to get on the good side of adults by complying. But it’s an agreement that we accept, nonetheless, and it’s fortified and reconfirmed by social surroundings and activities constantly (or at least weekly).

And then again when we are older, if the environment is still of a religious nature, we get Baptized! All rituals are designed to reinforce the agreement! There is no other point to them. Church itself, is simply to reinforce the agreement. Why would anyone need to go to church, really, except for social confirmation?

In fact attempting to break the agreement can have dreadful consequences, especially socially. Families will look down on those who leave the “flock” and will often shun them. But much worse, in Islam, apostasy is punishable by death!

Talk about reinforcement! Recently the ruler of Saudi Arabia, an Islamic theocratic kingdom, declared anyone that questions Islam (i.e. atheists) are terrorists and shall be put to death.

Under Islamic (Sharia) Law, your consent is unconditional!

The agreement to play the belief role “*is*” the faith. Do you see? It’s not the content of the thing believed, but the *agreement* to play the role. And others still, just play the role without the belief. (Does anyone really think that a Priest could rape a child in God’s own house if he *actually believed* God was present? Clearly they do not believe... they just play the role.)

### **Dehypnotizing a Believer**

Now that you understand the pointlessness of arguing the content of a belief held in faith, consider an alternative approach. Very few religious believers, especially those willing to entertain a debate or sorts, do **not** believe that they haven’t given the requisite scrutiny to their beliefs. That is to say, they truly think their beliefs are defensible. (Otherwise they wouldn’t be willing to debate the merits of those beliefs.) This willingness is what hackers call “a back door.”

That’s okay. But don’t go there scrutinizing or attacking their beliefs!

Instead, seek to understand a *mutual* problem *related* to their beliefs. For starters, this eliminates the argument, because there is none. Where you are

BOTH trying to understand something better, there is the “working together” aspect that cuts through the adversarial approach of vetting each other’s ideas.

This puts you both into “critical thinking” mode about a mutual attempt to understand something. And therein lies the first coup; **getting the believer into critical thinking mode, instead of defending the faith mode, is 100% of the objective!**

Regardless of outcome, you may not feel like you “won” an argument (because there never was one), but in the brain of the believer you will turn on neurons that make connections that would otherwise be consciously rejected! This is because they formulate as his ideas, instead of yours.

Very few of us who used to believe, became agnostic overnight. Sometimes it takes a couple of years. It depends greatly with where one is currently sitting. The fact is, most kids didn’t just “figure out Santa Claus.” It usually took some *other* kid saying something like, “You still believe in Santa Claus?” before it forced the believing kid into an introspection of critical thinking. One thing led to another until a critical mass of impossibility forced a mental correction. And though you needn’t be as blunt, that’s your role!

You don’t have to offer facts, or reason; **you only need to get them to think critically about an issue that relates to a belief held in faith!** So let’s look at some examples.

### **How to Plant a “Truth Virus” in the Matrix of Religion**

To navigate religious believers into critical thinking you have to ask the right type of question. For the child, “You *still* believe in Santa Claus?” – implies that the belief is childish, that older people do not share this belief, and that it will eventually change as they *grow up*. All this, because of the one word “still.”

That one word is a truth virus. But this works for children because they have not *agreed* to believe in Santa, but was rather a foregone conclusion based on

parental and social deceptions (for the age group). In other words, children didn't make a *commitment* to the belief against facts to the contrary.

Religious belief, on the other hand, is the *commitment* to believe *in spite of* evidence or facts to the contrary! The strategy must therefore be a bit more diabolical. It cannot question the surface belief (i.e., Santa), which involves the content of the belief (the typical argumentation strategy), but instead must expose the unsoundness of the underlying scaffolding that upholds the content (the matrix, or *structure*, of the belief) itself.

### **What is the Matrix?**

Now, before we go off the deep end, I am using the term "matrix" as a metaphor for the *structure* of belief (or a belief system) that overlays the real world otherwise known as "reality." It is **not** meant as an actual physical noun, as implied in the 1999 movie The Matrix. But it *is* a (software) program of sorts, albeit a mental one; thus the analogy.

All social conventions comprise the scaffolding of a matrix because it overlays the real world with memetic *systems*, like custom, like tradition, like social agreements from ear piercing & tattoos, to suit & tie vs hijab & burka. Even monetary systems based on fiat currency comprise a social matrix!

Consider the physical difference between a \$1 dollar bill and a \$100 dollar bill. The difference between them is entirely in the design; they have different pictures on them. Yet because of the picture we *socially agree* that one is one-hundred times the *value* of the other! Buying into that agreement puts you into a matrix that overlays the real world (that each is just an intricately designed piece of paper).

And people will kill or rob each other to gain these little pictures for themselves! This is the power of a matrix, so, in that sense, the matrix is real – real enough to command power, death, war, social approval, and the eternal life as promised by a religion. They are real *only* insofar as we make the *agreement* and play the role.

This is the mass hypnosis, the mass *agreement* to play a role that creates and upholds the matrix. We *agree* that a \$100 dollar bill is 100 times the value of a \$1 dollar bill.

It becomes clear, however, that this so-called value convention is contrived when there is literally no food, and no amount of paper dollars can make food appear. In which case, a bushel of corn has more value than a \$1000 bill. The “value” of that piece of paper becomes the value of any other intricately designed piece of paper, as toilet tissue or fuel for fire, or insulation, or... you get the point, it is in reality, literally “just a piece of paper.”

### **The Right Type of Question**

Back to the problem at hand: The question cannot be an attack or “questioning of” any sort of faith-based *content*. But rather, the question should seek to understand a problem or issue that requires objective thought *related to* the belief held in faith.

The formulation of the question, however, should supply *context* without content! For example, engaging conversation with a believer, you might ask:

Q: What is the difference between (religious) "faith" and "knowledge?"

Here, one must first define religious faith, and define knowledge. After which, the person must *distinguish* between the two. That IS the conversation, distinguishing between the two. (No less, no more.) In doing so, one is forced to differentiate what *isn't* the other. This eventually forces the clarification that faith is **not** knowledge, and why.

It is not important that *you* state the differences in conclusion, (in fact it's better that you don't), but that you allow the *other* person to distinguish and examine them in his own neurology.

Another example:

Q: Which Gods do you "not" believe in, and **why** don't you believe in them?

Here, since it's impossible to name every god not believed in, the believer will take the short cut and announce that s/he doesn't believe in any god except (name of God). The real conversation surrounds WHY they do not believe in the *other* gods.

(Do you see? Questioning why they believe in "their" god, can only be answered with faith. Don't go there! Question why they don't believe in the *other* gods! Those have defensible reasons.)

By listing and examining the reasons for un-belief in the other gods, the believer is forced to *weigh* those same reasons (even if subconsciously) against their chosen god as well. For each reason the other gods fail the belief test, the believed god must pass.

Another example. Here's one to ask a Muslim:

Q: Why is apostasy a threat to Islam?

Here, the Muslim must acknowledge *what* apostasy is (including its various forms), and then *why* Islam cannot tolerate it.

In case the Muslim is uninformed, here are a couple of recent articles pertaining to the subject:

Headline: **Saudi Arabia declares all atheists are terrorists in new law to crack down on political dissidents** <sup>ii</sup>[see source below in footnotes, click URL for the article, <http://tinyurl.com/qjcuff7> ] circa April, 2014.

Headline: **Saudi court sentences poet to death for renouncing Islam** <sup>iii</sup> [see source below in footnotes, click URL for the article, <http://tinyurl.com/o5r7bgl> ] November 20, 2015.

Saudi Arabia is a theocratic kingdom based on the Quran and thus Sharia Law. But why a religion must kill those who question or shun it, demonstrates a severe insecurity. As they say, "If your beliefs can't stand up to scrutiny, the scrutiny is not the problem." But I digress; it's all in how you show the other fellow what he would normally reject.

“He” must solve the problem of what Islam has to hide, or why Islam is so insecure that it must kill a human being for daring to question or examine its truth.

If he ever concludes that **the truth can stand up to scrutiny**, he now comes face to face with the cognitive problem that Islam admittedly *cannot* stand up to scrutiny.

### **Insert The Code And Snow Crash The Babble**

These are the conclusions the believer must conceptualize for himself. Through conversation, you may only plant and nurture the inevitable ideas that de-hypnotize the faith, but s/he alone must conclude the result.

So you must **allow** yourself to allow *them* to deconstruct the faith inside their own neurology. The hardest part is to not insist that  $2+2 = 4$ , but to engage in conversation *only* in so far as to what 2 means and what (+) means, and what “equals” means, and what an arithmetic expression means; but you must allow *them alone* to determine the only possible answer.

As Dale Carnegie, in *How to Win Friends and Influence People*, put it:

*“A man convinced against his will  
Is of the same opinion still”*

Think of yourself as a mental hacker. The last thing a hacker wants... is to get caught. Employ the “truth virus” and make no waves. This also means letting go of the ego, the satisfaction of publicly winning. Let go of your own need to be worshipped (having to be publically right), and allow the code to reconstruct the necessary neurology.

Just insert the code and snow crash the babble.

Sincerely,  
Dorian Greer

**EXTRA:** I've got something for you I'm certain you're going to enjoy! Be sure to check out the **Read Me Next**, below. Thank You!

---

<sup>i</sup> <http://www.secrets-explained.com/derren-brown/hypnosis>

<sup>ii</sup> <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/saudi-arabia-declares-all-atheists-are-terrorists-in-new-law-to-crack-down-on-political-dissidents-9228389.html>

<sup>iii</sup> <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/nov/20/saudi-court-sentences-poet-to-death-for-renouncing-islam>



How To Dehypnotize A Believer by [Dorian Greer](#) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](#).

Do the world a favor – (permission granted) make this available to your audience!

*By Dorian Greer, Dec. 2015*

## Read Me Next!

I wrote this to help engage the religious debate on a different level than argumentation. It takes a bit of practice to not succumb to “the argument.”

---

Changing a resistant mind must come from the inside. And you absolutely must forego the pleasure of winning. Precious few minds are ever changed by publically admitting the loss of an argument, but instead become even more resolute.

Unfortunately, the stakes are too high. Religious extremism is a virulent meme that has infected mankind for centuries. But how do you convince a Muslim to publically admit his religion is a violent, insecure, superstition when his own social network will offer his head (literally) for decapitation?

And let's be honest, if it weren't for secular laws, Christianity would be no different! You can hear the hate just short of bombing a Planned Parenthood, the anti-intellectualism, and the politics of the religious vote.

Cultural superstitions must be changed from the inside. Outward challenges are met with steadfast defense. No belief derived, or upheld, by faith is swayed by logic or reason. By its very definition, its purpose is belief *in spite of* logic or reason.

So I am asking for a favor. I am offering a free download of a chapter (in .pdf form) to a book I've written called, **Christianity vs Critical Thinking – 10 Challenging Questions Every Believer (& Skeptic) Should Ask**. The book (an eBook, actually) is short in length, but asks just ten carefully chosen questions. Each chapter supplies the full *context* for each question.

The free chapter is question 10, which asks: *"Is the Second Coming of Jesus a Failed Prophecy?"*

I have offered the chapter to (admittedly) warm you up, to the rest of the book. Right now it's sitting pretty lonely at Amazon in dire need of reviews. And that's the favor I seek – your honest review. Tell me, "How did I do?" – in explaining the view from the position of a non-believer in superstition, by asking a few simple, but challenging questions – questions that every Pastor should answer.

---

I truly believe that upon reading these questions in their complete context, you'll be able to ask them to your religious friends, Pastors and Ministers, Priests and Fathers, with complete aplomb and sincerity.

It will *change the conversation in their heads*. And at some point, hopefully, the world.

Download (or read online) the free chapter here (.pdf format):

[The Second Coming of Jesus: A Failed Prophecy?](#)

Review the book at Amazon.com here:

<http://www.amazon.com/dp/B00SHK7SBE>

And help plant a truth virus in the matrix of religion.