

**The parable of the blind men and the elephant is popular but mistaken.**

The blind men want to know what an elephant is like. One touches its side and says an elephant is like a wall. One feels its tusk and says an elephant is like a spear. One touches its ear and thinks its like a fan. And so on and on.

The conclusion of the parable is that the seeming differences between them are only seeming – they are not real. Each one is right.

The parable is dangerous and disgusting.

It is used solely to support the notion that one religion is as good as another. That nobody really believes it is proven by the fact that if a number of hard of hearing people listened to a lecture and had to write down what was said and nobody agreed on what they thought they heard that nobody would believe that they are all right about what was said. Why is the argument used for religion and nothing else?

First of all the blind men are all wrong. They are claiming to know what the elephant is. They are not saying their opinions are analogies of what an elephant is.

Second, it is intolerant to tell religions that claim to have the truth that they do not mean what they say.

Third, part of the truth is as dangerous as error and often worse. One bad result is that it can put the real truth into eclipse forever. The parable only serves relativists and those who want to try and recreate truth as if they can. The truth is the truth and nobody can change that. Anybody who tries to even in the name of tolerance is a bigot and paving the way for other bigots.

Fourth, if God speaks and gives you the final and completely truth at least in some matters the parable opposes him. It propagates man-made religion and protects its lies.

Fifth, to try and bring religions together in tolerance and love through excludes inventing another faith which is what this parable does. And the faith is opposed to logic and truth so it is toxic and not as sweet as it seems.

Some modify the parable a bit.

Some say that the blind men and the elephant parable shows that each religion is *sufficiently* true. The parable argues that none of the men were completely wrong. They had some truth.

The parable says that no religion sees the whole truth and is like an elephant.

It seems to be parable arguing for humility.

But in fact it argues for arrogant hypocrisy.

There could be a religion that has all the truth and the parable forbids us to see it. It accuses us of arrogance if we have the truth.

God would see the whole elephant. What if he has revealed what he sees to us? The parable rejects this possibility outright for no reason so it is far from humble.

Also, the parable is talking from the perspective of the person who sees the whole truth in the form of the elephant! The writer is claiming to know the whole truth that nobody else has the whole truth!

You always need to be clear on how you know something before you start talking about what you know. The parable writer makes no effort to do that.

It is hypocrisy to argue that all religions are sufficiently true. That is not for you to decide only the evidence can decide that. And it is obvious without evidence that not all religions can be sufficiently true!

FINALLY

The blind men and the elephant parable claims that all religions have the truth but that contradicts the religious belief

systems. It is you imposing a new world view on theirs and dismissing how seriously they take their claims as being the truth or at least as the most practical or tolerant way of life. How is that supposed to unify people?