

All religious constructs are influenced by numerous biases. Both the Constructor and the construct are skewed accordingly:

A “Construct” as a verb (transitive) means to compose or to frame mentally an argument, assertion, or even a sentence; as a noun the term refers to anything formulated or systematically constructed. A construct can be a very complex idea or thought that is the product of a synthesis of multiple simpler ideas. Further, a construct can be a model constructed for the purpose of correlating observable realities with theoretical ones.

The finitude of mankind assures that it is inevitable that all religious constructs will have some kind of flawed element, making all of them fallible. As far as divine conceptual constructs go, then, a finite man lacks any corresponding reality for his concepts. The finitude of a religious man betrays him, leading him to persist in his construction process, persuading himself that he is right. When a religious, finite constructor proceeds according to known fallacies, he might overly concern himself with fields outside the Bible, caring more that his religious, fallible construct not contradict finite philosophy or logic.

As a result, when one constructs a religious construct, one tends to co-depend upon certain rules of thumb, or heuristics, that help him to make sense out of the complex and uncertain field of religion. However, sometimes these heuristics lead to skewed and systematic errors in the constructing process. These Systematic errors (like errors of omission, and omission biases) are those that appear time and time again. They seem to arise from a series of cognitive biases in the way that religious constructors process Biblical texts and reach judgments. Because of cognitive biases, many religious constructors are certain to make poor hermeneutical judgments. They are religious, fallible constructs, because they depend for their existence and

character on the ingredients of which they are constructed and the pattern or structure-the biases-that they inherit in the process.

On the other hand, the texts are infallible, spiritual constructs, because their construction occurs according to the process of Divine inspiration. Divinely inspired Scripts: Infallible Constructs unlike human-made constructs (which are similarly constructs of religious, and traditional elements: they are not teleologically determined to fulfill some divine purpose) are Divinely inspired infallible constructs teleologically constructed to fulfill the divine purpose; specifically, as scripted: *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν πρὸς ἔλεγχον, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* Each Script *is* a God-breathed Script and *is* a profitable Script toward doctrine, toward reproof, toward fully-upright orthodoxy, toward training in the righteousness.

Scripts are Divine constructs. Religious constructs, on the other hand, are constituted by skewed ingredients-biases-and, because of such biases are not genuinely infinite; and, of course not infallible. These religious constructs are oral, flawed mixtures with no autonomous inspired status: They are not constructs-that-are inspired, that is, God-breathed.

A number of biases have been verified repeatedly among religious studies, so one can be reasonably sure that these biases exist and that all religious constructors are prone to them.

The prior hypothesis bias refers to the fact that religious constructors who have strong prior beliefs about the relationship between two or more concepts tend to construct according to these beliefs, even when presented with evidence that their beliefs are incorrect, that is, unscripted. Moreover, they tend to seek and use information that is consistent with their prior beliefs (source bias) while ignoring information (source avoidance) that contradicts those beliefs.

To place this bias in a tactical context, it suggests that a religious constructor who has a strong prior belief that a certain element makes sense, might continue to pursue that element, even including it in his construct despite evidence that it is flawed or fallible.

Another well-known cognitive bias, escalating commitment, occurs when constructors, having already committed significant resources to a construct, commit even more resources even if they receive feedback that the construct is fallible. This may be an irrational response; a more logical response would be to abandon the construct and return to the Scripts, rather than escalate commitment. Feelings of personal responsibility for a construct seemingly induce religious constructors to commit to a construct, even persuading others that it is right, making nothing of contradicting Scripts: Evidence that their construct is flawed.

A third bias, reasoning by analogy, involves the use of simple analogies to make sense out of complex problems. The problem with this heuristic is that the analogy may not be valid: One religious constructor once stated: “Since a dead man cannot make a choice, then one dead in sins cannot make a choice.” This simple analogy proffered for the hearer might seem absurd, but, among the field of religious construction, this simple, very flawed analogy is considered valuable construction material.

A fourth cognitive bias is referred to as the illusion of control, or the tendency to overestimate one’s ability to control the religious construction process. General or top constructors, otherwise known as “leading brethren” seem to be particularly prone to this bias: Having risen to the top of their religious construction organization, they tend to be overconfident about their ability to so construct a religious construct as to surpass even the *Scripted Constructs* themselves, leading many to follow after them, rather than the One. According to those that labor

in the word and doctrine, such overconfidence leads to what can be called the hubris hypothesis of conquests. Proclaimers of Divine Scripts, Constructs, that is, the Texts argue that leading brethren are typically overconfident about their ability to create a religious construct by acquiring elements of other's religious constructs; namely, historically and traditionally religious constructs.

Thus, when a religious construct is evaluated in the light of the Divine Scripts they are found to be a product of a biased process: A process that includes errors of omission, source avoidance, and source bias; bold hubris, illusions of control, simple analogies; escalating commitment, prior beliefs, along with vested denominational and religious loyalties. As such, one would do well to adhere to the divine constructs, the Scripts; for in so doing, one will not strive about words to no profit, that is, to the subverting of his hearers. Wherefore, one pursuing truth need only to study to demonstrate one's self an approved worker unto God, The Divine Scriber, that is, Constructor, a workman that has no need to be ashamed, nor to construct any religious construct, rather only to rightly divide the word of truth: The Infallible Construct. Finally, one does well when he avoids profane and vain religious construction processes: For they only increase unto more ungodliness.