

# OUR HOLY HELL

THE CAUSES, THE SOLUTIONS



AND THOUSANDS MORE

By Aron Loyd

OUR HOLY HELL

The Causes, The Solutions

By  
Aron Loyd

Original title: Can You Handle The Truth?  
Copyright, 1999  
808434252  
No use without permission or acknowledgment

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface: I II

1. Pg. 1 Stupidity and lies of the Old Testament
2. Pg. 59 Evil of the Old Testament
  
3. Pg. 137 Stupidity and lies of the New Testament
  
4. Pg. 215 Evil of the New Testament
  
5. Pg. 302 A Pound of Cure  
Pg. 343 Postscript

In a loose quote of earlier sayings, a person named Samuel Johnson once said "The road to hell is paved with good intentions." Which is a very good quote. Though when it comes to religion, good intentions haven't always been the main goal anyway. I on the other hand intend to tell you the truth. Which can only be good. To start it out, the first thing I have to say is something that most of you probably won't believe right now. But for those people, you will know it by the time you are finished reading this book. Which is that though religion may not be completely to blame for mankind's problems, for a very long time, it has been mostly to blame. Now despite the ever present influence of greed, envy or other aspects of the worst of human nature, what caused humanity to evolve into the social creatures that we are is that there is more to be gained through cooperation. (to a point) Which is something that any kind of religion probably had very little to do with in the "beginning." But as society has evolved, religion has taken over a greater role in it. Most often being used by religious leaders and governments to placate people and maintain the status quo.

One way this was often done is that if you didn't believe what you were told to believe, you were killed. Or repressed in some other way. Which for a religion is an especially disgusting way to gain or maintain influence. In the case of the bible for instance, an example of this kind of conditioning is the faith that so many people put into a book that for centuries most of them couldn't even read. Following the word of people who were misguided at best. One bad thing about such a thing is that the more people are conditioned to act a certain way, the more they will need to act that way. And the worse things get, the deeper they will probably go into the fantasy world that is largely responsible for their problems to begin with. It will also make dealing with reality a more difficult thing to do. There are other negative aspects to religion that make it something to be avoided. Look at things such as pollution or other types of environmental degradation, financial turmoil, overpopulation, crime, unjust wars, etc. Which in most cases are becoming worse and worse. If it existed, these things would represent the will of god. Which is not a good thing.

Though what these things actually mostly represent is the ability religion gives people to call their misdeeds or the results of others misdeeds the will of whatever gods they believe in. They can also claim ignorance. Doing that, they don't have to feel responsible for anything. Even for an Atheist, many unfortunate aspects of religion have become so ingrained in our culture that even they have in a way become believers in some of the unfortunate things religion promotes. One such thing that religion promotes in a round about way is the idea that whatever happens doesn't really matter. As long as it happens to

ll

someone else. For Christians, this attitude is taken to the extreme by the hope of many of them have that the world will be destroyed. So they can accompany Jesus to heaven. Though with the kind of insanity that keeps them from really caring about what happens to themselves in this way, then caring about what

happens to other people would naturally become even less of an issue. Unfortunately this religion isn't the only one that sells this doomsday crap. Which I guess for believers, beats actually doing something constructive to keep doom from happening.

In this aspect and many others, too little faith isn't the problem. Too much faith is. Another unfortunate thing about religion is that when this fantasy promotes self deception and benefits those who pander or lie, the harm that it can do is again greater than any possible benefit. Sure, religion may offer comfort to many people. But destroyers deserve no comfort anyway. In this book I will mainly be doing a critique of the bible. Though concerning itself mainly with the Judaic-Christian religion, it gives many excellent examples of thought that pertain equally to all religions. What I will be doing is dividing the bible into two main categories. What is stupid or lies, or what is evil. Though to be teaching what is stupid or a lie as being true or the infallible word of god is evil in itself, I will still be separating them as well as I can. This is to emphasize the difference between the two. Unfortunately, the lies and evil of the bible feed off of and grow from the other. Also, as far as the things that are untrue or outright lies goes, if something is partially made up of lies, you can "bet your bottom dollar" that it is all lies. Which only a deluded fool would believe in.

This book will be showing you what the right way to look at things is and giving you the solutions to the world's problems. That is, without going too far away from the main point of this book. Another thing I didn't want to do is write a thick, extensive book that was so full of details that it would be even more unpleasant for the average person to read. I would also like to add that I say things the way I like to say them. If at times they aren't grammatically correct, I hope you will excuse me. Now for those who may be religious or otherwise brainwashed, let me give you a word of caution. If you try to deny what I have to say, you will be in danger of driving yourself stupid. Which is an easier thing to have happen than being driven crazy. Also, if you have any arguments against what I have to say while reading this book, please be patient. Because such points will likely be reinforced by further logic later in the book. Fortunately, knowledge is easy to give. Unfortunately, courage is not. Which is something you are probably going to need to read this book. One reason being that about the worst thing you could say about anybody or anything is the truth.

## CHAPTER ONE

Stupidity and Lies  
of the  
Old Testament

1

To begin our examination, let's first go to Gen. 1:1. It says:

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

Here it says that god created the heaven "and" the earth. Assuming that "the heaven" is the same as the universe, we now know that the earth didn't exist anywhere near the time of the creation of the universe. Also, if god had just created "the heaven," where did he live before then. This also brings up the question of which came first, the chicken or the egg. To which I have come to the conclusion that the "egg" must have come first. Because I find it easier to believe that an egg, through some sort of multidimensional chaotic structuring, can form out of what we perceive to be nothingness before a chicken. Especially

when this "chicken" is supposed to be an all knowing being with arms, legs, etc. So as far as who created what goes, apparently the only "god" there needed to be to create what we now know to exist is the ability of structure to form out of chaos in the multidimensional infinity that we must also assume to exist.

Unfortunately, I can't get any sense of accomplishment from shooting holes in Moses's clueless guessing. It's just too easy. The next example is in Gen. 1:2. It says:

"And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."

Well the earth couldn't have been too formless or void if there was water on it.

For our next journey into the realm of the untrue, let's go to Gen. 1:3. it says:

"And God said, Let there be light: and there was light."

Wrong yet again. Are you surprised? Unfortunately for him, we now know that there were sources of light in the universe before our solar system even existed. Also, it's highly likely that our star was giving off light before the earth was even through forming.

This next paragraph shows a profound lack of knowledge about physics. In Gen. 1:4, it says:

"And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness."

I hate to burst his bubble, but light can basically only travel in one direction anyway. Also, if people were created in god's image and he just created light, why did he have eyes to see it.

The next journey into la la land that I would care to comment on is in Gen. 1:14-15. It says:

"And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night: and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years.

And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so."

First of all, those lights in the heaven would be unnecessary to differentiate the

2

day from the night. Also, those lights in heaven that he talks about aren't just lights. They are stars, planets, etc. But moving on to Gen. 1:16 it says:

"And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also."

Well if god just made the stars, then besides planets, etc., what were those lights in heaven he was talking about earlier. Also, I would take the "greater light to rule the day" as meaning the sun. Now if he isn't just needlessly repeating himself and god had indeed just created the sun, where did the light come from that he had to divide earlier. Another thing is that this suggests that the sun existed before the other stars. Which we now know wasn't the case.

With equal cluelessness, Moses goes on to tell how god created life. For

example, in Gen. 1:20, it says:

"And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and the fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven."

Now though there are other possibilities, which doesn't include his explanation, I myself think it's likely that life around here first originated in the clouds that our solar system formed out of. Also, after life in the water, it says that birds came about. But we now know that birds didn't come about until much later.

For another discrepancy in the facts, let's first go to Gen. 1:27. It says:

"So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them."

First of all, he says that god created man in his own image. Then they tell you the same thing backwards. Well I don't care how or how often they say it. Because I know better. Also, in the first chapter of genesis it says god first created all the birds and animals. Afterwards he creates man. But in Gen, 2:19, it says:

"And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, that was the name thereof."

So first he says that god created every living creature, then man. But here it says that god apparently made adam first, then all the other animals. I wonder if he enjoyed being stupid. Also, it said earlier that when god created man, he made both a male and female. But with all that's going on here, god has yet to create eve. Somehow I don't believe their whole story. It also says that god had adam give all these animals names. Which seems to be quite a lot to expect from somebody who hasn't eaten the fruit of knowledge yet. Though I've heard it explained that this knowledge was supposed to be the knowledge between right and wrong. But I would consider that to be the same as any other kind of knowledge.

From what this next paragraph has to say, it would appear that god doesn't know much about genetic engineering. As you can see, in Gen. 2:22, it says:

3

"And the rib, which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man."

Well from what you have probably heard about genetic engineering, you would know that it would have been unnecessary for god to use a whole rib to create eve from. Another thing is that this makes me wonder why god didn't create eve the same way he created all the other creatures. Though as far as this story is concerned, they probably made this story up to help place women in a subservient position to men. But usually being larger, I don't think that men need such help. Also, because of this stupid story, I've actually met somebody who didn't believe that men and women had the same number of ribs. And he probably wasn't alone in his belief. Unfortunately, ignorance and lies grow a



wide range of unhealthy fruits.

The Bible's next exercise in stupidity (that's worth mentioning) is in Gen. 3:1. It says:

"NOW the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?"

I just thought you ought to know that serpents, which I take to mean snakes, can't talk. And contrary to popular belief, it wasn't the devil talking through the snake. Because in Gen. 3:14, it tells, in its own way, of god taking away the legs of the species. Which would have been a pretty rotten thing for god to do just because one couldn't keep itself from being possessed by the devil. Though as you will be seeing, god isn't above such behavior.

This next paragraph tells of god's curse on women because of the whole eating the fruit of knowledge thing. But as a curse, it's pretty meaningless. As you can see, in Gen. 3:16, it says:

"Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children: and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee."

Here it basically says that god will cause women's childbirth to be painful. But the difficulty that women have in childbirth is no more than what you might expect for the females of our species. Then it says that god will multiply woman's conception. Well women don't get pregnant any more often than you might expect the females of our species to do. It then says that woman's desire will be to their husbands. That doesn't seem to be much of a curse to me. And as we know, that isn't always the case. Then it says that the husbands will rule over the wives. Men ruling over women? What a novel idea. So as you can see, this isn't much of a curse. Also, there's a matter of injustice here that I don't like at all. Which is that just because the serpent was able to deceive eve, god makes all women to suffer. This is an often repeated form of injustice that the Bible unfortunately teaches.

From what these next two paragraphs say, somebody was lying about the  
4

creation of man. Because just before this point in the bible, there were supposed to be only four people on the world. There was adam, eve and their two sons cain and abel. (I see no need to capitalize the names of likely fictitious people) But cain kills his brother abel. Then, in Gen. 4:14-15, it says:

"Behold, thou hast driven me out this day from the face of the earth; and from thy face shall I be hid; and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth; and it shall come to pass, that every one that findeth me shall slay me.

And the Lord said unto him, Therefore whosoever slayeth Cain, vengeance shall be taken out on him sevenfold. And the Lord set a mark upon Cain, lest any finding him should kill him."

So who was going to kill him. There were supposedly only two other people left

in the world. Also, it's sickening for god to tell cain that he is going to punish sevenfold anybody who kills him. Because being guilty of the senseless murder of his brother, he deserved to be killed. Another thing is that why wasn't cain punished sevenfold for killing his brother. Instead of just being made a fugitive and a vagabond. Because the strife was basically over who worshiped god better? What did they think they were trying to teach!

Another discrepancy about how many people were in the world can be found in Gen. 4:16-17. It says:

"And Cain went out from the presence of the Lord, and dwelt in the land of Nod, on the east of Eden.

And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch."

First of all, you may wonder how cain found a wife in the land of Nod when there were supposed to be only two other people in the world. Well don't wonder too hard. Also, for killing his brother, he was supposed to be made a fugitive and a vagabond. But there is no mention of him receiving even that slight punishment. He supposedly even built a city. (A city for three people?) So whatever happened to this fugitive and vagabond business.

I won't be copying scripture for this next part. In case you don't know, the Bible goes on to describe people living to be hundreds of years old. One, named methuselah, supposedly lived to be almost a thousand years old. Now I have heard one explanation for this as being that they didn't measure years the same way back then as we do now. Though even if they called seasons years, (which I doubt) methuselah would still have lived to be almost two hundred and forty two years old. Which is quite unlikely.

Next, we have the fairy tale of a person named noah building a large boat called the arc. On which he was supposed to have carried two of every creature in the world. To keep them from drowning in an apparent worldwide flood. Speaking of the animals he was supposed to save, in Gen. 6:19-20, it says:

"And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the arc, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female.

5

Of fowls after their kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after his kind, two of every sort shall come unto thee, to keep them alive."

First of all, the Bible puts the size of this boat at about four hundred and fifty feet long. Which wouldn't have been nearly large enough. Also, how would most of those creatures get there over thousands of miles of land and sea. Let alone back again. Another thing is the unlikeliness of two of every creature supplying enough genetic diversity to assure these creatures survival. Neither does this story take into account what effect such a cataclysm would have on the plant life for the forty days that the earth was supposed to be flooded. Then you have to take into account the unlikeliness of noah and whoever he had helping him being able to build such a boat.

Part of the description of the flood itself can be found in Gen. 7:19-20. It says: "And the waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth; and all the high hills, that were under the whole heaven, were covered.

Fifteen cubits upward did the waters prevail, and the mountains were covered."

Somebody would really have had to have driven themselves stupid to believe this story. It is stupid for too many reasons to go into. But I will mention one. It would take quite a redistribution of water to cover all the land in about twenty two and a half feet of water. I could just imagine the sides and peaks of mountains being covered in that depth of water. Keeping it from flowing downhill over forty days would be a feat in itself.

This next paragraph makes me wonder why the Jews don't eat pork. Because in Gen. 9:3, it says:

"Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things."

This doesn't go along with the Jewish menu I've heard about. I can only wonder why god apparently later changed his mind.

Another unlikely story concerning noah can be found in Gen. 10:5. It says:

"By these were the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands; every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations."

The people they are speaking of here are noah's children, grandchildren and in-laws. I wonder how many of these people spoke different languages. Or were at least bilingual. Seeing how people didn't get around very much in those days, you would expect that these people all spoke one language to begin with.

Now despite all the talk in this area of the Bible of dividing the lands of the Gentiles according to the languages they spoke, in Gen. 11:1, it says:

"AND the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech."

So if these people's predecessors spoke different languages, why do they all speak the same language here. It seems to me that the increased distance between them would have made the opposite more likely to happen.

Next, we have god making some comments about a structure called the tower of Babel. In Gen. 11:6, it says:

6

"And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do."

God doesn't seem to like the idea that nothing will be restrained from them. But is god so small that he could feel threatened by anything those people could do? Though the answer to what is going on here is that the writers of the Bible are probably trying to get people used to the idea of being restrained by a higher authority. Also, earlier god supposedly said that man had become as one of them. Of which he meant gods. But why should gods need to be restrained. Could it be that he was wrong and people weren't as godlike as they were made out to be?

God's plan to hinder these people doesn't seem very useful. As you can see, In Gen. 11:7-8, it says:

"Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language; that they may not understand one another's speech.

So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city."

So instead of one people in one place speaking one language, he causes them to be spread all over the place and speak different languages. Though it stands to reason that all those people would likely eventually end up doing the same thing again. Only this time in many different places. With much less of a sense of community between them.

In Gen. 18, there is a story that is a little too lengthy to copy. So I'll just tell you what happens. The story goes that the lord is going to destroy two cities called Sodom and Gomorrah. So a person named abraham asks god if he is going to destroy the good with the wicked. He then asks god if there are fifty good people there, if he will still destroy it. God relents and says that he won't. Abraham then manages to talk god down to not destroying the place for the sake of ten good people. So what was this story supposed to mean. That abraham had better morals than god? Or that he knew better than god? That doesn't seem like a very sensible thing for them to teach. Could god have then been testing abraham? It's hard to say. But one thing is for sure. If god was unable to punish the wicked without harming the good, he wasn't much of a god.

We're next given a stupid story about a person named jacob trying to obtain his brother's birthright. Which he manages to do when his brother shows up so hungry, he feels that he is close to death. So he offers his brother food in exchange for his birthright. Then in Gen. 25:34, it says:

"Then Jacob gave Esau bread and pottage of lentiles; and he did eat and drink, and rose up, and went his way: thus Esau despised his birthright."

From what this story says, Esau rightly figured that his life was more important than his birthright. I wouldn't call that despising your birthright.

This next story concerns jacob, esau and their parents issac and rebekah.

7

Here rebekah is planing to help jacob steal the blessing that issac was planing to give to esau. If he does so, jacob will inherit all that issac has. So to do this, rebekah decides to disguise jacob. Which won't be easy, because esau was supposedly hairy. And though issac is old and blind, he can still recognize esau by touching him. But rebekah supposedly gets around this problem. As you can see, in Gen. 27:16, it says:

"And she put the skins of the kids of the goats upon his hands, and upon the smooth of his neck."

Not that I believe this story any more than any of the others. But let's just assume that esau was hairy. Being expected to believe that he was that hairy is a little too much. Issac may have been blind and near death. But I find it difficult

to believe that anybody could be that far gone to be fooled by such a thing and still be able to function at all.

For more of this unlikely story, let's go to Gen. 27:22-23. It says:

"And Jacob went near unto Issac his father, and he felt him, and said, The voice is Jacob's voice, but the hands are the hands of Esau.

And he discerned him not, because his hands were hairy, as his brother Esau's hands: so he blessed him."

First of all, you would think that after going through all this trouble that Jacob would have at least tried to disguise his voice. Then, even though Issac feels the kid skins, he still believes that it is Esau? Who are they trying to kid here.

These next two paragraphs have Esau and Issac talking about Jacob's deception. In Gen. 27:36-37, it says:

"And he said, is he not rightly named Jacob? for he hath supplanted me these two times: he took away my birthright, and, behold, now he hath taken away my blessing. And he said, Hast thou not reserved a blessing for me?

And Issac answered and said unto Esau, Behold, I have made him thy lord, and all his brethren have I given unto him for servants; and with corn and wine I have sustained him: And what shall I do now unto thee, my son."

As far as this blessing goes, the Bible shouldn't be teaching that a person's words are like they are written in stone. So when Issac discovered that he had been deceived, he should have withdrawn his blessing from Jacob and have given it to Esau instead. Also, there's something not quite right about why Jacob earlier sought Esau's birthright. Could it be that without the birthright, the blessing would have been meaningless? It's hard to say, or care. Also, as you can probably guess, I think it is most likely that this whole story was made up. But if so, what could they have been trying to teach by making it up. That if somebody is screwed up, (in this case, hairier than a monkey) it's ok to steal from them? Or that it's ok to keep them from gaining too high of a position? Well I guess that such a thing would be a better justification for stealing than greed. Though I don't think that any such possible teaching should have been so esoteric in nature. Neither should any of their other similar teachings.

8

Next, Jacob has a dream in which he sees angels using a ladder. As you can see, in Gen. 28:12, it says:

"And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold the angels of God ascending and descending on it."

Well I would have to say that this is a pretty stupid vision. Because unless heaven was nearby, using ladders would be quite a time consuming and difficult task. Now it's possible that this vision could be trying to represent something else. But what that could be, I don't really care. I'll leave it to others who may be inclined to do so to read whatever they can into this.

For this next part, I must admit that I know practically nothing about raising

goats. But what these next two paragraphs have to say doesn't seem very likely. In Gen. 30:38-39, it says:

"And he set the rods which he had pilled before the flocks in the gutters in the watering troughs when the flocks came to drink, that they should conceive when they came to drink.

And the flocks conceived before the rods, and brought forth cattle ringstraked, speckled and spotted."

Can you put twigs of some sort into these animals drinking water that acts like an aphrodisiac to them? I find it unlikely. But maybe they thought it would work. Also, I can't see it making any difference as to what color patterns these animals had.

I have seen some excellent tricks in my day. But I doubt the ones these next two paragraphs speak of ever happened. First, a person named aaron took a rod that he was carrying and cast it down in front of the pharaoh. Which then turned into a snake. Then, in Ex. 7:11-12, it says:

"Then Pharaoh also called the wise men and sorcerers: now the magicians of Egypt, they also did in a like manner with their enchantments.

For they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents: but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods."

If illusions like that were possible, I'm sure some magician would have done it in recent times. But I have never heard of such a thing. So I doubt that they did those things either.

Now the Israelites were supposedly slaves in Egypt. But in Ex. 9:6, it says: "And the Lord did that thing on the morrow, and all the cattle of Egypt died: but the cattle of the children of Israel died not one."

So the children of Israel owned cattle. But the Egyptians supposedly owned the children of Israel. So how can property own property. If the Egyptians owned the children of Israel, chances are they owned their cattle too.

Next is a command by god that seems quite prudish. In Ex. 20:26, it says: "Neither shalt thou go up by steps unto my altar, that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon."

9

It would seem that god is afraid that if they used steps, somebody may see up their robes. How silly can they get.

I really don't like the rituals god had his followers perform. These next two paragraphs give an example of a particularly silly one. In Ex. 29:26-27, it says: "And thou shalt take the breast of the ram of Aaron's consecration, and wave it for a wave offering before the Lord: and it shall be thy part.

And thou shalt sanctify the breast of the wave offering, and the shoulder of the heave offering, which is waved, and which is heaved up, of the ram of the consecration, even of that which is for Aaron, and of that which is for his sons."

It seems rather silly to me for the lord to require those people to wave and heave their offerings. Especially the heave part. What were they doing. Trying

to help god take his part?

There are many miracles mentioned in the bible that I can't really say much about. Because I wasn't there. All I can say is that it is extremely unlikely that they ever happened. Take for example this excerpt from a story about a miracle in Num. 22:30-31. It says:

"And the ass said unto Balaam, Am I not thine ass, upon which thou hast ridden ever since I was thine unto this day? Was I ever wont to do so unto thee? And he said, Nay.

Then the Lord opened the eyes of Balaam, and he saw the angel of the Lord standing in his way, and his sword drawn in his hand: and he bowed down his head, and fell flat on his face."

A talking donkey is a little hard to swallow. I just find it much easier to believe that the whole story is a lie.

As you may very well guess, this next paragraph of theirs is quite stupid. It speaks of a coming prophet. In Due. 18:19, it says:

"And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shalt not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him."

Well if somebody doesn't want to listen to his prophet, he can require that they do so all he wants. They still aren't going to do so. For instance, I would be less likely to listen to somebody who claimed to be speaking the word of god than I would anybody else. For me and people like me, if god wants to say something to us, he should come down and say it himself. Though I wouldn't listen to him anyway. The reasons for which you will be seeing much more of later.

These next few paragraphs tell of how they determined whether or not a girl was a virgin. In Due. 22:15-17, it says:

"Then shall the father of the damsel, and her mother, take and bring forth the tokens of the damsel's virginity onto the elders of the city in the gate:

And the damsel's father shall say unto the elders, I gave my daughter unto this man to wife, and he hateth her;

And, lo, he hath given occasion of speech against her, saying, I found not thy

10

daughter a maid; and yet these are the tokens of my daughter's virginity. And he shall spread the cloth before the elders of the city."

I am guessing that these token of virginity would be the little bit of blood on the sheets that supposedly comes from a vagina's first penetration. (Which I have heard isn't always the case) Though it wouldn't have had much to show in the case of repeated anal sex. And what about oral sex. Or the spread of herpes through kissing. Now back in those days, requiring that your wife be a virgin may have been at least some sort of a defense against sexually transmitted disease. But the idea of tokens of virginity is still stupid. Also, the unfortunate idea of "let the buyer beware" would have been helpful to such women.

This next paragraph is piling the crap pretty deep. Speaking of god, in Due.

32:4, it says:

"He is the rock, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment: a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he."

You just won't be able to imagine the falsehood of this statement until after you've read the next chapter. But for now, it says here that god's work is perfect. Well if that were true, why did he supposedly destroy the world in the flood. He also supposedly created us. But we're not perfect. Also, claiming perfection is a good first step toward imperfection. Then it says all his ways are judgment. Well even if that were true, it wasn't always (if ever) good judgment. It then says god is a god of truth. But from what I have seen so far, it's all been a pack of lies. And as far as his being just and right goes, you will later hear me explain very many things that shoots down that theory.

Being a little lengthy, I'll just tell you some of what this next story is about. In Josh. 2, two Israeli spies are in Jericho to gather information on the city before an attack. But they were discovered and some men in the city are searching for them. But a prostitute in the city helps them escape through her house. As you can see, in Josh. 2:15, it says:

"Then she let them down by a cord, through the window: for her house was upon the town wall, and she dwelt upon the wall."

For helping these spies, they tell the whore that she, her family and all her possessions will be safe from the coming attack. But if they leave their house during the coming attack, they will be taking their lives into their own hands. Then the city is attacked. Part of the story of which is in Josh. 6:20. It says:

"So the people shouted when the priests blew with the trumpets: and it came to pass, when the people heard the sound of the trumpet, and the people shouted with a great shout, that the wall fell down flat, so that the people went up into the city, every man straight before him, and took the city."

Now the prostitute's house was supposed to be on the wall that just fell down flat. And saying that the troops that surrounded the city were able to go straight before them into the city seems to show that the whole wall fell down flat on all

11

sides. So this woman's house and everything in it should be flat as well. But in Josh. 6:22, it says:

"But Joshua had said to the two men that had spied out the country, Go into the harlot's house, and bring out thence the woman, and that she hath, as ye sware unto her."

But there should be no house to bring her and her possessions out of. So somebody must be lying somewhere. Either the wall didn't fall down as completely as they said, or the woman's house wasn't on the wall as they said it was. Also, how this wall was supposedly knocked down was by having the army of about forty thousand men marching around the city, in what would have had to be a unison step, once a day for six days. While seven priests blew seven horns



continually. On the seventh day, the army marched around the city seven times. After which everybody shouts and the wall supposedly fell down flat. Now though it's possible to knock down a wall with sound, I can't see what they describe as being able to cause nearly enough vibration to do the job.

Even if they were only using something like a fortified mud brick wall, it should have been able to withstand the kinds of vibrations they describe. In fact, with a wall being apparently that weak, they shouldn't have had to go through all the trouble they describe to penetrate it. So I don't believe this aspect of their story either. Another thing is that a city wall is probably the strongest part of a city. And even though such a strong structure would likely absorb most of the vibrations the army caused, it seems to me that any structures near the wall on the inside that were made with similar materials would have been destroyed first. But it would also seem that if they had caused any such destruction, they would have mentioned it. Which casts further doubt on their story.

These next two paragraphs tell of a miracle Joshua asks the lord for. In Josh. 10:12-13, it says:

"Then spake Joshua to the Lord in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon.

And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is this not written in the book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hastened not to go down about a whole day."

First of all, I guess god forgot to tell Joshua that the sun doesn't move. The earth does. And it's somewhat the same story with the moon. Also, this miracle must still be in effect. Because it still takes about a whole day for the sun to set. Unless they meant the whole twenty four hours. In such a case, it's too bad that god didn't slow down time for the Amorites. Then to the Israelites, it would have been like fighting people who were moving in slow motion. Another thing I would like to talk about while we're on the subject is this filth about the Israelites avenging themselves upon the Amorites. All the Amorites did was live in a place

12

that the Israelis say their god gave to them. That doesn't seem like a very good cause for revenge. It might also have been helpful if god had told the Amorites of his decision to give their land to the Israelis. Though I guess this is one of those cases where history was written by the victors. Jewish history that is. I can only wonder if there were any other versions of this supposed history that were destroyed when the library of Alexandria was destroyed.

The Israelis seemed especially good at slaughtering people who lived on land they calmed their god gave to them. But in Josh. 15:63, it says the children of Judah couldn't drive out the Jebusites from Jerusalem. So they dwelt with them. Then in Josh. 16:10, it says that they couldn't drive out the Canaanites that dwelt in the land of Gezer. But this lack of resolve seems especially negligent. Seeing

how just back in Num. 33:52-56, the lord was supposedly saying to Moses:  
"Then ye shall drive out all the inhabitants of the land from before you, and destroy all their pictures, and destroy all their molten images, and quite pluck down all their high places:

And ye shall dispossess the inhabitants of the land, and dwell therein: for I have given you the land to possess it:

And ye shall divide the land by lot for an inheritance among your families: and to the fewer shall ye give the less inheritance: every man`s inheritance shall be in the place where his lot falleth: according to the tribes of your fathers ye shall inherit.

But if ye shall not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you, then it shall come to pass, that those that ye let remain of them shall be pricks in your eyes, and thorns in your sides, and shall vex you in the land where ye dwell.

Moreover it shall come to pass, that I shall do unto you, as I thought to do unto them."

After all that, I find it hard to believe that they would let those people stay. Especially after all the miracles the lord supposedly performed before their eyes. I guess you`ll just have to mark it down as another example of the Israelis having short memories concerning god`s commandments.

This next paragraph had Joshua making a prediction he shouldn`t have. In Josh. 23:5, it says:

"And the Lord your God, he shall expel them from before you, and drive them out of your sight; and ye shall possess their land, as the Lord your God hath promised unto you."

This sort of thing had been predicted before. But it didn`t always turn out that way. So I don`t know what made him think they would do any better in the future. Also, Joshua lets a little truth slip through when he says "ye shall possess their land." Not the land god supposedly gave them, but the land of those who occupy it. So he admits that they were stealing it. Though seeing how they were likely no different or better than the occupants of those lands, it`s wrong for the Bible to try to justify such behavior.

13

Another example of the truly unbelievable can be found in Josh. 24:23. It says:  
"Now therefore put away, said he, the strange gods which are among you, and incline your heart unto the Lord God of Israel."

Now let`s just consider for a moment what happened to the children of Israel in about the last two hundred and thirty years here. After many miracles, Moses frees them from the Egyptians. Then they come to a point where aaron and his sons make a golden calf to worship instead of the god that had performed so many miracles to that point. The error of which caused about three thousand of them to be killed. Which should have weeded out most of the disobedient and the disbelievers. Then after many more miracles, Moses led them to the promised land. Then Joshua leads them in stealing the land. With many more

miracles going on. So after all this, if the Israelites at least to some extent still worshiped strange gods, it would most likely be because all those miracles never happened. Because I can't see it being possible that after all those miracles they would be stupid enough to still be worshipping other gods.

It's time for a break. I'm nearly one sixth of my way through the Bible and my brain is already starting to hurt. Which is probably the effect it was meant to have. But not to any good end. So far, the things I've found in the Bible are largely false, stupid, irrelevant, repetitive, confusing, contradictory, evil and seriously lacking in things that are praiseworthy. Also, their syntax is terrible, they often have punctuation where it doesn't belong and none where it does, etc. I hope you can appreciate my sacrifice.

Now to continue, you may remember me mentioning that in Josh. 15:63 it saying that the children of Judah couldn't drive out the Jebusites from Jerusalem. As god commanded them to do. But now, in Judg. 1:8, it says:

"Now the children of Judah had fought against Jerusalem, and had taken it, and smitten it with the edge of the sword, and set the city on fire."

So I would take all this to mean that the children of Judah finally killed or drove off the Jebusites. But moving on to Judg. 1:21, it says:

"And the children of Benjamin did not drive out the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem; but the Jebusites dwell with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem unto this day."

Is somebody lying or did somebody take a stupid pill. The children of Judah had apparently successfully killed or drove off the Jebusites. So how could there have been any Jebusites left to give the children of Benjamin problems.

Moving back a couple of paragraphs to Judg 1:19, what it had to say doesn't say much for the lord. It says:

"And the Lord was with Judah; and he drove out the inhabitants of the mountain; but could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron."

All I have to say here is that if the lord couldn't defeat chariots of iron, he must be pretty lame.

14

It's hard to believe that anybody could be as fickle as the Israelites were supposed to have been. They must have been part frog the way they kept hopping from one god to another. Another example of this can be found in Judg. 3:7-9. It says:

"And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and forgot the Lord their God, and served Baalim and the groves.

Therefore the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and he sold them unto the hands of Chushanrishathaim king of Mesopotamia: and the children of Israel served Chushanrishathaim eight years.

And when the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, the Lord raised up a deliverer to the children of Israel, who delivered them, even Othniel the son of

Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother."

This type of thing happens over and over again. As it is, there are two good explanations to this phenomena. One is that the priests are completely worthless. The other is that everything attributed to god has been a lie. Though after many of the things god had supposedly said and done, you can't blame them for serving other gods. But it would have been better if they had served none at all. Also, it says here that the lord sold the children of Israel to this king with an alphabet for a name. That is a transaction that I would like to have seen.

These next few paragraphs show a servant of a king named Saul telling a lie. Which isn't exemplary behavior. First, in 1 Sam. 16:18-19, it says:

"Then answered one of the servants, and said, Behold, I have seen a son of Jesse the Bethlehemite, that is cunning in playing, and a mighty valiant man, and a man of war, and prudent in matters, and a comely person, and the Lord is with him.

Wherefore Saul sent messengers unto Jesse, and said, Send me David thy son, which is with the sheep."

Now supposedly David was a mighty and valiant man. A man of war. But in 1 Sam. 17:33, it says:

"And Saul said to David, Thou art not able to go against this Philistine to fight with him: For thou art but a youth, and he a man of war from his youth."

So first David was described as a mighty and valiant man. A man of war. But now he is just a youth? That would seem to show Saul's servant to be a liar. Though unlikely as it is, to be fair, it could be that Saul's idea of a mighty and brave man of war was different from the servant's.

There is another aspect to this story that doesn't ring true. First, Saul gets to know David quite well. Some examples of which can be found in 1 Sam. 16:21-22. It says:

"And David came to Saul, and stood before him; and he loved him greatly; and he became his armourbearer.

And Saul sent to Jesse, saying, Let David, I pray thee, stand before me; for he hath found favor in my sight."

15

Then strangely, Saul acts like he had never seen him before. As you can see, in 1 Sam. 17:58, it says:

"And Saul said unto him, Whose son art thou, thou young man? And David answered, I am the son of thy servant Jesse the Bethlehemite."

It looks like somebody was lying again. Because I find it hard to believe that Saul's memory was that bad. Sure, David may have looked a little different after chasing the Philistines. But if Saul was able to tell he was a young man, he should have been able to recognize him as his armor bearer, harp player and whatever else he may have been to him.

Being a little too lengthy to copy, I'll just tell you what happens in this next unsavory story. In 2 Sam. 1, the story starts with David returning from the

slaughter of the Amalekites. Then an Amalekite comes to David with his clothes torn and dirt on his head in a gesture of grief. He tells David that Saul had been killed in a battle with the Philistines. And rather than being captured by them, Saul falls on his spear. But Saul couldn't wound himself bad enough. So he asks this Amalekite to stand on him to kill him. Which he did. Then David asks why he wasn't afraid to kill the lord's anointed king and has him killed.

This is a pretty terrible thing to teach. Because if this Amalekite didn't fulfill Saul's request, it's a good bet that the Philistines would have made Saul wish he had. So the Amalekite shouldn't have been killed for his actions. Then there is the unlikely aspect to this story. Which is that this Amalekite probably knew that the Israelites wanted to see his people dead from even before David's recent expedition to actually slaughter them. So I find it unlikely that this Amalekite would have done Saul this favor. Also, knowing that the Israelites didn't like his people, it's also unlikely that he would have actually been grieved over Saul's death. And if he tried to feign grief in hopes of getting a reward for helping Saul die, he must have known that it would have been a hard sell at best. Which also makes the story unlikely.

According to this next paragraph, David was indeed wrong for having the Amalekite killed. Because in 2 Sam. 7:15, god supposedly says to a prophet: "But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee."

Here, supposedly by his own admission, god said that he was responsible for Saul's death. I guess that lets the dead Amalekite off the hook.

Next is another story that is a little too lengthy to copy. So I'll just tell you what happens. In 2 Sam. 21, Israel is experiencing a famine because Saul killed a bunch of Gibeonites that had sworn something by Israel to. So here we go again with the Bible trying to justify the punishment of the innocent. It was god's anointed, Saul, who ordered the deed to be done. The rest of Israel shouldn't have been punished. Especially seeing how Saul is dead and gone. Oh well, injustice is just another of the unsavory things that the Bible teaches. Also, how could the people of Israel refuse any order to kill those Gibeonites. Seeing how

16

they had done similar things so often with god's approval. Another stupid thing about all this is that they had done even worse things than to break a promise. With little or no reprisal at all.

Now to make up for this sin, David agrees to have Saul's relatives killed. As you can see, in 2 Sam. 21:8-9, it says:

"But the king took the two sons of Rizpah the daughter of Aiah, whom she bare unto Saul, Armoni and Mephibosheth, and the five sons of Michal the daughter of

Saul, whom she brought up for Adriel the son of Barzillia the Meholathite:

And he delivered them into the hands of the Gibeonites, and they hanged them in the hill before the Lord: and they fell all seven together, and were put to death in the days of harvest, in the first days, in the beginning of the barley harvest."

It speaks here of five apparently adopted sons of a daughter of Saul's being killed. But if their aim was to stamp out Saul's bad genetics, killing adopted children wasn't going to get them anywhere.

These next paragraphs give a good example of one of the things I hate about how the bible is written. In 1 Ki. 6:23-26, it says:

"And within the oracle he made two chrubims of olive tree, each ten cubits high.

And five cubits was the one wing of the cherub, and five cubits the other wing of the cherub: from the uttermost part of the one wing unto the uttermost part of the other were ten cubits.

And the other cherub was ten cubits: both the chrubims were of one measure and of one size.

The height of the one cherub was ten cubits, and so was it of the other cherub."

Is it just me, or does this description seem a little repetitive to you too. With all the obscurity that runs rampant throughout the Bible, it's stupid for them to waste ink in this way. Because all they needed to say was that these two cherubs were each ten cubits tall. Each with two wings that measured ten cubits from wing tip to wing tip. Also, if I ever knew what the images of these creatures were supposed to represent, luckily I've forgotten.

This next little story of theirs gives an account of such outlandish stupidity that it's hard to believe. Things start out with god punishing a person named Rehoboam by making him stupid. Now Rehoboam wanted to be made king. And the congregation of Israel comes to him to offer to make him king. As you can see, in 1 Ki. 12:4, it says:

"Thy father made our yoke grievous: now therefore make thou the grievous service of thy father, and his heavy yoke which he put upon us, lighter, and we will serve thee."

After this, he tells them to come back in three days so he can think about it. Think about it? Here he wants to be made king and they offer to make him king. But he has to think about it? I'm not buying that. He then asks the advice of their version of young republicans and takes their advice on how to answer. So in 1 Ki. 12:14, he tells the congregation this:

17

"And he spake to them after the counsel of the young men, saying, My father made thy yoke heavy, and I will add to your yoke: my father also chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions."

He tells them the exact opposite of what they want to hear. And he had time to think about it! I can't believe that anybody could be that stupid and still be able to function. Now this person sounds like the kind of person who would lie. Which is all he would have had to do to be made king. People who wanted to be made king have done much worse to be made king.

Next we have an even worse case of stupidity on their part that is without god's help. In this story, a person named Jeroboam sins against the lord. Then a prophet comes to him and predicts that his altar will be rent and its ashes spilled. When Jeroboam hears this, he puts forth his hand to order the prophet's capture. But his hand supposedly dries up and he can't pull it back to himself. His altar is also rent and its ashes spilled. Then Jeroboam asks the prophet to ask god to restore his hand to normal. Which god supposedly does. Now after all this, you would think that he would have learned his lesson and listen to what the prophet says. But in 1 Ki. 31:33, it says:

"After this thing Jeroboam returned not from his evil way, but made again the lowest of the people priests of the high places: whosoever would, he consecrated him, and he became one of the priests of the high places."

Now if there were a god, I would withstand its punishment to do what I thought was right. But I don't think he was like me. So I find it highly unlikely that he would have ignored the warning that he got.

This next paragraph says something that simply isn't true. In 1 Ki. 15:11, it says:

"And Asa did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, as did David his father."

Well seeing how David wasn't the father of this person named Asa, why did they say he was. I could guess, but why bother.

There are a couple things wrong with these next two paragraphs. In 2 Ki. 10:30-31, it says:

"And the Lord said unto Jehu, Because thou hast done well in exacting that which is right in mine eyes, and hast done unto the house of Ahab according to all that was in mine heart, thy children of the fourth generation shall sit upon the throne of Israel.

But Jehu took no heed to walk in the law of the Lord God of Israel with all his heart: for he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam, which made Israel to sin."

As far as this children of the fourth generation thing goes, that isn't much of a reward. But the strange thing here is that he was apparently already doing the same things as Jeroboam had done when god spoke to him. So if god didn't want him to be doing the same sorts of things as Jeroboam had done, he should have mentioned something about it. Instead of telling him that he was doing a

good job. Also, having god talk to him would tend to make Jehu believe even more that he was doing what he was supposed to be doing. So if he wasn't doing what god wanted him to do, I would say it was pretty much god's fault.

Speaking of not telling somebody something, let's go to 2 Ki. 13:18-19. It says: "And he said, take the arrows. And he took them. And said unto the king of Israel, Smite upon the ground. And he smote thrice, and stayed.

And the man of God was wroth with him, and said, Thou shouldest have smitten five or six times; then hadst thou smitten Syria till thou hadst consumed it: whereas now thou shalt smite Syria but thrice."

How stupid can they get! He should have told him why he was striking the ground with the arrows. So then he could have stayed up all night striking the ground with them. Then they could have become masters of the universe. Which supposedly being the chosen of god, they must naturally believe they should be anyway. Also, the Bible says that you should kill witches. But what they were doing sounds a lot like witchcraft to me. Another thing is that if Israel had ever smitten Syria even once, it's news to me. Though I can only imagine what their definition of smiting is.

These next two paragraphs show excessively bad syntax. In 2 Ki. 16:11 it says: "And Urijah the priest built an altar according to all that king Ahaz had sent from Damascus: so Urijah made it against king Ahaz come from Damascus."

The only way you might be able to figure out what they're getting at here is by reading the rest of their story. Which apparently involves some warfare between the children of Israel and the children of Judah. Now it's possible that this may have just been a mistake in copying something. But I don't think it would have offended god too much to add what seems to be a couple missing words.

Well Judah has a new king named Manasseh. And not surprisingly, he does evil in the sight of the lord. So in 2 Ki. 21:14, it says:

"And I will forsake the remnant of mine inheritance, and deliver them into the hands of their enemies; and they shall become a prey and a spoil to all their enemies;"

First of all, it seems silly for god to refer to these people as his inheritance. Because he didn't inherit them. He supposedly created them. Also, they again try to sell the idea that just because one person screws up, in this case Manasseh, it's apparently ok for god to punish everybody. Which I don't like at all. Because I'm one of those kinds of people who believe that only the guilty should be punished. Which supposedly, being the all powerful god that he is, he should have had the ability to do. Another thing I don't like is that, as it turns out, Manasseh lives and dies without anything happening. What kind of punishment is that for a guilty person! If god was going to punish everybody for this guy's sin, the least he could have done is do it while he was still alive.



The next unfortunate bit of supposed history that I would like to comment on concerns a king named Josiah. In this story, some people find a book of god's  
19

law in a temple. After hearing what the book had to say, the king tears his clothes in grief. He then sends some people to see a prophetess and find out what he should do. But instead of telling them to follow god's laws, in 2 Ki. 22:17, it says:

"Because they have forsaken me, and have burned incense unto other gods, that they might provoke me to anger with all the work of their hands, therefore my wrath shall be kindled against this place, and shall not be quenched."

Well if god's not going to punish those who perpetrate these deviations and if he's not interested in forgiving them when they discover somebody's mistake, he should leave them alone. Also, it's unlikely that those people did what they did just to provoke god.

So what do you think god does to reward Josiah for his concern? Well in 2 Ki. 22:20, it says:

"Behold therefore, I will gather thee unto thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered into thy grave in peace; and thine eyes shall not see the evil which I will bring upon this place. And they brought the king word again."

I myself wouldn't consider being "gathered unto thy fathers" as much of a reward. But at least it says he will die in peace. Which as it turns out, is just another lie. Because in 2 Ki. 23:29-30, it says:

"In the days of Pharaoh-nechoh king of Egypt went up against the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates: and king Josiah went against him; and he slew him at Megiddo, and brought him to Jerusalem, and buried him in his own sepulchre. And the people of the land took Jehoahaz the son of Josiah, and anointed him, and made him king in his father's stead."

It looks like god really screwed that one up. Because I wouldn't call being killed in battle being gathered to his grave in peace. Now for you believers out there, so far you have seen some of the examples of what faith in god has done for some of these people. Do you really think your faith in god is going to get you any better treatment?

The Jews seem to do so bad at following the rules of their religion that I'm surprised they even tried. For an example of one of these laws, let's go to Neh. 10:29-30. It says:

"They clove to their brethren, their nobles, and entered into a curse, and into an oath, to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and do all the commandments of the Lord our Lord, and his judgments and his statutes;

And we would not give our daughters unto the people of the land, nor take their daughters for our sons:"

That seems pretty clear cut. But in Ester 2, a Jew named Mordecai gives his cousin to the king of Persia for a wife. How soon they forget. Also, what do you think happens to them for breaking their oath and god`s law? The king of Persia gives them the power to destroy all their enemies. How stupid can god be. The 20

Jews had a hard enough time following god`s laws when they were supposedly being punished for breaking his rules. But unless screwing people up is his plan, it doesn`t seem to be a very good idea for him to allow them to be rewarded for doing so.

According to what this next paragraph said, Jesus wasn`t the only son that god had. Because in Job 1:6, it says:

"Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them."

This brings to mind some questions. Such as how many sons did god have. Did he have any daughters? Or did he have a wife? Do I really care? Well at least I can answer the last question. No. This also makes me wonder if satan was one of god`s sons, or if he just crashed the party.

In case you don`t know, god punishes a person named Job for a bet god made with satan. This next paragraph has a person named Eliphaz making an untrue statement to Job about his misfortune. In Job 4:7, it says:

"Remember, I pray thee, who ever perished, being innocent? Or where were the righteous cut off?"

So he asks who ever perished being innocent. Well apart from Job, his family and servants, I would imagine there were quite a few people who died in the supposed great flood who were innocent. Along with all the innocent animals. Then there`s the people god directed the Jews to kill. I wonder how many innocent people there were among them. They even killed their animals. I know they couldn`t have been guilty of anything. There are also all the Jews god supposedly punished because some past king made a bad decision about how to worship god. Or how guilty can a subject be for a present kings decisions.

For another faulty statement by Eliphaz, let`s go to Job 5:6. It says:

"Although affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground:"

I can agree with this to some degree. Because problems usually have causes. Though sometimes, things just happen. Now as far as what he said goes, a dust storm is an affliction in itself. There could also be some sort of nasty microbe or fungus in the dust that could cause an affliction. Locusts or some other nasty

insects could come out of the ground also. They could cause an affliction. Etc.

Speaking of what god is supposedly responsible for, in Job 5:10, it says:

"Who giveth rain upon the earth, and sendeth waters upon the fields."

Here he says god causes the rain. Which he doesn't. Meteorologists have a better explanation. And if any of this refers to rivers or streams, god doesn't cause that to happen either. Gravity and topography does. In fact, he would be hard pressed to stop it. It's no wonder god is thought to be so great when they attribute things like this to him.

Chapter five has a lot of these stupid statements in it. Though I don't intend to comment on all of them, another is in Job 5:15-16. It says:

21

"But he saveth the poor from the sword, from their mouth, and from the hand of the mighty.

So the poor hath hope, and iniquity stoppeth her mouth."

I wish I had a quarter of a penny for all the times that the lord hadn't saved the poor from the sword. It's also hard to imagine all the instances where the poor have been unjustly talked badly to, beaten or starved by the mighty. Though he could mean that god "can" do those things. But I can't see how the poor can receive much hope from that. Neither is hope a good reason for people to stop speaking iniquity about those who deserve it.

One if the better lies they tell is in Job 8:3. It says:

"Doth God pervert judgment? Or doth the Almighty pervert justice?"

They would expect the answer to be no. But the real answer to these questions is you can bet your ass he does! Now I don't want to spoil your fun. So just let me say that you won't know how much god perverts these things until after you've read the next chapter.

For more of the Bible's stupidity, let's go to Job 8:9. it says:

"(For we are but of yesterday. and know nothing, because our days on the earth are a shadow:)"

Well at least he admits that he doesn't know anything. Also, just because he seems to think so little of our lives here doesn't mean that you should. Though the reason they probably try to get you to think of yourselves and your lives in this way is because such people would be more in need of god. Time and time again the bible tries to get you to believe that your lives here aren't important. Another reason for which is probably to placate those who fear death. But the fear of death is a very poor reason to diminish the relevance of life.

The dung gets deeper in this next paragraph. In Job 8:20, it says:

"Behold, God will not cast away a perfect man, neither will he help evildoers."

Just for argument's sake, let's say god won't "cast away" a perfect man. But

Job was supposed to be a perfect man. Though he may not have been "cast away," god sure let satan screw him up good. It also says that god will not help evildoers. Help them? He supposedly creates them! I would call that being helpful. Also, the Bible says that everything that happens is the direct result of god's intervention. But bad people sometimes get away with their crimes. So from the Bible's point of view, it must be with god's help that they succeed.

For another example from this constant barrage of nonsense, let's go to Job 25:4. It says:

"How can man be justified with God? Or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?"

First of all, we don't need to be justified with god. All we need to be justified with is what we know to be right. It then asks how a man be clean that is born by a women. But generally speaking, I see no way how being born by a woman can tarnish you. Also, satan apparently wasn't born by a woman. Being as evil as he  
22

is supposed to be, it would seem that not being born of a woman is no guarantee of "cleanness" either.

The next person to talk to Job is a person named Elihu. Who was equally as clueless. For example, take what he had to say in Job 33:3. It says:

"My words shall be of the uprightness of my heart: and my lips shall utter knowledge clearly."

So he says that he will utter "knowledge" clearly. Taking into consideration most of the things I've read so far, none of these people talked very clearly about anything. Though maybe it was as clear as their primitive, monkey language allowed.

One reason the Bible is written so confusingly can be found in Job 33:15-16. It says:

"In a dream, in a vision of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, in slumberings upon the bed;

Then he openeth the ears of men, and seaeth their instruction,"

Well I don't know about these guys, but I do my best listening when I'm awake. It's no wonder that what they say often sounds like it came from an unconscious person. Now while we're on the subject here of what I take to be dreams, I would like to talk about how they tie into reality. First of all, it has been said that everybody is three people. There is the person as other people see them, the person they see themselves as and the person they really are. In the same vein, I see there being five different kinds of reality. Each probably influences the other to varying degrees. There is reality as people think it is; reality as people have been led to believe it is; reality as people would like it to be; reality as it may

be portrayed in dreams and reality as it really is.

Now as far as dreams go, though they may seem very real at times. Or the scenarios they can portray may seem very plausible. But they are just dreams. They are stories the brain comes up with for whatever reason when you're asleep. And there is a big difference between the reality dreams may portray at times and reality as it really is. So you should be careful that you don't let what you may dream while you're asleep influence your behavior. Because it is decisions made by your conscious mind that should influence you.

This next paragraph shows Elihu doing some wishful thinking. In Job 34:12, it says:

"Yea, surely God will not do wickedly, neither will the Almighty pervert judgment."

So here they go telling us this lie again. But in the next chapter you will see even more clearly that not only has god done wickedly and perverted judgment, but that he does so many times.

Now from what I have read in the Bible, most of the things in it that are hard to understand aren't overly wise. They are merely stupid. It would seem that they are following the old saying, "if you can't dazzle them with brilliance, then baffle  
23

them with bullshit." Which is what I would say they were up to in these next paragraphs. In Job 36:29-33, it says:

"Also can any understand the spreadings of the clouds, or the noise of his tabernacle?

Behold, he spreadeth light upon it, and covereth the bottom of the sea.

For by them he judgeth the people; he giveth meat in abundance.

With clouds he covereth the light; and commandeth it not to shine by the cloud that cometh betwixt.

The noise thereof sheweth concerning it, and the cattle also concerning the vapour."

As far as explaining the supposed power of god goes, I wonder if he could have been any more obscure if he tried. Also, I can't say I'm sure about what he was getting at with this "cattle concerning the vapor" thing. But I am sure that reading nonsense like this is worthless.

Finally, after all the various stupid things I've had to read through recently, god himself supposedly speaks. In Job 38:1-2, it says:

"THEN the Lord answered Job out of the whirlwind, and said,

Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?"

First of all, it says god answered Job out of the whirlwind. What whirlwind. This is the first I've heard of it. It would have been nice if they had deleted some

nonsense and added some story line here. Also, I wonder if god was referring to Elihu speaking words without knowledge, or if everybody who was speaking to Job was speaking words without knowledge. Having the wisdom of god, you would think that he could be a little precise in what he was saying. Another thing is that it doesn't make much sense for the bible to go through all the trouble of documenting words that god himself supposedly said were without knowledge.

But when it comes to speaking words without knowledge, god is hard to beat. As you can see, in Job 38:4-8, it says:

"Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare if thou hast understanding.

Who hath laid the measure thereof, if thou knowest? Or who hath stretched the line upon it?

Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? Or who hath laid the corner stone thereof;

When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy?

Or who shut up the sea with doors, when it brake forth, as if it had issued out of the womb?"

Job may have been ignorant, but I see nothing to be gained for god to confuse architecture with geology. Not that I believe such a creature exists. But if god did exist, he should at least have taken a stab at explaining a little about how things really work. Or just say he created things and let it go at that. Instead of  
24

telling lies. Now what god seemed to be getting at with all this is that being a god gives him the right to do whatever he wants. Which is debatable. Also, I just wish that they had found a much less stupid way of saying it.

Chapter thirty eight is full of this kind of nonsense. For one more example, let's go to Job 38:29. It says:

"Out of whose womb came the ice? And the hoary frost of heaven, who hath gendered it?"

First of all, if this means to suggest that ice and frost comes from god, that must mean god has a womb. So is god is a woman? Who knows. And who cares. Also, the cold that any ice or frost comes from doesn't come from any sort of womb. It comes from the natural cold of space. In fact, if there was anything out of the ordinary that came from any sort of womb, it would have been matter and heat. Not cold.

To liven up their stories for the simple minded, the Bible talks about some interesting creatures. One example can be found in Job 39:9-10. It says:

"Will the unicorn be willing to serve thee, or to abide by thy crib?

Canst thou bind the unicorn with his band in the furrow? or will he harrow the

valleys after thee?"

Well to my knowledge there is no evidence that unicorns ever existed outside of fables like this.

Two more creatures are talked about in Job 40 and in Job 41. The first is called behemoth. It is supposed to be a very large creature that eats grass like an ox and can drink up rivers. But skipping the absurdity of such a creature, is there any other kind of animal that they could have been referring to in their stupid way. Could it be a giant Bison? Well they lived in North America and died out during the last ice age. So I doubt it. Though maybe they were talking about an elephant? They do mention that it's nose can go through snares. But they don't eat grass like an ox. Besides, back in those days, there was a now extinct North African Elephant. I would also imagine that these people weren't unfamiliar with ivory. So it seems likely to me that they had at least heard of such creatures and knew them as such.

The other creature they talk about is called leviathan. Which from their description, sounds a lot like a fire breathing dragon. It is also unlikely that this could be a highly inaccurate and overblown description of a crocodile. Now I don't know just how far up the Nile crocodiles migrated, but it's likely that they heard descriptions of this known creature too and knew them as such. So the creatures they describe here are probably as imaginary as the unicorns.

Moving on, the Bible is fond of calling people sons of god. Which doesn't do much to promote humility. But some relief from this egotistical poison can be found in Ps. 8:4. It says:

"What is man that thou art mindful of him? and the son of man, that thou visitest him?"

25

This helps. But moving on to Ps. 8:5 it says:

"For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honour."

The Bible tells you often enough that pride is a sin. But calling you sons of god, or here saying that you are a little lower than the angles with glory and honor, doesn't discourage pride much. Let alone self restraint. But what gets me here is the way they had people's egos going up and down like a yo yo. It's just another way in which the bible tries to screw you up. Also, being poor, a lot of the people I've met were a lot lower than the angles. (not that the rich are much better) So generally speaking, people aren't crowned with glory and honor. Another thing is that any such praise is something that must constantly be earned. Not bestowed.

For one of the Bible's many contradictions, let's first go to Ps. 19:9. It says:

"The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

But moving on to Ps. 19:12 it says:

"Who can understand his errors? cleans thou me from secret faults."

So it says that the judgments of the lord are true and righteous. Then it says that he makes errors. Which would be in what he considers to be true and righteous as much as anything else. But I wish they would make up their minds. Because if he makes errors, he can't be altogether true and righteous. Unless they want you to think that even god's errors are true and righteous. But they can take any such teaching and stick it you know where. Also, they say that the fear of the lord is clean. Which I take to mean good. Well things like fear and pain may be necessary, but I wouldn't exactly call them good. That they are unpleasant is pretty much why they exist. They are meant to be fought and avoided. Just as god and any fear of him should be. Another thing is what it is you're supposed to fear about him. What he may do to you if you do bad things? Possibly. But you must also apparently fear his errors. Or punishment you're receiving because of some ruler's great grandfather's mistake. How could anybody worship such a creature.

This next paragraph is a psalm of David. It brings up a subject they were better off not bringing up. In Ps. 25:19, it says:

"Consider mine enemies, for they are many; and they hate me with a cruel hatred."

Ok. Let's consider their enemies. They've taken other people's land because they claim their god gave them the land. When they had taken cities, they usually mercilessly killed everybody. Even the animals. Then, long after David, others wanted to help these people rebuild their temple and worship their god. But they wouldn't allow it. And even though other people in the area were likely no different than the Jews, the Jews considered those of their kind who had mixed blood with them to be impure and therefore inferior. Etc. But he has the  
26

nerve to cry about how much the people they consider to be their enemies hate them? Maybe he should have stopped to consider that those other people were just tired of being Jewed.

They let a little truth slip through in this next paragraph. In Ps. 29:1, it says:

"GIVE unto the Lord, O ye mighty, give unto the Lord glory and strength."

Most of the bible tries to get you to believe that god is an omnipotent and infinite being. Which if he were, he wouldn't need you to give him glory and strength through your worship, servitude, fear, etc. So I would say that they were telling the truth here and god isn't all that powerful. Otherwise he wouldn't need



those things from you. Seeing how he apparently does need those things from you, it would mean that he is unworthy of your worship. There is another reason why I don't like the idea of giving god strength through your worship. Because it could be making you out to be like cows to be milked for some sort of extrasensory energy. Such a relationship would not be beneficial to you. But aside from this bit of fantasy, (at least I hope it is) humans shouldn't become mired in a self serving religion that makes us dependant on superstitious servitude.

For an exceptional contradiction, let's see what it says in Ps. 40:6. It says: "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt offerings and sin offerings hast thou not required."

Since when! In Exodus god required all sorts of sacrifices and offerings to be made. He was very exacting when he supposedly told Moses how and how often they should be done. So it would be pretty stupid for him to change his mind after all that.

It sure makes my job easier that there are so many stupid things in the bible. Which is one of the things that make it so worthless. One of these examples of stupidity can be found in Ps. 47: 7-8. It says:

"For god is king of all the earth: sing ye praises with understanding.

God reigneth over the heathen: God sitteth upon the throne of his holiness."

First of all, it tells you to sing praises with understanding. Which can't be done. Seeing how if you praise god, it means that you have very little understanding to begin with. Though at least this makes you think you can praise god and have any worthwhile understanding in that respect. For all it's worth. Also, as you will see later, god sees to it that these people have very little understanding. Which contradicts any suggestion here that understanding is good. Another thing is that judging from all of the punishments he had given the Jewish people so far for straying, his supposed existence was something he needed to find a better way of making them understanding of too. It then says that god reigns over the heathen. It's too bad the heathen don't know that. I guess telling them wasn't worth the bother.

We next have a case of somebody, with their ego running amok, doing some wishful thinking. In Ps. 49:1, it says:

27

"HEAR this, all ye people; give ear, all ye inhabitants of the world."

They had no radio back then and he couldn't yell that loud. So it would be pretty hard for the whole world to listen. Also, though it requires a stretch of the imagination, he could have meant that the whole world should eventually "listen" to him through his writings. But if that is what he meant, that is what he should

have said. Another thing is that even if the whole world could or eventually would listen to him, what is it that he would expect them to hear. That the Jews and only they are the chosen of god? It would take a pretty loathsome, exceptionally brainwashed, non-Jewish lowlife to go along with that idea.

Not surprisingly, this next paragraph tells a pretty big lie. As you can see, in Ps. 49:3, it says:

"My mouth shall speak of wisdom; and the meditation of my heart shall be of understanding."

You can take my word that if you read the rest of what he says in chapter forty nine, you would see very little, if any, wise understanding in what he says. Also, you will be seeing more fully later that for these people to speak about understanding is like, so to speak, listening to an ice cube talk about fire. Or a carpenter talking about brain surgery.

There is nothing fancy about this next paragraph. It just tells straightforward lies. In Ps. 53:1, it says:

"THE fool hath said in his heart, There is no God. Corrupt are they, and have done abominable iniquity: there is none that doeth good."

Well I don't believe in god or in its worship. I have looked and have found no folly in this. Then, as far as their trying to sell the idea of god goes, it has been said that the bigger the lie, the more people will believe it. And nothing is supposed to be bigger than god. Also, judging from history to the present, (and extrapolating into the future without this book) if the clergy have ever been less corrupt, abominable or iniquitous than anybody else, it was most likely because it simply wasn't good business for them to be so. Also, as far as other believers go, I would be filthy rich if I had one tenth of a penny for all the misdeeds committed by them.

To the contrary of what they teach, a non believer would probably be less likely to be as bad as they are. Because they wouldn't be able to blame their shortcomings or misdeeds on either god or the devil. Which in turn would promote more responsible behavior. Or at least more honest behavior. As for myself, though I have been no angel in the past, I am probably less corrupt, abominable or iniquitous than most. And as far as doing good goes, it is the whole reason I'm writing this book. Though how big of a bastard that makes me is something you are going to have to decide for yourself after you've read this book.

Another example of the Bible's confused writing, out of many, can be found in Ps. 53:4. It says:

"Have the workers of iniquity no knowledge? who eat up my people as they eat

bread: they have not called upon God."

You may not think so from the way this is written, but the people they speak of who have not called upon god aren't the ones who eat up his people like bread. Also, one reason why I think it's wrong to tell people that they should call on god to get them out of trouble is because it's often people that cause problems. People also have the ability to foresee and prepare for other problems. So it should be up to people to get themselves out of trouble. Another stupid thing about this is that it makes god seem like an attack dog-god. Sick`em boy!

In this next paragraph, we're given another example of how small this god is. In Ps. 68:34, it says:

"Ascribe ye strength unto God: his excellency is over Israel, and his strength is in the clouds."

As I said before, if god needs you to ascribe strength to him, then he isn't much of a god. Also, according to this, you need not thank god for anything he does. Because it would be the strength that you ascribe to him that does whatever. So why not just cut out this hocus pocus middle man. Then it says that his excellency is over Israel. Well if that's where he keeps it, he shouldn't expect any "strength" from other nations. Besides, Israel is small. So his excellency must also be small. The same thing goes with his strength being in the clouds. Because considering the vastness of the universe, his strength must be minuscule indeed.

What this next paragraph had to say is quite misleading. In Ps. 71:1, it says: "IN thee, O Lord, do I put my trust: let me never be put to confusion."

First of all, it is a confused teaching to suggest that if you trust in the lord, you will never be put to confusion. Though it may be hard to be confused when you leave others to do your thinking for you. But to do so shows confusion in good judgment. It is also confused to believe in god because to believe in something that isn't real again shows confused thinking. Another thing is that if believers read the bible they will be confused. Because the bible says that it is written to be confusing. Etc. So it's pretty stupid for the bible to renounce confusion here. Seeing how confusion is what it's all about. Also, if these people don't feel confident enough to trust in their own judgment to avoid confusion, but instead ask god to do it for them, how can they trust in their judgment to trust god.

Speaking of confusion, let's see what it says in Ps. 92:10. It says:

"But my horn shalt thou exalt like the horn of a unicorn: I shall be anointed with fresh oil."

From what I have read, there have been people who have grown a horn. Which only happens extremely rarely. But I doubt if he was one of those people. So why would he say such a thing. Or why would anybody exalt it like a unicorn's. Also, though I find the explanation unlikely, I remember hearing somewhere that the word horn could be a mistranslation of the word for hair.

Would such a thing mean that when they spoke of a unicorn's horn before, they were speaking of its hair? Luckily I'm not confused enough to really care what the explanation is.

For another example of a stupid psalm, let's go to Ps. 94:2. It says:

"Lift up thyself, thou judge of the earth: and render a reward to the proud."

I don't think I'm wrong in thinking that it's wrong for this guy to be telling god what to do. Or to be suggesting that he was lying down on the job. Also, this says that god should render a reward to the proud. But as you can probably guess, what he is likely really saying is that the proud should be punished.

There is a mold that can grow on grain that acts like LSD. From what these next paragraphs say, it sounds like the person writing this ate some. In Ps. 114:3-8, it says:

"The sea saw it, and fled: Jordan was driven back.

The mountains skipped like rams; and the little hills like lambs.

What ailed thee, O thou sea, that thou fleddest? thou Jordan, that thou wast driven back?

Ye mountains, that ye skipped like rams; and ye little hills, like lambs?

Tremble, thou earth, at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the God of Jacob;

Which turned the rock into a standing water, the flint into a fountain of waters."

All I can really add to this is that this guy sure had a vivid imagination.

The old testament seems rather ambiguous about life after death. Sometimes it says that there is a life after death and sometimes it says that there is not. These neat two paragraphs are among those that suggest that there is not. In Ps. 115:16-17, it says:

"The heaven, even the heavens, are the Lord's: but the earth hath he given to the children of men.

The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence."

Here it says that heaven is for god and the earth is for man. So as far as heaven is concerned, I guess you're not invited. Which isn't anything like what Jesus taught. Then it says that the dead don't praise the lord. Or those who, what I take to mean, are buried. What I take all this to mean is that when you're dead, you're dead. It's too bad that they couldn't have made up their minds about such an important matter. Now the conclusion I have drawn from the subject is that there is some sort of existence after death. But I would have to doubt that it is anything like this existence. Also, who knows. Maybe if enough people want the afterlife to be a certain way, that's the way it will be for them at least to some degree. Though, among other reasons, nobody should kill

themselves or look forward to death on the strength of a maybe. Another thing is that some may think that it is to make this point as to why the old testament vacillates on the subject. But if the bible has something to say, it should just say

30

it. Any such confusing, lawyer word games only come in handy when you want to avoid the truth.

This next paragraph spoke of how great god is. In Ps. 135:5, it says:

"For I know the Lord is great, and that our Lord is above all gods."

He basically says here that he knows his god is greater than all other gods. But how does he know. I doubt if he had knowledge of other gods from parts of the earth that were unknown to him. Let alone those that could likely be found on other planets. So I don't think he was enough of an expert to be making a statement like that. Besides, I know that his god isn't greater than my god. If you want to call it that. Because my idea of god is infinity. Which goes so far beyond the visible universe that it boggles the mind. The reason I believe it to be so large is because no matter how far you go, there will always be something beyond that point. And my idea of god doesn't require any sort of worship. Neither would it bother itself with anything happening on something so incredibly infinitesimal as our planet. Let alone some piece of dirt on the eastern end of the Mediterranean sea.

In speaking of what to do with a thief who steals because he is hungry, in Prov. 6:31, it says:

"But if he be found, he shall restore sevenfold; he shall give all the substance of his house."

Well if somebody is so poor that they have to steal to eat, chances are they won't be able to restore seven times what they stole. There are also other variables. Like what was the value of the thing that was stolen. Had the thief stolen before? Was the victim of the thief rich or poor. Was anybody threatened or hurt during the theft? Etc. So I say the punishment should be made to fit the crime. Another problem we have is our society in general. Though thieves are punished, people often justify them. They think like "god made them that way; governments often steal; it's an acceptable last ditch option for survival; it's a way of allowing for a more fair distribution of wealth; such morality is what made many people rich to begin with." Etc. It also often seems to be the case that if you have enough money to spend on lawyers, you can buy your way out of criminal punishment. So to more effectively control thieves and be morally justified in doing so, we need to become more moral ourselves.

What this next paragraph had to say leaves much to be desired. In Prov. 10:4,

it says:

"He becometh poor that dealeth with a slack hand: but the hand of the diligent maketh rich."

Well in general, it's true that the harder you work, the more you will get. But this isn't always the case. I've worked for places that worked people like dogs. Knowing that you can easily be replaced, they would chew you up and spit you out. Leaving you little to show for your effort. I can see how that kind of diligence may have, for example, made some employers rich. But it likely

31

sucked for most everybody else. Also, greed should not be your only motivation for hard work. Obsessiveness can also be a danger if all you care about is diligence.

Apart from being too obscure, I don't see anything good in this next paragraph. In Prov. 11:8, it says:

"The righteous is delivered out of trouble, and the wicked cometh in his stead."

Well if a righteous person is delivered out of trouble, what is it that's supposed to happen to him that a wicked person will take his place. Unless they mean the righteous person dying. But I wouldn't call dying being delivered out of trouble. In fact, dying is the worst possible end result of trouble. Also, if a righteous person is "delivered out of trouble," might not another righteous person take his place? What else could they be trying to say here. Maybe that you shouldn't deliver a righteous person out of trouble. Or that a wicked person taking his place is worth the price. I may not know exactly what they were trying to get at here. But I'm willing to go out on a limb here and guess that whatever it was, it is lacking in common sense.

Apparently the idea that god controls your lives isn't stupid enough. They add some extra stupidity to the idea in this next paragraph. In Prov. 20:24, it says:

"Man's goings are of the Lord; how then can man understand his own way?"

They basically ask here that if god controls your actions, how can you understand what you do. Well that's easy. You would do it, for instance, the same way you decide how to move a piece in a game of chess. Unless they want you to believe that god does that too. But you would really had to have been driven stupid to believe that. What they say here only reaffirms my opinion that the bible is a waste of ink and paper.

Not surprisingly, they ask a stupid question in this next paragraph. In Prov. 22:20, it says:

"Have I not written to thee excellent things in counsels and knowledge."

Well seeing how he asked, for the most part, no, he hasn't. As with the rest of the bible, they may have managed to say something from time to time that wasn't

too objectionable. Even rarer yet to say something that was actually good. But for the most part, it's all been a load of crap.

Speaking of crap, these next two paragraphs were teaching people to be two faced. In Prov. 25:21-22, it says:

"If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink:

For thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord shall reward thee."

I say that if somebody is your enemy and it's their fault you are enemies, let them go screw themselves. As a point of personal honor if nothing else, it would be better to be honest with somebody rather than to try to make them feel ashamed for having to ask for your help. Though if in such a circumstance you

32

did decide to help an enemy, I would say that the help should come at a price. Which is to try to resolve your differences.

We're given a straightforward contradiction in these next two paragraphs. In Prov. 26:4-5, it says:

"Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him.

Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit."

First you're told not to answer a fool according to his folly. Then they turn right around and tell you to answer a fool according to his folly. Whatever they are trying to say, (if anything) they couldn't have found a more stupid way to say it.

The Bible doesn't show a great understanding of human nature in this next paragraph. In Prov. 28:17, it says:

"A man that doeth violence to the blood of any person shall flee to the pit; let no man stay him."

Well anybody inconsiderate enough to unjustly do violence to another person probably wouldn't be considerate enough to punish himself by fleeing to any pit. In fact, he would probably run away from it.

You will have to excuse me if I write about too many contradictions. For the benefit of those with short attention spans, I can skip some. But I can't skip too many of them. The first part of this next contradiction is in Eccl. 7:3-4. It says:

"Sorrow is better than laughter: for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made better.

The heart of the wise is in the house of mourning; but the heart of fools is in the house of mirth."

Then, moving on to Eccl. 8:15 it says:

"Then I commend mirth, because a man hath no better thing under the sun, than to eat, and to drink, and to be merry: for that shall abide with him of his labour the days of his life, which God giveth him under the sun."

First of all, sorrow isn't better than laughter. Though both have their places, too much of either isn't good for you. Now as you can probably guess, what I wanted to point out here is that after basically saying that sorrow is better than happiness, he later comes to the conclusion that happiness is good. Well if you think that their confused writings are stupid, you're right. They are.

I can't really agree with what this next paragraph has to say. In Eccl. 9:4, it says:

"For to him that is joined to all the living there is hope: for a living dog is better than a dead lion."

I myself think it's better to be dead with your self respect, control of your life and soul, than to be alive without them. You may argue that if the lions choose death, that would leave only the dogs to breed. Well for whoever killed the lions, living with the dogs can be their fate. Because the dogs that are left would likely find their way into the victors bloodlines.

As you know, I have come to the conclusion that there is some sort of existence  
33

after death. Though I have never seen a ghost, I have experienced some strange things. Then there are the people who have claimed to see ghosts and have experienced a host of paranormal activity. They can't all be liars or suffering from some other brain malfunction. It is also far from a certainty that such things are a paranormal projection of the human mind. I would also say that the universe is sufficiently mysterious enough to allow for some sort of existence after death. But don't get me wrong. Even if there is some sort of paranormal god "thing," it can still blow me. (I will talk more about this later) These next two paragraphs again suggest that there is no existence after death. First, in Eccl. 9:5, it says:

"For the living know that they shall die: but the dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten."

Then, moving on to Eccl. 9:10 it says:

"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest."

Now I would take all this to mean that your chances for life after death are about zero. Not exactly the type of thing you would expect the bible to teach, is it. Another thing is that though the bible is capable of some incredible stupidity, I doubt if they could be talking about the lack of life in the corpse itself. There is another aspect of this that is extremely disgusting. Which is that the Bible has already said that you shouldn't punish the wicked. Because god will do it. And if I'm not mistaken, this punishment was supposed to happen in the next life. But according to these types of teachings, what will there be to punish.



Speaking more on this subject, in Eccl. 12:7 it says:

"Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was: and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it."

So does this mean your souls will go to heaven to be with god and live on as a continuation of yourselves? Or does this mean that your spiritual energy will be reabsorbed by god and you yourself, as any kind of entity, will cease to exist. Well considering the things they said earlier, I would have to say the second supposition is supposed to be the correct one. Which doesn't offer much consolation.

These next two paragraphs again said that god doesn't require animal sacrifice. In Isa. 1:11-12, it says:

"To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats.

When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts?"

Here god supposedly asks who required sacrifice to him. Well as you know, god did. So as far as this sacrifice thing goes, I guess it depends on who you think was doing the least amount of lying. Moses or Isaiah. Also, maybe to

34

people like this, truth doesn't really matter. Which from the way the bible is written, is a position they have no choice but to take. But as far as I'm concerned, truth is the most important thing there is.

Do you want to hear more of the bible's stupidity? Too bad, you have to anyway. For another good example, let's go to Isa. 6:10. It says:

"Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed."

Here the lord is supposedly cursing them because they strayed, again. But considering all the times they had disobeyed him and have gone back and forth between his favor and disfavor, a curse like this is stupid. It's like cursing a fish to be wet. Also, when they spoke of understanding here, it gives the false impression that, for the most part, they teach anything good to be understood.

This next paragraph shows a good example of one of the bad things that the bible does. In Isa. 7:10, it says:

"Moreover the Lord spake unto Ahaz, saying."

I realize that on its own, this isn't saying much. I just didn't want to copy a lot of scripture. But the bad thing about what this says is that the lord didn't speak to Ahaz earlier and he wasn't doing so here. The lord was supposedly speaking to

Isaiah and he is passing the word along to Ahaz. Now I'm sure there are many religious fanatics who may think that god speaks to them. Most if not all of them would also like you to think that their word is as good as the word of god. But you shouldn't believe it. One reason being that only words given to you directly from god himself should hold the same weight. Also, if you're not worth talking to, then he isn't worth listening to. But as you will be seeing more clearly later, even if god does speak to these prophets, or to you, what he has to say is more than just useless.

Jesus's birth seemed to be foretold in this next paragraph. In Isa. 7:14, it says: "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bare a son, and she shall call his name Immanuel."

Well it couldn't be Jesus they were speaking of. Because this was supposed to be a sign for Ahaz. But there are sixteen more books to go through before the new testament. Which I imagine would encompass enough time to make it unlikely that Ahaz would be around to see this sign. Then moving on to Isa. 8:3, it says:

"And I went unto the prophetess; and she conceived; and bare a son. Then said the Lord to me, Call his name Mathershalalhasbaz."

They don't call the child Immanuel. So if this isn't the virgin birth they spoke of, why did they even bring it up?

It looks like prophets like Jesus weren't a novelty. Because in Isa. 9:6, it says: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be

35

upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counseller, The mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace."

As I said before, there are sixteen more books to go through before the new testament. But here they say a child "is" born. They don't say here it will be born. So it again doesn't seem likely that it was Jesus they are talking about here. Though a religious person would likely say that the "is" part refers to a revelation that such a person will be born. But if that is what they meant, there would have been a much less stupid way of saying it.

There are a few things wrong with these next two paragraphs. In Isa. 20:3-4, it says:

"And the Lord said, Like as my servant Isaiah hath walked naked and barefoot three years for a sign and a wonder upon Egypt and upon Ethiopia;

So shall the king of Assyria lead away the Egyptians prisoners, and the Ethiopians captives, young and old, naked and barefoot, even with their buttocks uncovered, to the shame of Egypt."

First of all, it isn't much of a god that would make somebody run around naked for three years just to provide a sign. The only sign this would have been to me is that this person was extremely stupid. Also, what he was doing sounds more like voodoo. To try to make such a thing happen. And maybe give the Assyrians some ideas. But this is just another example of the mumbo jumbo that the bible unfortunately promotes. Another thing is that I doubt if the Assyrians would have stripped their captives naked. Doing that would likely have slowed them down, made many of them ill and diminished their value as slaves. Then they would have had to provide them with clothes afterwards.

It seems that god was going to devastate the earth, again. Part of the reason for which can be found in Isa. 24:5. It says:

"The earth is also defiled under the inhabitants thereof; because they have transgressed the laws, changed the ordinances, broken the everlasting covenant."

So god was going to do this because they transgressed the law. But god is the one who closed their eyes and made their ears heavy. So whose fault was that. Another reason god was supposedly going to do this is because they changed the ordinances. But god himself is guilty of that. For instance, by first telling them to make sacrifices and then changing his mind. Also, if god wanted his laws obeyed, he should have come down himself and made his laws known to them directly. Because how were they, or are you, supposed to tell one stupid, pandering, parasite, scumbag, liar from the ones that the bible would consider to be true prophets of god.

Another thing I sometimes run across is the bible describing objects with human feelings. An example of which can be found in Isa. 24:23. It says:

"Then the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of

36

hosts shall reign in mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously."

I think it's unlikely that the moon will ever be confounded or the sun ashamed. Also, it says basically that the lord will reign over his ancients. Which I take to mean worshipers or prophets that have passed on. But according to some of the things I've read in the bible, there isn't supposed to be anything left of them to reign over except dust and bones.

For another example of the bible's unspecific writing, let's see what it says in Isa. 26:10-11. It says:

"Let favour be shewed to the wicked, yet will he not learn righteousness: in the land of uprightness will he deal unjustly, and will not behold the majesty of the Lord.

Lord, when thy hand is lifted up, they will not see: but they shall see, and be ashamed for their envy at the people; yea, the fire of thine enemies shall devour them."

First of all, what I believe they were trying to say is that favor shown to the wicked is wasted. But who would show favor to the wicked to begin with. You might offer them forgiveness, but favor is another matter. Now there's a possibility that by saying favor, they meant forgiveness. But if these people couldn't say what they meant, they shouldn't have said anything at all. Then, after saying that they will not see, it turns around and says that they will see. I wish they would make up their minds. Though there is a slight possibility that they meant that at first they will not see, but god will eventually make them see. But again, if that is what they meant, that is what they should have said. Speaking clearly isn't rocket science. It then brought up the subject of envy. Which is a major cause of wicked behavior. And being such, there are a couple things I would like to say about it.

First, there is the aspect of it that causes greed. Though we live in a society that you must act in a greedy manner to make it at all. Though you should be careful that you don't seek too much. Take for example the many "successful" people have gained more than most. Most if not all continued to be greedy for even more. No matter whose toes they have to step on to get it. Then there is the aspect of envy that occurs on a more personal level. Somebody could be envious of another person because of things like physical attractiveness or intelligence. But you should be careful that you don't let the lack of such attributes cause you to treat other people poorly. Though it goes against human nature, if you are bothered by such things, you should consider limiting the number of your offspring. You should also be willing to be forgiving of others who may treat you poorly because of your lack of such attributes.

Isaiah describes a lot of destruction in chapter twenty four. But surprisingly he admits that he was wrong. Or what I prefer to refer to as lying. As you can see, in Isa. 26:18, it says:

37

"We have been with child, we have been in pain, we have as it were brought forth wind; we have not wrought any deliverance in the earth; neither have the inhabitants of the world fallen."

So as I said, what I take all this to mean is that he was lying. It's nice of him to admit it. But that doesn't excuse it. This only reinforces my position that none of these people should be listened to. And what if something did by chance happen. I'm sure he would have been more than happy to take credit for something that he had nothing to do with. Also, if what he said earlier was

wrong, why did he go through all the trouble of documenting it. To show people how to be stupid? Another thing is that if he was full of crap before, what made him think he would do any better in the future.

What these next two paragraphs had to say wasn't bad. It could have just been said much more clearly. In Isa. 29:20-21, it says:

"For the terrible one is brought to nought, and the scorner is consumed, and all that watch for iniquity are cut off:

That make a man an offender for a word, and lay a snare for him that reproveth in the gate, and turn aside the just for a thing of nought."

Now instead of being so long winded, why couldn't he just have said, "He who scorns in little matters is consumed. And they that seek iniquity in small matters are cut off."

There is a good lie to be found in this next paragraph. See if you can find where it is. In Isa. 30:6, it says:

"The burden of the beasts is in the south: into the land of trouble and anguish, from whence come the young and old lion, the viper and the fiery flying serpent, they will carry their riches upon the shoulders of young asses, and their treasures upon the bunches of camels, to a people that shall not prophet them."

Yes, it's the part about the fiery flying serpent. Such creatures may make a story exciting. But maybe if they had something worthwhile to say, they wouldn't have to invent such creatures.

Though there is quite a bit to find fault with in Isa. 34, I think it's sufficient here to limit my comments to the creatures it talks about. First, in Isa. 34:7, it says: "And the unicorn shall come down with them, and the bullocks with the bulls; and their land shall be soaked with blood, and their fat made with fatness."

Well seeing how this person likely never saw a unicorn, I would have to imagine that he is just repeating fables. Which to a large extent is what religion is all about.

They go on to speak of another unlikely creature in Isa. 34:13. It says:

"And the thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortress thereof: and it shall be a habitation of dragons, and a court for owls."

I am just going to assume here that the dragons they spoke of here are your normal imaginary kind. Not just a misrepresentation of a crocodile or big lizard.

But hopefully, you don't need me to point out the unlikeliness of the kinds of dragons they would have you believing in.

Even more of this kind of silliness can be found in Isa. 34:14. It says:

"The wild beasts of the desert shall also meet with the wild beasts of the island,

and the satyr shall cry to his fellow; the screech owl also shall rest there, and find herself a place of rest."

In case you didn't know, a satyr is a creature like the demigod pan. They are half man and half goat. So it's pretty safe to say that no such creatures ever existed. At least not on this planet. Nor are they likely to in the future.

Next, the Bible again suggests that there is no life after death. In Isa. 38:18, it says:

"For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee: they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth."

As I said before, I doubt they could be so stupid as to be speaking of the lack of life in the corpse itself. So what they must be saying is that there is no life after death. But what I find interesting here is the fact that many religious people believe in a life after death. Despite teachings like this. Though my views on the subject have nothing to do with any sort of religious considerations. For example, as I said before, many people have claimed to have seen ghosts. Sometimes more than one person at a time. What if they weren't all lying or mentally deluded. Also, if it's possible for such things to exist, it is also possible that they could be more than some sort of mental projection or environmental recording. If stories of reincarnation are likewise to be believed, could there be more to it than extreme telepathy? Though I should also again add here that only an extremely stupid person would sacrifice this life in exchange for any possible afterlife.

The last paragraph ended by saying that those who go down into the pit can't hope for god's truth. But with documents like the bible around, truth has a pretty tough battle to fight in this life as well. Take for example what it says in Isa. 40:28. It says:

"Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching his understanding."

Hast thou not known. Hast thou not heard. God supposedly rested on the seventh day of creation. If he rested, he must have been weary.

An argument that I have had with some believers is settled in this next paragraph. In Isa. 43:10, it says:

"Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no god formed, neither shall there be after me."

The argument that I have had with believers is what I talked about at the beginning of my examination of the bible. Which is the argument about what

came first, the chicken or the egg. I would say that if god, the chicken, came first then where did he come from. To which their only reply would be that god always was there and always would be there. But here, god himself supposedly tells Isaiah that not only was he formed, but there was a time before him and there will be a time after him. Also, this leaves me to wonder who formed god. Though doubtlessly the hard core believers, having already been driven stupid (and liking it) will be able to explain this away also.

This next paragraph shows a good contradiction. But to save myself a lot of copying of biblical gibberish, I will just tell you the latter part of the contradiction. In Isa. 47:12, it says:

"Stand now with thine enchantments, and with the multitude of thy sorceries, wherein thou hast laboured from thy youth; if so be thou shalt be able to profit, if so be thou mayest prevail."

What makes this contradictory is that in the preceding paragraph it promises evil, confusion, inescapable mischief and sudden desolation on such people. So why did he say this? Maybe the point he was trying to make is that religion should take a back seat when it comes to making money or just plain survival. This isn't something the average person would probably expect the bible to teach.

We're next given a prediction that turns out to be very wrong. In Isa. 52:1, it says:

"AWAKE, awake; put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city: for henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean."

Well apart from such people as who were already there, what about the many times Jerusalem was conquered since this was written. I imagine there were unclean and uncircumcised among the conquerors. Now not that any of the other prophets were much better, with Isaiah having been wrong about so much, it makes me wonder why they bothered at all to include his writings in the bible. Maybe as with religion in general, the point they were trying to make is that the truth, or being right, isn't really important. But for thinking creatures like mankind, especially with the effect we have on this planet, the truth and being right is the most important thing there is.

There are a couple things wrong with what this next paragraph says. In Isa. 59:17, it says:

"For he put on righteousness as a breastplate, and an helmet of salvation upon his head; and he put on the garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloke."

First of all, I would assume that the righteousness they talk about comes from being god's servant. But later, you will see very clearly the lack of righteousness in god and in the act of worshipping it. Also, to promote zeal in such an

unfortunate belief is terrible. Especially when religious leaders seek all the zeal  
40

they can sucker you into giving. There is also a fine line between zeal and fanaticism. Now I have known people who were clad in zeal, and it was a pretty ugly sight. Though I can imagine the unfortunate high they got from it.

We have some rather interesting babble in this next paragraph. In Isa. 66:3, it says:

"He that killeth an ox is as if he slew a man; he that sacrificeth a lamb, as if he cut off a dog's neck; he that offereth an oblation, as if he offered swine's blood; he that burneth incense, as if he blessed an idol. Yea, they have chosen their own ways, and their soul delighteth in their abominations."

What I assume they say here first is that sacrificing an ox is like killing a man. I can agree that to sacrifice an ox would be bad. But I don't think it is equal to murder. It then says that offering an oblation or burning incense is bad. This leads me to wonder why many Christians disobeyed this teaching in their services. Because oblations are still sought and incense is sometimes still burned. So somebody must be wrong. It then says that they chose their own ways. Which isn't really true. Because it's less likely that regular people or low level religious leaders got together and said, "we want to worship this way." It's more likely that they were told to worship a certain way from those in a higher position of authority. They were probably even told that those instructions came from god. Though in such matters, religious leaders are probably more willing to be duped than other people. Another thing is that "god" supposedly periodically killed off those who "did evil in the sight of the lord." So in the face of such conditioning, why blame believers or their leaders for believing what they're told. It then says that they delight in their abominations. But again, if they did, whose fault would that be.

This next paragraph gives another example of the stupid way in which the lord gets people to do his bidding. In Jer. 3:12, it says:

"Go and proclaim these words to the north, and say, Return, thou backsliding Israel, saith the Lord; and I will not cause mine anger to fall upon you: for I am merciful, saith the Lord, and will not keep anger for ever."

The stupid thing here is, as I said before, that if god wants something proclaimed he should do it himself. Especially when his prophets have differing teachings on various matters. What are people supposed to do. Believe every Tom, Dick and Harry that says god spoke to them? Well it seems that is what you're supposed to do. Which for obvious reasons would be a very bad idea. Besides, these people believe in demons. So how could they as mortal humans know it wasn't a demon talking to them. Though as far as I am concerned, if



anything had been speaking to these people, it was a demon. Also, this supposed god wants Israel to return to the worship of him. But if I were a god, I wouldn't want their worship. Because being a god, my ego wouldn't be feeble enough to want it.

41

Another example of their stupidity, out of the much larger number of ones that I have not bothered mentioning, can be found in Jer. 5:3. It says:

"O Lord, are not thine eyes upon the truth? thou hast stricken them, but they have not grieved; thou hast consumed them, but they have refused to receive correction: they have made their faces harder than a rock; they have refused to return."

First of all, it asks if god's eyes were not upon the truth. But apart from the truth that many people are willing to worship it, don't let what they say here fool you into believing that god has anything to do with the truth. It then says that though they were stricken, they did not grieve. Well maybe it's because they weren't stricken. Or maybe they had the audacity to think that things like plagues; famines; earthquakes; storms; fires; wars or even breathing can happen without it being the result of god's direct intervention. Another thing is considering all the crap the Jews had gone through to that point, maybe they figured they tried their best to worship god, but it didn't do them much good. So why bother. Especially since, as they mentioned before, he wasn't a strong enough of a god to even defeat chariots of iron. Also, those people weren't supposedly stricken or consumed for disobeying god. It supposedly happened because they disobeyed some guy who claimed to speak the word of god. Someone who was undoubtedly stupid and was mistaken. They may have been also lying for the other usual reasons. Such as wealth and power.

It would have been nice if god had taken the advice he supposedly gave here himself. In Jer. 22:3, it says:

"Thus saith the Lord; Execute ye judgment and righteousness, and deliver the spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor: and do no wrong, do no violence to the stranger, the fatherless nor the widow, neither shed innocent blood in this place."

This starts out with a pretty good example of hypocrisy. For instance, god wasn't performing good judgment or righteousness when he supposedly destroyed the world in the great flood. Another instance out of the many where god did wrong was when he supposedly told Moses to do sacrifices. Only to change his mind later. Etc. Now the best way to teach morality is by example. But the bible doesn't do this very well. Also, god told Jeremiah to do something that I am in part attempting to do right now. Which is deliver you out of the hand

of the oppressor. With god being the oppressor. Who supposedly inflicts you with evil; demands your worship and servitude; considers you his property; tries to instill a fear of him in you; tries to take credit for the good times and blames you for the bad times; preys on your weak desire to be taken care of; etc. You may not be convinced yet, but hopefully you will be delivered. God also supposedly said here that they should not shed innocent blood in that place. But wouldn't it have been better to tell them not to shed innocent blood at all?

What this next paragraph had to say is particularly rotten. In Jer. 24:7, it says: "And I will give them an heart to know me with, that I am the Lord: and they shall  
42

be my people, and I will be their God: for they shall return unto me with their whole heart."

Now if god were capable of giving them a heart to know him with, why didn't he do it long before this. Instead of putting them through all that suffering. The most likely explanation to me would be that he didn't want to spoil all his fun. Though it could be argued that it helps to experience what is bad to appreciate what is good. And experiencing enough badness, they would eventually appreciate what is "good" and live that way. Giving them "a heart to know god with." But one hole in such a hypothetical scenario is that given the time span in which such a thing was supposed to occur, I don't think it would have been long enough to cause such a mental shift to happen. Also, if you do what is "right" for the sake of god instead of whatever actually being the right thing to do, given the devolutionary and repressive nature of religion, you've already lost the battle.

Speaking of the Hebrew conquest of Israel, in Jer. 32:23, it says:

"And they came in, and possessed it; but they obeyed not thy voice, neither walked in thy law; they have done nothing of all that thou commandest them to do: therefore thou hast caused all this evil to come upon them:"

To begin with, as I said before, god didn't speak to them. So how can they disobey his voice. As I also said before, I'm sure any run of the mill prophet would like you to believe that their voice is as good as words coming from god himself. But there is an extraordinarily large difference. Also, why should they have obeyed "god`s" voice anyway. Because at the time he was talking about, god had not yet given them a heart to know god with. It also says that they did nothing of all that god had commanded them to do. Well they supposedly took land that god commanded them to take. And they must have done at least some of the other things that god commanded them to do. Then it says that because they disobeyed god, he caused evil to fall upon them. But calling misfortune punishment from god and finding reasons to justify that punishment is one of the easiest things to do. Which even an idiot can probably figure out. So Jeremiah

shouldn't have been too shocked if his threat of god's punishment didn't set them to quivering.

Another good example of the Bible's stupidity can be found in Jer. 32:33. It says:

"And they have turned unto me the back, and not the face: though I taught them, rising up early and teaching them, yet they have not hearkened to receive instruction."

Now this is supposedly god talking through Jeremiah, saying that he taught them. But I can guarantee you that god didn't personally instruct the masses. Though wherever this instruction came from, the tuition was too high. Because the price is your soul. Also, this paragraph adds another reason to the list of crap as to why god lets bad things happen to good people. Because it says here that god rose up early. Which suggests that he sleeps. So when searching for  
43

an answer as to why god lets bad things happen to good people, they can use the excuse that he may have been asleep.

Being able to figure out where your actions will lead (and hopefully doing something about it) is a good thing. But relying on prophecies, apart from being stupid, is at odds with this mental exercise. One of many kinds of useless prophecies can be found in Jer. 33:15. It says:

"In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up into David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land."

It doesn't really say when those days were supposed to be. And something so unspecific is useless. Because anybody can predict that in the future something will happen. Which it usually does. So this prophesy doesn't impress me. Neither do I care what he meant by this branch of righteousness growing into David thing. Though my bible says that this branch is supposed to represent Jesus. Which even if it were, you will later be seeing that he didn't always execute righteous judgment either.

This branch of righteousness thing supposedly representing Jesus seems to be disproved in this next paragraph. In Jer. 33:16, it says:

"In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely: and this the name wherewith she shall be called, The Lord our righteousness."

It says that in those days, Judah would be saved and Jerusalem would dwell safely. But in Jesus's time, the whole area was under Roman occupation. I doubt if Jeremiah or any other Jew would have considered that being saved or dwelling safely. Neither do I remember ever hearing of Jerusalem having been called "the lord is our righteousness."

As you should know by now, the bible is good at making all sorts of

contradictory statements. A good one can be found in Jer. 43:4-5. It says:  
"So Johanan the son of Kareak, and all the captains of the forces, and all the people, obeyed not the voice of the Lord, to dwell in the land of Judah.

But Johanan the son of Kareak, and all the captains of the forces, took the remnant of Judah, that were returned from all nations, whither they had been driven, to dwell in the land of Judah."

First it says that they didn't obey the voice of the lord to dwell in the land of Judah. Then it says they did. I wish they would make up their minds. If they had any. Also, they come up with this crap again about obeying the voice of the lord. Though even if I heard god speak, I wouldn't listen to him anyway. Another reason being that I'm not a dog. I would also much rather be damned for being on my feet than I would being blessed for being on my knees.

Now at the last report, these people went to dwell in the land of Judah. But in Jer. 43:7, it says:

"So they came into the land of Egypt: for they obeyed not the voice of the Lord: thus came they even to Thapanhes."

44

The question here is that if they went to dwell in the land of Judah, how did they end up in Egypt. Not that I really care.

These next two paragraphs are both stupid and contradictory. In Jer. 48:9-10, it says:

"Give wings unto Moab, that it may flee and get away: for the cities thereof shall be desolate, without any to dwell therein.

Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully, and cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood."

First of all, if I'm not mistaken, it's from the people of Moab that their swords were supposed to find blood. So it seems strange for them to want those people to get away. Also, the bible has sayings like "vengeance is mine, saith the lord," or "thou shalt not kill." But now it's cursing those who don't kill? There's decisive thinking for you. It also says not to do the work of the lord deceitfully. Which is stupid. Because that's like telling somebody that they shouldn't do the work of a criminal criminally. Now many religious leaders may mean well. And many others may be willing to do good deeds. But it's a good bet that people who lie to themselves will end up lying to you as well. Which as with other reasons people may tell lies, it is more likely to do harm than good.

This next paragraph gives another good example of god's ineptitude. In Jer. 51:9, it says:

"We would have healed Babylon, but she was not healed: forsake her, and let us

go every one into his own country: for her judgment reacheth into heaven, and is lifted up even to the skies."

It says here that god would have healed Babylon, except it wasn't healed. So he couldn't say he healed it. That's about the extent of god's power.

In these next two paragraphs, it shows god saying one thing will happen, but the opposite happens instead. First, in Jer. 51:36, it says:

"Therefore thus saith the Lord; Behold, I will plead thy cause, and take vengeance for thee; and will dry up her sea, and make her springs dry."

Then, moving on to Jer. 51:42, it says:

"The sea has come up upon Babylon: she is covered with the multitude of the waves thereof."

So as it turns out, instead of drying up, the place supposedly floods. They sure got that wrong. I could say more, but I don't know (or really care) if they are talking about the city of Babylon or the country of Babylon.

Now let's move on to the book of Ezekiel. Right near the beginning, he describes an apparition of god that is hard to tell if it is a lie or a hallucination. Though from what the bible has shown of prophets, it could have been a little of both. In case you've never read it, I'll tell you a little about it. What he describes is a thing that is apparently part machine and a conglomeration of various animal parts. It is very unusual. As far as the animal parts of it are concerned, all I can say is that it is very unlikely. I have heard people try to explain away the animal

45

parts of it as an ignorant person's description of a machine. Which is unlikely. Because though they may not have had a lot of exposure to the simple machines that they probably had back then, they did know quite a bit about what animals were.

Also, the mechanical aspects of it that he describes probably originated from the godlike qualities mechanical devices had back then. Be they chariots, waterwheels or whatever. Because the intelligence it took to build even simple devices like those was probably impressive to the average person. Some people have even brought up the U.F.O. angle in relation to this story. Though the only plausible explanation I can think of for extraterrestrials to put on such a show for him would be to promote religion in a feeble manner and thereby help impede mankind as a species. Which I find unlikely.

Sometimes the bible refers to mankind as the sons of god and sometimes as the son of man. An example of the bible referring to people as the sons of man can be found in Eze. 2:1. It says:

"AND he said unto me, Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak unto thee."

I must say I prefer humans being referred to as sons of man rather than sons of god. Because it helps deflate people's egos a little. But they will probably refer to people as sons of god again later.

Their story takes a strange turn in these next two paragraphs. In Eze. 3:1-2, it says:

"MOREOVER he said unto me, Son of man, eat that thou findest; eat this roll, and go speak unto the house of Israel.

So I opened my mouth, and he caused me to eat that roll."

The roll they speak of here is actually a scroll. Which I can't really see happening. Considering how chewy such a thing would likely be. Also, why would god want him to eat a scroll. Because none of the other prophets had to eat scrolls to deliver god's messages.

These next two paragraphs again show god to be pretty fickle with his decisions. First, in Eze. 4:12, it says:

"And thou shalt eat it as barley cakes, and thou shalt bake it with the dung that cometh out of a man, in their sight."

Then, in Eze. 4:15, it says:

"Then he said unto me, Lo, I have given thee cow's dung for man's dung, and thou shalt prepare thy bread therewith."

So first he tells him to cook using human dung. Then he almost immediately changes his mind and has him use cow dung instead. He supposedly even goes as far as to give him the cow dung himself. Well at least this time god's vacillation didn't result in the senseless loss of human and animal life. But what doesn't make much sense to me is why he would change his mind. Could it have been just a test to see if he would go through with it? Who knows. Though  
46

god himself should have known if he would have gone through with it, I suppose it could be argued that god wanted him to experience the fact that he was willing to go through with it. For whatever reason. But if the human dung thing had been just a test of faith, you would think that they would have said so.

What this next paragraph has to say seems uncharacteristic for a god. In Eze. 9:1, it says:

"HE cried also in mine ears with a loud voice, saying, Cause them that have charge over the city to draw near, even every man with his destroying weapon in his hand."

I find it hard to believe that a god so unimaginably great as god is supposed to be would get upset enough to start yelling, or crying, into a prophet's ears. We would be too insignificant to get such a god to become so emotional.

It seems the lord was having difficulty finding reasons for punishment. Because

in Eze. 14:13, it says:

"Son of man, when the land sinneth against me by trespassing grievously, then will I stretch out mine hand upon it, and will break the staff of the bread thereof, and will send famine upon it, and will cut off man and beast from it:"

Well it's unfortunate that I should have to say this, but land can't trespass grievously. So if he is going to punish it, he is going to have to come up with a better reason for doing so.

Another example of the senseless nature of the bible can be found in Eze. 17:2. It says:

"Son of man, put forth a riddle, and speak a parable unto the house of Israel;"

As it is, most of what he has been saying sounds like a riddle and a parable to begin with. So I don't see what good this is going to do. Now as I said before, I don't care for the bible's use of parables. Another reason being because I think it should have concerned itself with teaching morality. Not this useless form of problem solving of theirs. Also, being as ambiguous and senseless as the rest of the bible, figuring out the answer to their word puzzles isn't worth the effort it took to figure out.

This next paragraph lists a couple rather silly sins. In Eze. 18:6, it says:

"And hath not eaten upon the mountains, neither hath lifted up his eyes to the idols of the house of Israel, neither hath defiled his neighbour's wife, neither hath come near to a menstruous woman,"

First of all, I can't see how eating on a mountain could be sinful. Though I can see why they would consider it sinful. Because you would be doing so apparently too close to god. But if that was sinning, the astronauts who ate while they were on the moon must have really been sinning. The last sin they mention here is coming near to a menstruous woman. Though seeing how they brought the subject up, it would have been interesting to hear just how near to a menstruous woman they were talking about. Also, from what I've heard about

47

people in that area of the world, they should have mentioned something about coming near to menstruous sheep too.

From what this next paragraph says, god would have made a miserable travel agent. As you can see, in Eze. 20:15, it says:

"Yet also I lifted up my hand unto them in the wilderness, that I would not bring them into the land which I had given them, flowing with milk and honey, which is the glory of all lands;"

I wouldn't call Israel the glory of all lands. Even before it was raped by man and his animals (with god's blessing) it was probably still largely worthless desert.

The only reason the Jews probably wanted it was because it was flowing with trade routes. Not milk and honey.

These next few paragraphs show Ezekiel telling the Pharaoh a parable. In Eze. 32:4-6, it says:

“Then will I leave you upon the land, I will cast thee forth upon the open field, and will cause all the fowls of the heaven to remain upon thee, and I will fill the beasts of the whole earth with thee.

And will lay thy flesh upon the mountains, and will fill up the valleys with thy height.

I will also water with thy blood the land wherein thou swimst, even to the mountains; and the rivers shall be full of thee.”

Silly as all this is, the meaning of it is clear enough. Now if I were the Pharaoh, it would have been at about this point that I would have ordered his head chopped off. But somehow, still being alive, in Eze. 32:7-8, he adds:

“And when I shall put thee out, I will cover the heaven, and make the stars thereof dark; I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give her light.

All the bright lights of heaven will I make dark over thee, and set darkness upon thy land, saith the Lord God.”

From what this last part says, it seems that all god was going to do was make it cloudy. Which isn't very spectacular. Because I'm sure that even happens in Egypt from time to time. Also, being a living god himself, I find it hard to believe that the pharaoh would be interested in listening to some curse from this Jew's god. Even if all that crap about Moses and the Egyptians were true. Which for my part, the word “doubt” would be a severe understatement.

The best thing that can be said about what this next paragraph had to say is that god knew nothing about eugenics. In Eze. 34:16, it says:

“I will seek that which was lost, and bring again that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick: but I will destroy the fat and the strong; I will feed them with judgment.”

As far as binding up the broken and helping the sick goes, there's nothing wrong with that. To a point. But for them to promote destroying the fat is pretty bad. Because back then being fat was a sign of health. And destroying the

48

healthy would be a rotten thing to do. Now knowing what we now know about being fat, I still wouldn't destroy fat people. I simply wouldn't encourage them to breed. Then, as far as the strong goes, destroying them would also be pretty rotten. Because there isn't really anything wrong with being strong. The only thing that could be wrong with it is that in the animal world, strength seems to



equate to a shorter life span. Though I can imagine what they would have against strength. Which is that the strong would be able to get along better without their fantasy of religion.

This next paragraph shows an amazing amount of ignorance about what is needed in a healthy ecosystem. In Eze. 34:25, it says:

“And I will make with them a covenant of peace, and will cause the evil beasts to cease out of the land: and they shall dwell safely in the wilderness, and sleep in the woods.”

It was for man that god was supposedly going to make the wilderness safe here. Apparently by destroying the “evil” beasts. But dangerous animals aren’t evil. And to call something evil that isn’t is itself evil. Now dangerous animals are necessary to keep the safe ones from becoming numerically destructive. So to destroy them just so people can feel safe in the wilderness is a pretty rotten thing to do. People just need to learn to adapt to their presence.

These next two paragraphs talk about bringing the dead back to life. In Eze. 37:5-6, it says:

“Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones; Behold, I will cause breath to enter into you, and ye shall live:

And I will lay sinews upon you, and will bring up flesh upon you, and cover you with skin, and put breath into you, and ye shall live; and ye shall know that I am the Lord.”

There is more, but I didn’t want to do a lot of copying. It then goes on to say that these things happened. Which of course they did not. Then, moving on to Eze. 37:11, it says:

“Then he said unto me, Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel: behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost; we are cut off for our parts.”

So why did he go through all the trouble of making statements that weren’t true? The best reason I can think of for his doing so is to get any readers use to the idea of such stupidity.

For more of this lie or hallucination, let’s move on to Eze. 37:13. It says:

“And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves,”

God supposedly already brought them up out of their graves. Which didn’t actually turn out to be the case. So I doubt if it would have happened in the future. Also, if he didn’t have the power to prevent their being killed to begin with, having the power to resurrect them would be even more unlikely.

In these next two paragraphs, we’re given another example of god’s feeble

control over his actions and emotions. In Eze. 38:18-19, it says:

“And it shall come to pass at the same time when Gog shall come against the land of Israel, saith the lord God, that my fury shall come up in my face.

For in my jealousy and in the fire of my wrath have I spoken, Surely in that day there shall be a great shaking in the land of Israel;”

So it says god’s fury will come up in his face. Which I take to mean it will backfire on him. And all because he couldn’t control his jealousy and anger. That isn’t very godlike at all. Also, the reason these things backfire on him must be because he was unable to undo the things he had earlier decided to do. Which isn’t very godlike either. Now a really feeble god in his anger and jealousy might predict, through some prophet, a future event that it had no control over. Then try to justify its inability to prevent the event with some sort of “I Have Spoken” horseshit.

Next is a story of god not wanting a nation referred to as Magog to cut any wood in some forest. In Eze. 39:9-10, it says:

“And so they that dwell in the cities of Israel shall go forth, and shall set on fire and burn the weapons, both the shields and the bucklers, the bows and the arrows, and the handstaves, and the spears, and they shall burn them with fire for seven years:

So that they shall take no wood out of the field, neither cut down any out of the forest; for they shall burn the weapons with fire: and they shall spoil those that spoiled them, and rob those that robbed them, saith the Lord God.”

Here it says that they mean to burn the things they describe for seven years. But it seems to me that burning things for seven years would use up a lot of the wood they meant to protect. Also, such an action would seem to be childish. A way of saying, “we don’t want the wood, we just don’t want you to have it.” It also gives the unfortunately phrased advice here to spoil and rob those who spoiled and robbed them. Because if their being spoiled and robbed was undeserved, their doing the same to those who did it to them wouldn’t be spoiling and robbing. It would be justice and reparations. Otherwise it shouldn’t have been done at all.

Moving on to Eze. 39:11-15, it describes a great slaughter of the people of Gog. They supposedly kill so many of them that it takes the people of Israel seven months to bury them all. Though after a few months there probably wouldn’t have been a lot left to bury. Then, in Eze. 39:17, it says.

“And, thou son of man, thus saith the Lord God; Speak unto every feathered fowl, and to every beast of the field, Assemble yourselves, and come; gather yourselves on every side to my sacrifice that I do sacrifice for you, even a great sacrifice upon the mountains of Israel, that ye may eat flesh, and drink blood.”

Here god was supposedly telling Ezekiel to speak to all the birds and beasts. Which I would say was unlikely to happen. Not only because of the language barrier, but by the time he found them all to speak to, the bodies would have

rotted away. Also, earlier he spoke of some evil beasts that god wanted dead. But now he is making a sacrifice to them? Get real. Another thing is that I don't like the idea of sacrificing to animals any more than I do the idea of sacrificing to god.

Moving on, it seems that the lord had changed his mind about sacrificing to him, again. As you can see, in Eze. 43:18, it says:

“And he said unto me, Son of man, thus saith the Lord God; These are the ordinances of the altar in the day when they shall make it, to offer burnt offerings thereon, and to sprinkle blood thereon.”

First god wanted sacrifices, then he didn't, and now he wants them again. I wish he would make up his mind. Which he probably would have if he had one. Now for you believers out there, if you haven't already, you will probably be getting to the point where you say to yourselves, “ya, ok, the bible is screwed up, but it is faith that matters.” You may even have deluded yourselves into believing somehow that the bible is purposefully written screwed up to promote faith. Though you just won't know how screwed up it is until after you've read the fourth chapter. But I am telling you that words must MEAN something. Any point that somebody is trying to make must MEAN something. If you are unfortunate enough to rely on religious faith, it must MEAN something. If the only point to faith is faith itself, then it means nothing. It becomes like a stick that somebody is flailing around aimlessly in a crowd.

Still speaking of what priests can and can't do, this next paragraph has both bad and stupid elements to it. In Eze. 44:22, it says:

“Neither shall they take for their wives a widow, nor her that is put away: but they shall take maidens of the seed of the house of Israel, or a widow that had a priest before.”

First of all, I don't like the phrase “put away.” It makes it sound like those divorced women were thrown away. Which they probably were. But such disregard for women is unacceptable. It's also a pretty good reason why those jerks probably didn't want women to have any sort of equality. Lest the “worm turns” and they are the ones “put away.” Also, it seems rather silly that priests can only marry the widow of another priest. Because starting out, none of these women had a priest before. I have come up with various speculations as to why they would have said such a thing. But what they is still senseless as far as I'm concerned.

An exceptionally stupid teaching about what priests are supposed to do can be found in Eze. 44:25. It says:

“And they shall come at no dead person to defile themselves: but for father, or

for mother, or for son, or for daughter, or brother, or for sister that hath had no husband, they may defile themselves.”

Well there’s no difference between a priest’s dead relatives and other dead people. So if they can “defile” themselves with the one, they should be able to  
51

“defile” themselves with the other. Also, married or not, they should have been able to “defile” themselves for their sisters as well.

There are two things that the bible has made very clear so far. Which is that the land this supposed god gave to the children of Israel is for them only and that they shouldn’t mix with other people. But in Eze. 47:22, it says:

“And it shall come to pass, that ye shall divide it by lot for an inheritance unto you, and to the strangers that sojourn among you, which shall beget children among you: and they shall be unto you as born in the country among the children of Israel; they shall have inheritance with you among the tribes of Israel.”

This is quite a change from earlier teachings. But I suppose it’s possible that the strangers they spoke of here could be Jewish strangers. Maybe this point is so obvious that they didn’t feel it necessary to make the distinction here. Also, if at some future point they are to share their land with non-Jews, there doesn’t seem to be much point for them to be so stingy with their land. Either back then or now. So it could have been Jewish strangers they were speaking of. It would have been nice if they had elaborated a little more on the subject.

Next, we have a mystery about a city that god wanted to be built. In Eze. 48:35, it says:

“It was round about eighteen thousand measures: and the name of that city from that day shall be, The Lord is there.”

Well if the lord wanted this city built, he must have been disappointed. Because I don’t remember hearing of any city being built called, “the lord is there.” Neither do I think any such city is likely to be built. Because they speak of this city having gates. Which I take to mean it will have walls also. Like cities had long ago. But with things like artillery, such structures are largely useless. Also, if the lord were indeed there, you wouldn’t think that he would need walls to protect the city he was occupying.

As far as teaching history goes, the bible sure leaves a lot to be desired. The next paragraph is part of an account of what happened when Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, captured Jerusalem. In this story, Daniel and Jeremiah give somewhat differing accounts of what happened. First, in Dan. 1:2, Daniel says: “And the Lord gave Jehoiakim the king of Judah into his hand, with part of the vessels of the house of God: which he carried into the land of Shinar to the house of his god; and he brought the vessels into the treasure house of his god.”

I don't want to do a lot of useless copying. So I'll just tell you Jeremiah's account. His version of it has the king of Babylon taking everything that wasn't nailed down and some of the things that were. So who is telling the truth here. Why did Daniel say that they took only part of the vessels of the house of god and Jeremiah say that they cleaned the place out. Now I hate to read things into the bible that may or may not be the case. But to be fair, Daniel could have meant that some of the vessels were hidden so they couldn't be taken. Though

52

if that were the case, I'm surprised that he would have brought the subject up at all.

To set this next story up, we have to begin in Dan.2. Here he talks about a dream the King of Babylon had. Though the king can't even remember the dream, he tells his wise men to interpret it or be cut to pieces. Which is stupid in itself. Because given such a choice, I would just have made something up. But they don't, so the king orders them to be executed. Then, unlikely as it is, Daniel comes up with the interpretation and asks that the wise men be spared. Even though at least some of them must have told the king that attacking Jerusalem was a good idea to begin with. Then the king has another dream. Part of this story can be found in Dan. 4:7-8. It says:

"Then came in the magicians, the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers: and I told the dream before them; but they did not make known to me the interpretation thereof.

But at last Daniel came before me, whose name was Bethshazzar, according to the name of my god, and in whom is the spirit of the holy gods: and before him I told the dream, saying,"

This makes little sense. He already knows his wise men aren't very useful. So I think it's unlikely that he would go to them first for an answer. You would also think that he at least would have waited for Daniel to be among them. Though I suppose it's possible that he could have been giving his wise men a second chance. Seeing how he could at least tell them this time what the dream was about. Also, the whole idea of interpreting dreams as being messages from god is stupid anyway. Because chances are that if anybody was able to say an interpretation was wrong, they probably wouldn't need anybody to interpret it to begin with.

Now with Daniel being so good at interpreting dreams, you might think that he would be equally as good at interpreting a vision. But this next paragraph tells of something with a man's voice asking the angel gabriel to explain the meaning of a vision to Daniel. As you can see, in Dan. 8:16, it says:

“And I heard a man’s voice between the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision.”

So why would somebody so good at interpreting dreams need an angel to explain the meaning of a vision to him. It just doesn’t seem very likely to me. Then, after gabriel explains the meaning of the vision to him, in Dan. 8:27, it says:

“And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days; afterward I rose up, and did the king’s business; and was astonished at the vision, but none understood it.”

Here it says that he was astonished at the vision and nobody understood it. But who cares about the vision. That’s old news. What matters now is the explanation of the vision. Unless what they meant to say here is that nobody understood the explanation of the vision. But why would somebody so good at  
53

interpreting dreams be unable to explain the explanation to a vision? Well fortunately, I don’t really care. Because the whole story is likely a load of crap.

You probably remember me earlier writing about the bible calling certain beasts evil and wanting them cleared off the land, so people can lay down safely in the woods. But in Hos. 2:18, it says:

“And in that day will I make a covenant for them with the beasts of the field, and the fowls of heaven, and with the creeping thing of the ground: and will break the bow and the sword and the battle out of the earth, and will make them to lie down safely.”

So whatever happened to getting rid of those “evil” beasts. I suppose it could be the beasts he spoke of weren’t of the evil variety. It’s hard to say, or care. But if god had the ability to make a covenant with any animal, it would have been nice if earlier he made a covenant with the “evil” beasts instead of wanting them destroyed. Also, given what an animal’s ability to agree to any covenant would be, I don’t think god would have much luck with this anyway.

This next paragraph shows another example, out of an incredibly large number of others that I didn’t comment on, of obscure writing in the bible. In Hos. 8:7, it says:

“For they have sown the wind, and shall reap the whirlwind: it hath no stalk: the bud shall yield no meal: if so be it yield, the strangers shall swallow it up.”

Now with this wind business, what I think they were trying to say is that for those who work at doing bad things, the result for them will be something even worse. Which is the way I would prefer they had said it. Then, after speaking of a bud yielding no meal, they talk about the possibility of it yielding meal. Well there’s decisive thinking for you. What they should have said is something like, “the bud is not apt to yield any meal.” It may be a little longer, but its meaning is

more accurate.

Apart from being strange, this next paragraph is quite stupid. In Hos. 13:14, it says:

“I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from mine eyes.”

First of all, in the paragraph before this and in the paragraph after this, it talks about the troubles god was going to bring upon these people. So it doesn't make any sense for him to do something nice to them here, like putting off death. Also, it spoke of death here as if it were a sentient entity. As if it has power, can accept ransom, be affected by plagues or destruction, or be able to repent. Now if promoting sensibility was important to the writers of the bible in any way, I'm sure they would have found a more sensible way of saying the things they did.

For another excursion into the unlikely and stupid, let's see what it says in Amos 3:7. It says:

54

“Surely the Lord will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets.”

When he says here that the lord will do nothing, what I believe he meant to say was that the lord would do nothing bad to them at that time. But from some of the things I've been reading in the bible lately, he shouldn't have been so sure. Also, it speaks of the secret that god reveals to the prophets. But revealing any secret wouldn't make it secret for very long. Unless it is a secret that they have managed successfully to keep from the rest of you. Which doesn't bother me. Because I have no doubt that any secret that god would have to reveal would be as worthless or sickening as the things he had supposedly already openly revealed.

Though what is written about in these next two paragraphs is only a vision, it shows god's judgment to be askew. Speaking about a vision of a plague of locusts, in Amos 7:2-3, it says:

“And it came to pass, that when they had made an end of eating the grass of the land, then said I, O Lord God, forgive, I beseech thee: by whom shall Jacob arise? For he is small.

The Lord repented for this: It shall not be saith the Lord.”

First of all, if they deserved punishment, it shouldn't be stopped just because Amos asked for forgiveness. Because who is he to question god's judgment. A religious person might argue that for some mysterious reason, god showed Amos these things for the purpose of getting him to ask for forgiveness. But just

because an answer may be convenient doesn't mean that it is correct. Then we have the problem of it saying the lord repented. What did he think he was trying to teach! Because you don't repent carrying out a just punishment. Or was the punishment this vision foretold unjust. If so, was this punishment unjust because it was unjust, or was it unjust because god made a mistake. Whatever the story is here, it's pretty stupid.

For some reason they apparently felt it necessary to repeat the same kind of nonsense in Amos 7:4-6. As you can see, it says:

"Thus hath the Lord God shewed unto me: and, behold, the Lord God called to contend by fire, and it devoured the great deep, and did eat up a part.

Then said I, O Lord God, cease, I beseech thee: by whom shall Jacob arise? For he is small.

The Lord repented for this: This also shall not be, saith the Lord God."

What could god be doing here. Showing Amos various punishments to see which one wouldn't cause him to put up a fuss and ask for forgiveness? Who knows, or cares. Also, in this vision it says that fire would devour the deep. But why show a vision of something that can't happen. Because fire can't burn under water. Though it could be argued that this fire was meant to represent an underwater volcanic eruption. Which could temporarily devour a small part of the ocean floor. But that wouldn't mean much considering the vastness of the

55

ocean. Another thing is that Amos asked god to forgive and not perform this punishment for the sake of Jacob's descendants. Though unless they lived underwater, I don't think they would have had a lot to worry about.

Next, though I am no expert on history, if what this next paragraph had to say were true, I think that even I would have heard something about it. In Amos 9:12, it says:

"That they may possess the remnant of Edom, and all of the heathen, which are called by my name, saith the Lord that doeth this."

If there were ever a people called the lord or god, I've never heard of them. Also, even if there were a people called such a thing, it seems likely that they would have worshiped what they had named themselves after. But for god to consider such people heathen and cause them to be dispossessed and enslaved would be a terrible thing to do. It would also have made them even bigger suckers than your average believer is.

Though the writings of Obadiah are only one chapter long in the bible, he still managed to say something stupid. As you can see, in Oba. 1:16, it says:

"For as ye have drunk upon my holy mountain, so shall the heathen drink continually, yea, they shall drink, and they shall swallow down, and they shall be



as though they had not been.”

From what the bible seems to infer, it is those who had drank upon the mountain who shall be as though they had not been. But unfortunately, explaining this process of drinking seemed to be more important than being clear about what they were trying to say.

Many of you have probably heard the story about Jonah. But for those of you who have not, the bible tells some pretty big lies. First, these next two paragraphs tell of Jonah trying to flee from god by sea. While he was supposedly on a ship, in Jon. 1:4-5, it says:

“But the Lord sent out a great wind into the sea, and there was a mighty tempest in the sea, so that the ship was like to be broken.

Then the mariners were afraid, and cried every man unto his god, and cast forth wares that were in the ship into the sea, to lighten it of them. But Jonah was gone down into the sides of the ship; and he lay, and was fast asleep.”

Whoever wrote this must have never been out to sea during a storm. Though it doesn't take much imagination to figure out that the bumpy ride itself would make sleep almost impossible. Add on top of that terrified people running around, yelling, crying and pulling out cargo, I would say it was impossible.

A little later, the story gets even harder to swallow. (Pun intended) In Jon. 1:17, it says:

“Now the Lord prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah. And Jonah was in the belly of the fish three days and three nights.”

First of all, it says that god prepared a great fish. So what does this mean. That he created the fish? Or that he did things like having its teeth fall out so it

56

wouldn't bite him or give it some antacids so its stomach acid wouldn't dissolve him? Etc. It would be nice to know some of these details. Then, after his little ride, the fish vomits Jonah out onto dry land. Well after reading what they're trying to pass off as the truth, I know how the fish must have felt at the time. Now reflecting on this and other wild stories I've read in the bible, I find it hard to imagine people basing their faith on it. Also, if what you base your faith on is a lie, then your faith is a lie. To what ends such savage stupidity can and has lead is something that is unpleasant to contemplate. Another thing I would like to add is that if you are unfortunate enough to feel that you must have faith in something, there are two things that you can put your faith into which is less likely to lead you astray. Which is the truth and the greater good. Even if you don't have the ability or desire to objectively determine what those things are, at least you would be less likely to fall prey to all those who would use faith in one of the multitudes of religious cults as a means of controlling you for their own

ends.

The prediction these next two paragraphs made doesn't fit very well with most of the things the bible has taught so far. Talking about the Jews and others, in Mic. 4:4-5, it says:

"But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid: for the mouth of the Lord of hosts has spoken it.

For all people will walk every one in the name of his god, and we will walk in the name of the Lord our God for ever and ever."

I can't believe that god would let other people among them worship other gods. Whatever happened to his being a jealous god. Another thing is that he would be doing all the work that a god does, and those other people would be giving all the credit to their gods. If anything would make god jealous, you would think that would. Or maybe for some reason it's only important what the Jews believe in. Also, what about all the slaughter that god supposedly promoted so the Jews could have a land for their kind only. Was that all to be for nothing?

You will later be seeing some of the instances where the bible calls pride a sin. But in Mic. 4:9, it says:

"Why dost thou cry out aloud? Is there no king in thee? Is thy counsellor perished? for pangs have taken thee as a woman in travail."

When it asks here if there is no king in you, what I think they are referring to is pride. But with all the bible has to say against pride, it's quite contradictory for them to promote it here.

If you have ever heard any of the stories supposedly written by Shakespear, you know that for some reason people sometimes spoke in a convoluted manner in the past. Having to decipher such syntax in the bible drives me crazy. One of the nearly constant examples of this can be found in Nahum 2:11. It says:

"Where is the dwelling place of the lions, and the feeding place of the young

57

lions, where the lion, even the old lion, walked, and the lion's whelp, and none made them afraid?"

Why couldn't they have just said something like, "Where do the young and old lions dwell. Where do they feed and where do they walk. Nobody will make them afraid." If what they say are the words of god, then he didn't have very good language skills.

For another example of the bible's confused teachings, let's go to Hab. 2:14. It says:

"For the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

I know that the bible often speaks metaphorically, but let's just get through this. Here he says that the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of god as the waters cover the sea. In which case it would have been more accurate for him to say that the earth will be covered with such 'knowledge.' Not filled with. Also, the waters don't cover the sea. The waters are the sea. What they cover is land.

According to other things I've read in the bible, what this next paragraph had to say makes little sense. In Hab. 3:3, it says:

"God came from Teman, and the Holy one from mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise."

So it says here that god came from Teman. But was this place around before the earth as god supposedly was? Well even though I don't know what or where Teman is, I would guess that it wasn't around before the earth as god supposedly was. Now because of the way the bible is written, I can't be too sure what he was getting with this. But if he was going to bother people with such "information," it would have been nice if he had been a little more clear about its meaning. Also, is this holy one they speak of god too? If so, is Teman near mount Paran? Or is he just saying that god came from all over. Well fortunately, I don't even care.

Now and then the bible taught an example of unlikely behavior. One of which is mentioned in Zep. 3:7. It says:

"I said, Surely thou wilt fear me, thou wilt receive instruction; so their dwelling should not be cut off, however I punished them: but they rose up early, and corrupted all their doings."

Well it isn't very likely that people would rise up early and do again what they were just punished for. Unless they like punishment. But if any "punishment" did happen, I think it's more likely that they continued doing whatever they were doing because they were somewhat normal people. As such, they probably rightly figured that bad things just sometimes happen. Not that it's punishment from god for some wrong. Though anytime anything bad ever happened, those priests probably fell all over themselves getting the word out that it happened because of some wrong action on their part.

58

You will be seeing later that the bible said that it is wrong to rebuke. But in Zec. 3:2, it says:

"And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; even the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee: is this not a brand plucked out of the fire?"

Now with the bible being against rebuking, why did god do it here. Though I'm

sure that there are probably those who would say that god can do it because he is god. But I say that if he can do it, so can we. And not because god does it. But because it is sometimes the right thing to do. Also, as far as god rebuking satan goes, you will soon be seeing many instances that compared to some of the things god supposedly said and did, satan could only be an improvement.

From what some of the preceding paragraphs had to say, this next paragraph seems to be speaking of what their world will be like after the coming of Jesus. In Zec. 3:10, it says:

“In that day, saith the Lord of hosts, shall ye call every man his neighbour under the vine and under the fig tree.”

As I said before, after all the things the bible has tried to justify about the Jews taking other people's land, keeping themselves separate from other people, etc., it's rather stupid for them to change their minds and promote such togetherness here. That is just too massive of a contradiction to overcome. The only way to overcome all the teachings to the contrary would be to scrap their religion completely. They would have to come out and openly admit that everything that had come before had just been a load of crap. Otherwise all of the previous contradictory teachings would always be there to throw any new teachings into disrepute. Also, because of the authority it wields, the word of “GOD” is not something that can evolve. The things he had said and done must either be right or wrong. They can't be both. Another thing about their last paragraph here is that the prediction it made has not turned out to be the case. As anybody with eyes can see.

## CHAPTER TWO

EVIL  
of the  
OLD TESTAMENT

What you have seen were some of the better examples of the stupidity, lies,

etc., in the old testament. You have also seen, in a limited manner, what I found wrong with them. Now you will see some of the unsavory or outright evil things in it also. Which you will also see takes on many forms. So to start things out, let's go back to Gen. 1:26. It says:

“And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.”

What did god think he was doing giving man dominion over all the earth. They hadn't even eaten the fruit of knowledge yet. Talk about giving children matches to play with! Though the main point I wanted to make here is that if I were a devil and I wanted man and the earth to self destruct, this is just how I would go about it. By using ideas like being created in god's image to prey on man's arrogance, narcissism and greediness. Which can be easily blown out of proportion as it is. It can also be done by giving them the idea that anything they do is god's will. Leaving people without the restraint that they so obviously need. Also, it's bad enough that the bible tells you that you are created in his image. But to be told that the earth is yours to do with as you please is too much. This type of teaching only puts you at odds with your true creator. The ecological system of this planet. Yet another bad thing about all this is that god needn't have given you dominion over all the earth. Because just being told that you were created in god's image would have given people sufficient justification to take it. I guess god just wanted to make sure his deplorable message got through and stuck. If only god had supposedly created those he had made in his image during the time of the dinosaurs. Then mankind's "dominion" would have been a little more difficult to claim.

Another thing I don't like about all this creation crap is that the bible puts forth the idea that god creates each and every one of you. Because among people you will find murderers; perverts; thieves; those who buy or sell political influence; etc. And supposedly being perfect, the only reason he would be creating them is because they serve some useful purpose. Which they do not! (you will be hearing more about this later) Also, because of such notions, I have actually met people who believed that anything they did was ok. Because if god didn't want them to act that way, he wouldn't have created them to act that way. But I have news for those who try to justify their crimes or perversions in such a manner. It's not god's will that makes them act badly. It's bad genetics!

This next paragraph also taught something that promotes destructive arrogance. In Gen. 1:28, it says:

“And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea,

and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.”

First of all, telling man to multiply and subdue the earth is like telling a fish to swim. God should have known the eventual destruction this would have caused. Such as overpopulation, environmental destruction, famine and war. And from what I have seen of other religions and cultures, the people the bible speaks of would have probably done those things anyway. We sure didn't need these idiots help in making sure they happened. Also, though I looked for such things, it's no surprise to me that I found nothing in the bible that promotes any prudence in the rule of your "dominion.”

As if your being told that you were made in god's image wasn't bad enough, in this next paragraph you're given even more excessive flattery. In Gen. 3:22, it says:

“And the Lord God said, Behold, the man has become as one of us, to know good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever.”

So because man had eaten the fruit of knowledge, he had become like a god? I must disagree with that assessment. Another thing is that I think it takes more than a knowledge of right and wrong to make somebody a god. Also, if this simplistic knowledge made man like god, it only proves that god isn't worth worshiping. Now somebody once said "I think, therefore I am." But because of teachings like this, I think it has come to mean "I think, therefore I think it's a big deal." Though simply being able to think doesn't give people the right to do anything they want. Especially given the limited nature of some people's thinking. There is another stupid aspect to all this. Which is that only the fruit of knowledge was forbidden to man. So you would think that had they not eaten it, they would have eventually gotten around to eating from the tree of life. Which apparently would have made them live forever. But earlier god told them to be fruitful and multiply. Though even an idiot could see the incompatibility of these two things.

What this next paragraph had to say is particularly disgusting. It had god talking to one of adam and eve's two sons named cain about his brother abel. In Gen. 4:7, it says:

“If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.”

What god is telling cain here is that he is in a no lose situation. That if he does well, he will be accepted. But if he doesn't do well, which I interpret as meaning if he does bad things, his brother will envy him and he will rule over him. So in other words god is saying that crime pays. What a filthy thing to teach! Also, I

wonder how many people would accept being a sinner if it meant they would be envied and rule. Instead of simply being accepted. With teachings like this, it's no wonder that Cain killed his brother, Abel. Now to the contrary of what they

61

teach here, though crime may at times pay for the criminal, I wouldn't recommend it. One reason being that the torment of the many, who are preyed upon by the few, far outweighs the gain of the few.

There is no rational way that what this next paragraph had to say can be justified. In Gen. 6:7, it says:

“And the Lord said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them.”

Well maybe God should have taken the trouble to foresee what was going to happen before he created them. But what I really don't like here is that just because man screws up, he was going to destroy everything. What a complete asshole! And that's the best thing I can think of to call him. Only the greatest of devils would do such a thing. If he were any kind of God at all, he would destroy only the guilty and leave the rest unharmed. But from what I have seen he enjoys killing too much. Another thing that makes me sick to my stomach is that God lets Noah, his family and two of every creature survive. Thereby negating the reason for all the slaughter and devastation. But that didn't stop him from doing it. It also makes me sick that people should accept such behavior as God's right. I say that you should not accept such despicable behavior or the despicable creature that performs it. No matter what kind of comfort you get from religion.

I don't care much for the power God gave people in this next paragraph. In Gen. 9:2, it says:

“And the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast of the earth, and upon the fowl of the air, upon all that moveth upon the earth, and upon all the fishes of the sea; into your hands are they delivered.”

Unfortunately, with man being the omnivorous creatures that we are, we do inflict fear on other animals. Which I suppose is for the best. Because I would not like to expose animals to the possibility of death at our hands in a completely unsuspecting manner. (At least not wild animals) But what I don't like here is the concept that all creatures are yours to do with as you please. Because some people barely deserve to breathe, (and sometimes not even that) let alone having all creatures delivered into their hands. Now to greatly improve this last paragraph of theirs, they only needed to add three words. Which are “harvest them wisely.” But the Bible is no place to look for any teachings about



conservation.

This next story concerns noah, his son ham and ham's son canaan. In this story, noah gets drunk and falls asleep naked in his tent. But ham discovers that his father was naked and tells his two brothers. Who then respectfully walk into noah's tent backwards and cover him without looking. But when noah finds out what happened, in Gen. 9:25, he says:

62

“And he said, Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren.”

So here noah is cursing ham's son canaan because of what ham did. What a terrible example of supposed justice to teach! It was ham who did the accidental deed. If anybody was to be punished, it should have been him. Now if people are just plain scum, I could see possibly stearlizing them and their children. Because the genetic disposition toward antisocial behavior would be present in the children too. But if noah's reason for making canaan a servant was anything like that, it would have been pointless. One reason being that to have any real effect, he would have had to make canaan a eunuch instead.

The next story I would like to mention concerns a person named abram and his wife sarai. The story tells of them going to Egypt to escape a famine. But abram's wife is supposedly beautiful and he is afraid of somebody killing him and taking her. So in Gen. 12:13, he says:

“Say, I pray thee, thou art my sister: that it may be well with me for thy sake; and my soul shall live because of thee.”

What a spineless worm! Now there may be times when you have to lie to protect yourself from injustice, but you have to draw the line somewhere. Neither does the fact that she could have been taken from him mean that she would have been taken from him. So if he wasn't man enough to call her his wife, he deserved to have her taken away from him. Also, he asked her to lie here so it would be well with him for her sake. What a liar! He wanted her to lie so it would be well with him for his sake. And from the sounds of things, she would have been better off without him. So the bible can take this jellyfish philosophy and shove it. Another thing is that the more things that I show you from the bible in this chapter, the less you will be surprised that they didn't come up with better examples of supposed history to teach.

As this story progresses, sarai apparently does do better than abram. Because the pharaoh takes her for his wife. But the lord doesn't like it. As you can see, in Gen. 12:17, it says:

“And the Lord plagued Pharaoh and his house with great plagues because of

Sarai Abram`s wife.”

There is no reason that the lord should have plagued the pharaoh. It was Abram who lied and told his wife to lie. The only thing the pharaoh did wrong was to believe them. So it was Abram and his wife who should have suffered plagues. Also, seeing how God himself supposedly told Abram to go there, he shouldn't have felt it necessary to lie to protect himself.

What these next paragraphs have to say sounds a lot like voodoo. Which isn't the worst of it. As you can see, in Gen. 15:8-12, it says:

“And he said, Lord God, whereby shall I know that I shall inherit it?

And he said unto him, Take me an heifer of three years old, and a she goat of

63

three years old, and a ram of three years old, and a turtledove, and a young pigeon.

And he took him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each piece one against another: but the birds he divided not.

And when the fowls came down upon the carcasses, Abram drove them away.

And when the sun was going down, a deep sleep fell upon Abram; and, lo, an horror of great darkness fell upon him.”

This bloody ritual that was supposed to be done here was so Abram could know something. Which is beyond stupid. Because he and God were already supposedly having a conversation. What more should he have needed! You would also think that a God capable of jealousy would be a little pissed off by Abram not simply taking God's words for things. But apparently not. Though the really disgusting thing here is the disregard for the lives of these animals that this teaches. Because surely any kind of God wouldn't need the deaths of innocent animals to give Abram some kind of vision. But instead, God has Abram perform this pointless, voodoo like animal sacrifice. Another thing is that being just another religious practice, I don't like the idea of voodoo either. Because just as with things like witches casting spells to get the spirits to do their bidding, their trying to harness any possible powers that are beyond mankind isn't a good idea. Seeing how such people are as susceptible to all the stupidity and corruption that mankind is capable of. And being religious, as far as things like stupidity or corruption goes, I would say they are definitely more susceptible to such things.

Because there are quite a number of examples in the Bible of it promoting slavery, I won't be showing you all of them. But for now, one example can be found in Gen. 17:12-13. It says:

“And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generation, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any

stranger, which is not of thy seed.

He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant.”

This makes buying and selling people seem like no big deal. But treating people like merchandise is wrong. Also, for the religious, you can think what you will. But in my considered opinion, no good results can come from your choice to not be free from god. Another thing is that, for the most part, I would say that people have the right to decide their own destiny. As long as it doesn't infringe on the rights of others. I will be talking more on this subject later.

Next we have the bible condoning incest. This story concerns a person named lot and his two daughters. In Gen. 19:32-33, it says:

“Come, let us make our father drink wine, and we will lie with him, that we may preserve the seed of our father.

And they made their father drink wine that night: and the firstborn went in, and

64

lay with her father; and he perceived not when she lay down, nor when she arose.”

Then the other daughter does the same thing the next night. Well the bible may find this kind of incest acceptable, but I don't. Another thing is that being lot's daughters, they would have carried some of their father's genetics to begin with. So they could have had children with anybody to preserve his seed. Though this whole story seems unlikely to begin with. Because I doubt if lot's daughters could have gotten him so drunk that he didn't know what was going on and still have him be able to become sexually stimulated. Now with human nature being what it is, people can and have formed fairly stable social structures even though it allowed various forms of perversion. Such as we have with religion. But as far as I can see, a heterosexual and monogamous society where children are sexually off limits to adults is a very safe and healthy way to go.

We next revisit the story of esau and jacob. Which exemplifies some pretty bad behavior. In Gen. 25:31-32, esau goes to his brother for food because he is starving. It says:

“And Jacob said, Sell me this day thy birthright.

And Esau said, Behold, I am at the point to die: and what profit shall this birthright do to me?”

As you may remember, esau sells his birthright for some food. What a rotten thing to teach! Unless somebody is an enemy, if they are in need as badly as esau seemed to be, they should be helped. Even if they're a stranger. Let alone family. They shouldn't be taken advantage of. You probably also remember that

esau and jacob's mother, rebekah, helps jacob steal the blessing that their father isaac planned to give to esau. So that jacob instead would inherit all that isaac owned. Their mother was in fact the one who came up with the plan for the deception that led to the theft of this blessing. But despite what the bible taught, deceiving people isn't acceptable.

Now if the reason for this deception was because esau was apparently some sort of hairy throwback, that might have been a different matter. Though the bible tells of no such possible justification. Which as I said, makes their story pretty bad. But the bible does a lot of teaching of examples of bad behavior. And though some may say it's only history, having it in a book meant for religious instruction isn't good. The least they could have done here is mention that such things are wrong to do. But they didn't. Now I think it's likely that people could do a good enough job at being lowlifes on their own without being taught other people's achievements in the area. Also, if people weren't given so many examples of bad behavior, it might seem less common to them. Which in turn might make them less likely to do bad things. Because it would seem more unusual.

Moving on, jacob has misgivings about stealing esau's blessing. But only because he was afraid of what esau would do. Because if his misgivings had

65

been based on morality, he probably wouldn't have went along with it. Then, in Gen. 27:13, it says:

"And his mother said unto him, Upon me be thy curse, my son: only obey my voice, and go fetch me them."

She is quite right about her being to blame for stealing esau's blessing. But the blame is not all hers. Jacob was to blame also. So she was wrong in thinking that she could take jacob's blame upon herself too. Because people are responsible for their own actions.

After esau's blessing is stolen, isaac tells esau to do something pretty rotten. In Gen. 27:40, it says:

"And by the sword shalt thou live, and serve thy brother; and it shall come to pass that thou shalt have the dominion, that thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck."

So by telling esau to live by the sword, he is telling him to plunder, pillage, rape, etc. Which he apparently did. Now though what rebekah and jacob did was pretty bad, the advice isaac gave was even worse. I hope that any supposed descendants of these supposed persons won't mind my calling any of these people dirty cocksuckers! (Not that to these people, such a thing would likely be a bad thing) Also, just because esau may have been treated badly doesn't give

him the right to treat others badly too. And in this case, even worse. Then the reason isaac gives for this filthy advice is so esau can someday break his brother's yoke off from his neck. But I can't see why isaac should have thought it bad for jacob's yoke to be on esau's neck. Seeing how he's the one who put it there! Also, there was a better way to go. Such as by esau sticking a sword into jacob instead. Isaac also could have suggested honest, diligent and hard work so that esau could someday pay to have the yoke taken off his neck. He might have also suggested that esau simply walk away and make his own way in the world. But apparently those things weren't good enough.

Now you might think that isaac would be a little upset with jacob because of what he did. But in Gen. 28:3-4, isaac says to jacob:

“And God almighty bless thee, and make thee fruitful, and multiply thee, that thou mayest be a multitude of people.

And give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee, and to thy seed with thee; that thou mayest inherit the land wherein thou art a stranger, which God gave unto Abraham.”

This is a pretty lavish blessing for isaac to give jacob for forcing away esau's birthright, deceiving him and stealing esau's blessing. You might as well say that he was blessing and praising jacob for his crimes. Which is an incredibly vile thing to teach. Because to do bad things is bad enough. But to actually revel in it is taking it to a whole other level. Isaac may also have praised jacob to this extent because he figured that jacob was just a chip off the ole block. Or as I would more accurately put it, a piece of shit off the ole pile. Also, according to 66

the bible, god supposedly fulfills this blessing. Which makes god as guilty as everybody else in this sordid story. They might as well have come right out and said that crime pays. But then criminals who use this story as a justification for their criminal behavior wouldn't be able to think that their criminal behavior was the result of some secret, esoteric wisdom.

This next promotion for slavery gives one example of what slaves can be used for. In Gen. 30:3-4, it says:

“And she said, Behold my maid Bilhah, go in unto her; and she shall bear upon my knees, that I may also have a child by her.

And she gave him Bilhah her handmaid to wife: and Jacob went in unto her.”

If this slave bilhah was very good looking, I doubt if jacob's wife needed to do a lot of convincing. But did anybody stop to consider how bilhah felt about it? I doubt it. After all, she was just a slave. Though despite teachings like this, slavery isn't acceptable.

As you know, jacob did some pretty rotten things to esau. Which in a real world

situation you would presume that esau would be unlikely to forgive. But when esau next sees jacob, in Gen. 33:4, it says:

“And Esau ran to meet him, and embraced him, and fell on his neck, and kissed him: and they wept.”

I can't see esau being so forgiving. Sure, time may have passed. He may also have missed his brother. Or maybe he may have bought that crap about the blame for what happened being on his mother, etc. But after all the things jacob did to him, I would have expected esau to be a little less emotional than this. Now I don't like the level of happiness they teach on esau's part because it makes it seem like there should be no reason for animosity between them. Because what happened is just the way people are. Which even if all this really happened, would still make it a rotten thing to teach. Though there could be another explanation for this seemingly absolute forgiveness. Which is that though jacob stole from him, esau himself lives by the sword and he figured that one piece of shit can't fault another.

The story that is told in Gen. 34 is a little too lengthy to copy. So I'll just tell you what supposedly happened. The story tells of jacob's daughter, dinah, and a Hivite prince named sechem making love out of wedlock. But wedding plans are made. And to help make peace, the men of the Hivite city circumcise themselves. Though even after this ample reparation for the couples passion, two of jacob's sons decide to seek revenge on their own. They supposedly go into the Hivite city and kill all the men. Then the rest of jacob's sons loot the city and take the women and children captive. But after all this, jacob only chastises his two sons. I am underwhelmed by his sense of justice. He could have at least let the women and children go. Along with their possessions. Also, I find it amazingly hypocritical for any guy who would like to have sex with somebody's sister to be upset by anybody likewise having sex with their sister.

67

So as you can imagine, I find nothing wrong with what dinah and sechem did. That's just what men and women do. As long as they act responsibly and don't knowingly spread any disease, they should be able to have sex whenever society considers them to be old enough to do so. Though even if the pair are a little too young, it shouldn't be treated like it's the end of the world. Another thing is that what dinah's brothers did was probably more for their honor than hers. Which isn't a very good thing to teach. Because before any young woman is somebody's daughter or sister, they are their own person first. So the brother's shouldn't have gotten involved. Unless it was really necessary. Which shouldn't include a simple break up. Even though they are sometimes painful.

Speaking of other gods, what this next paragraph had to say leaves a lot to be

desired. In Ex. 20:5, it says:

“Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me,”

First of all, god is supposed to be perfect. So if it's ok for him to be jealous, it must be ok for you to be too. But generally speaking, I don't think jealousy is a very good thing. Also, if god is jealous of other gods, he can't be much of a god himself. Then it says that god will punish the children of those that hate him to the third or fourth generation. But practicing such reverse eugenics on people is another reason to hate him. You will also be seeing more clearly as you read on that hating the god they talk about is a virtue. And punishing the virtuous would screw mankind up. Another thing is that it's pretty bad to punish the descendants of people he supposedly created to act the way they do.

This next paragraph leaves something to be desired. In Ex. 20:16, it says: “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.”

This teaching doesn't do anything about instances where somebody may bear false witness “for” their neighbor. Neither is bearing false witness for or against your neighbor the only place where a lie may hold significance. For example, people often use lies to steal. One way this can be done is by telling a lie or withholding the truth about something somebody may be trying to sell to get more money for it than it is worth. This is basically stealing. Which isn't good. So a more helpful thing to say would have been to not bear false witness at all. Unless of course it was for the fairly harmless purpose of sparing somebody from hurt feelings.

I hope you don't mind my going off on a tangent here, but human civilization seems to be built on lies. Though religious people don't have to worry about it, this doesn't bode well for evolution. (Not that humans are likely to survive for much longer if things don't change) I have heard of infectious microbes that have evolved to the point where they don't do well in the absence of antibiotics. Another microbe I have heard about evolved to the point where they could survive on nuclear rods in cooling tanks. (It would be interesting to know how

68

well these bacteria survive in the absence of radiation) The point I am getting at with this is that I would hate to see humans evolve to the point where they couldn't survive without lies. Because as far as I have been able to figure, it just isn't necessary. As it is, I have heard that the use of antidepressants has gone up. Could this be an evolutionary hangover from people no longer being able to swallow the ridiculous nature of religion? With no rational society to replace it? Though I am not in a position to say for sure, I would say it's possible. But I

would rather swallow antidepressants than religion. Though as far as that goes, I would rather swallow a cyanide pill than religion.

In this next promotion for slavery, god supposedly sets forth some rules on the matter. In Ex. 21:2-7, it says:

“If thou buy an Hebrew servant, six years shall he serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing.

If he came in by himself, he shall go out by himself: if he were married, then his wife shall go out with him.

If his master have given him a wife, and she have born him sons or daughters; the wife and her children shall be her master’s, and he shall go out by himself.

And if the servant shall plainly say, I love my master, my wife, and my children; I will not go out free:

Then the master shall bring him unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; and the master shall bore his ear through with an aul; and he shall serve him for ever.

And if a man sell his daughter to be a maidservant, she shall not go out as the menservants do.”

First of all, it talks here of Hebrew slaves. But it would have been interesting to hear how other slaves were to be treated. Moving on, it says here that if a master gives his slave a wife and they have children, if the father-slave decides to leave, the wife and children can be made to stay. Well that’s one way to make sure the father-slave sticks around. Also, I wonder what rights children born into slavery were supposed to have. Another thing I don’t like is the idea of slave children or that the women can never go free. So with god supporting this vile form of employment, I hope nobody will mind my saying that he can eat shit and die! It’s also amazing that he had the nerve to say all this after what he supposedly just put the Egyptians through for owning Hebrew slaves. Though with this being their religion, it’s no wonder that they would teach that they are somehow “special.”

These next two paragraphs dealt with what a man is to do if he gets himself a second wife. In Ex. 21:10-11, it says:

“If he take him another wife; her food, raiment, and duty of marriage, shall he not diminish.

And if he do not these three unto her, then she shall go out free without money.”

69

So what this is saying is that if a man takes a second wife, but doesn’t maintain the first wife’s standard of living, then the first wife can hit the road without a penny. What a thing to teach! Though this isn’t really clear as to whether the first wife can leave on her own or if this simply saves him the trouble of throwing



her out. Another thing I don't like here is the idea of polygamy. One reason being those who could afford to have more than one wife wouldn't necessarily be genetically superior. Having the wealth to do so could come from luck; inheritance; greed; dishonesty; environmental rape; ass kissing or for some unwholesome reason adhering to an overly self sacrificing work ethic that would otherwise be honorable.

Also, because polygamy leaves some men out in the cold, what they suggest could cause a rise in homosexuality. One reason that would be bad is that there are too many jerks in the world as it is. But having to deal with gay jerks, for various reasons, would be even worse. Now on this last point, some of you out there may think that I am the one being a jerk or that I am, so to speak, talking out of my ass. But I have, as they say, been around the block a few times. I have also been in the navy. So as with everything else I have to say in this book, even though I most often don't go into as much detail as I could, you can be assured that what I have to say comes from experience and weighing everything from various angles.

What god supposedly had to say in this next paragraph seems way too strict to me. In Ex. 21:17, it says:

“And he that curseth his father, or his mother, shall surely be put to death.”

First of all, I am going to assume that the cursing they talk about here is simply harsh words. Not that they are speaking of somebody's offspring actually trying to place a curse on them. So only an evil slimeball could have come up with this one. The reason they probably said it was because they figured that you can't expect strict obedience to god if there is no strict obedience at home. Also, what if the parents deserved to be cursed. Apparently that doesn't make any difference. Now I myself think that the parents should try beating the crap out of the kid instead. Or if the child is an adult, they could try displaying the child's shame to others. Thereby forcing their offspring to be penitent. Throwing them out or disowning them would have also been something to try before death.

Speaking more about how slaves should be treated, in Ex. 21:20, it says:

“And if a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and die under his hand; he shall surely be punished.”

Now I'm sure of it. God is a republican! But seriously, how compleatly rotten can they get. A few paragraphs back they said that if you curse your parents, you will be put to death. But here they say that if you kill a slave, you will only receive some sort of punishment? What kind of evil scum could teach something like that! Now one way the faithful out there may justify their faith in god is by accepting such behavior as somehow being right. Or that with the bible

being contradictory, teaching both good and evil, that both are somehow necessary. But they would be wrong. It is just evil. Neither do I agree with the idea that evil is largely a subjective matter that is open to debate. They may also try to justify such things by saying that what doesn't kill you makes you stronger. Which may be true in some cases. But as far as religion is concerned, any evil it promotes would most likely make you weaker. For example, by giving into it. Neither can you be morally justified in fighting evil if you allow for it yourself.

Another thing to take into account is the effects of good verses evil. What is the best that can come from good? How about healthy, attractive and intelligent people living in a healthy environment. With them liking and being friendly toward each other. What is the worst that can come from evil? How about things like necrophilia or pedophilia. Or ugly, stupid, aggressive, self centered or unhealthy people living in a unhealthy environment and probably disliking each other because of it. I have also come to the conclusion that the negative mental ripple effects that evil sends through society outweighs the positive mental ripple effects that come from doing what is normal and good. Yet another bad thing that comes from allowing for evil is when it takes on the form of corruption. Unfortunately there can be great profit in it. Which is especially troubling in a capitalist society.

People may also try to justify the evil things the bible says by thinking that things were different back then and god has changed since then. But worshiping what you may imagine to be a reformed or more evolved god is a bad idea. One reason being that even a strong building built on a rotten foundation is still rotten. Other believers may worship god believing that what they imagine him to be is what he is. But if you were to believe in some religion, it is the religion that decides what it is. Not you. So to reject the evil in the bible, believers should reject the bible completely. Despite what they may feel religion has evolved into. Also, if none of this talk about evil has convinced you to reject the bible and religion in general, don't worry. Because as with other topics that I talk about, I will have different points of reason to unleash on you later.

The bloody slaughter that god supposedly commanded to be done in Ex. 29 is a little too lengthy to copy. So I'll just tell you some of what happened. First, they kill a bullock before the lord. Apparently so god wouldn't miss out on all the fun. Then they take its blood and spread it on the horns of the altar with one of their fingers. They pour the rest of the blood beside the bottom of the altar. After that, they take some internal tissue which they call caul, the fat and the kidneys and burn them on the altar. Next they kill a ram and sprinkle its blood all around the altar. After which they cut it into pieces, wash it, and burn it on the altar. Then they kill another ram and put its blood on the tip of the right ear, the right thumb and the right big toe of aaron and his sons. The rest of its blood they sprinkle around the altar. They next take the blood on the altar, along with some

anointing oil, and sprinkle it on the clothes of aaron and his sons.

71

This gory practice supposedly went on for a week. After which two lambs were to be sacrificed each day from then on. What a barbaric massacre! I'm glad they didn't have any chainsaws or wood chippers back then. Though at least they weren't doing human sacrifice here. Now despite what they teach, the lives of animals are far too precious to waste on performing some sort of voodoo-witchcraft ritual to this bloodthirsty god of theirs. But as far as that goes, feces is too valuable to waste as a sacrifice to this god. Only a devil could advocate the kind of senseless slaughter they describe. After which the commandment "thou shalt not kill" loses much of its authority.

Moving on, it would seem that they believed that their souls (and likely yours) are not for free. As you can see, in Ex. 30:12, it says:

"When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel after their number, then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord, when thou numberest them; that there be no plague among them, when thou numberest them."

This is just what I would expect from the lord. First he supposedly gives them their soul, then he requires a ransom for them. I guess worshiping him wasn't good enough. Another thing is that I wonder what somebody's slave was expected to pay. Or if that was an expense placed on their owner. I just find the whole idea disgusting. And what's also bad about all this is that even if they did pay a ransom for their souls, they still remained under god's control. Also, this ransom was supposedly going to keep plague away from them when they had gathered to be numbered. But it doesn't seem fair to me that god should cause those people to be put into a position where plague could spread among them and charge them in any way for the service of keeping plague away from them.

It's bad enough that god would require them to pay a ransom for their souls, but as you are about to see, he couldn't even be fair about it. In Ex. 30:15, it says: "The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less than half a shekel, when they give their offering unto the Lord, to make an atonement for your souls."

They have to be congratulated. They've confused me. Because I don't know if this payment was supposed to be a ransom, an offering or an atonement. Though it was probably anything they wanted to call it. As long as they forked over the dough. But the unfair thing about all this is that both rich and poor were to pay half a shekel. Because half a shekel would mean a lot more to somebody who only has one than it would mean to somebody who has hundreds. So the poor in fact had to pay more. I guess it's just too bad everybody can't be rich. Now as far as this religious taxation goes, I heard a good idea in a joke. You

throw your money up in the air. Whatever god wants, he keeps. Whatever falls back to the ground, you keep.

These next two paragraphs show that the Jews had come up with a pretty easy way to make reparations for their sins. In Lev. 16:21-22, it says:

“And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess  
72

over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat, and he shall send him away by the hand of a fit man into the wilderness;

And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities into a land not inhabited: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness.”

Well if this was all their was to relieving themselves of their sins, they couldn't have been too worried about committing them. Which isn't a very good attitude to promote. I myself believe that people should be responsible for their own actions. Trying to make a goat responsible for them is both stupid and rotten. Also, they speak here of all their transgressions in all their sins. But I don't think you can commit a real transgression without committing a sin. If you could, then the transgression wouldn't be a sin at all.

What this next paragraph had to say about the reason for a female slave's transgression isn't very specific. In Lev. 19:20, it says:

“And whosoever lieth carnally with a woman, that is a bondmaid, betrothed to an husband, and not at all redeemed, nor freedom given her; she shall be scourged; they shall not be put to death, because she was not free.”

Here it says that whoever had sex with such a woman. But does this include her master? If so, then scourging her would be a filthy act. Because it would likely mean that she had no choice in the matter. This also makes me wonder if any punishment at all would have been meted out if she had not been betrothed. It also says here that she shouldn't be put to death because she wasn't free. So does this mean that she indeed had no choice in the matter? Or could it mean that her value as property was more important than punishing her sin with death. Whatever the case, I find the whole thing disgusting. Then, what should be done with the man can be found in Lev. 19:21. It says:

“And he shall bring his trespass offering unto the Lord, unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, even a ram for a trespass offering.”

This isn't very fair. The woman gets scourged. Or if she had been free, they would have killed her. But all the man has to do is pay the price of a goat? Now if they really wanted to discourage such behavior, they should have said that in such a situation the man would be scourged or possibly be put to death too.

This next paragraph dealt with the Israelis getting ready to take land the lord

supposedly gave them. In Num. 10:9, it says:

“And if ye go to war in your land against the enemy that oppresseth you, then ye shall blow an alarm with trumpets; and ye shall be remembered before the Lord your God, and ye shall be saved from your enemies.”

What a bunch of crap! The Jews were going to war for the same reason that most other people went to war. Which is to take what other people have. All the people who the Jews considered to be their enemies did was to live on land that the Jews claimed their god gave to them. So it was the Jews who were the oppressors. Also, starting in Egypt, god supposedly caused plagues, parted a  
73

sea, caused a pillar of flame to follow the Israelites around, etc. So why didn't he simply tell those other people directly that they should move or he was going to punish them. He should also have had the power to cause them to move himself. Though I guess that would have spoiled all the fun slaughter. Another thing is that the earth wasn't very populated back then. They could have found better and more unpopulated land elsewhere.

Now as far as the Israelites going to war to take what other people have goes, there are a few other things I would like to say about it. Which though being a little more lengthy than usual, will still be incomplete. But I think I will get my point across. It's just what I have to say is bound to make some people really angry. Though if I am to make people angry, I intend to make some attempt here to tell you why I feel the way I do. So as far as the Israelites taking what other people have goes, I wanted to point out how little things have changed. First of all, think about what happens in a knife fight. You wouldn't stab somebody in the arm or the leg. You would try to stab them right where it would do the most harm. And when people commit to warfare, they will tend to do it in whatever way is expedient or achievable for them. Then, compare those things to the control the Jews have over the media here in the U.S. Take for example the early years of the movie industry. Most of the major movie studios in the U.S. were either run or owned by Jews. Which in turn then gave them the opportunity to control how people view the world. And controlling what people think is stabbing them in the most vital area.

Some of you may not see anything much wrong with surrendering yourselves to a race who are followers of a success oriented cult. Who may try harder and sacrifice more to justify their view of themselves as the chosen of god. But take for example the disproportional number of Jews and Italians in show business. They aren't there in such numbers because they are better at such things than anybody else. As for the disproportional numbers of Jewish performers in show business, the most likely reason for that is because if you are a White person

looking to a Jew for a job, and you are competing against another Jew, the job would most likely go to the one who is one of the “chosen of god.” Even if they are less qualified. Then as far as the Italians are concerned, they are also likely there in disproportionate numbers because the Jews see little if any difference between they and themselves as far as physical appearance is concerned. The Jews and Italians also both seem to have an affinity for organized crime. Which comes in handy when you need to take a carrot and stick approach to controlling people.

Also, when it's Jewish money paying to make people successful in show business, they wouldn't want to promote the physical appearance of people who are from central or northern Europe. They would also find it useful to fool people into believing that Jewish and Italian people all look like people from central or northern Europe by using Jewish or Italian performers that look like people from

74

central or northern Europe. Neither would they be likely to promote White people unless those people were willing to kiss Jewish ass. This sort of thing also happens in the financial arena. Which is another area where the Jews have a disproportional influence. If you are competing with a Jew for a loan and it is another Jew who has the money, even if both of their reasons for a loan are equally valid, would you be willing to take a wild guess as to who would be most likely to get the loan? This kind of behavior would eventually turn the populace of the countries they have infected with their presence into second class citizens and slaves.

The Jews also use the media to denigrate and marginalize the White man and his culture as much as possible. You would have to be blind not to see it. And the more the White man becomes use to it, the farther they are apparently willing to push it. Causing “whitey” to become less patriotic toward their own kind in favor of other species of human who, among other problems, have no historical claim to moral superiority themselves. If not less. One reason they do this is because the Jewish people are unlikely to be anything but a minority themselves. And by attacking “whitey,” they promote their own cause. Which is to gain all the power they can by sowing confusion amongst their enemies. As if that wasn't bad enough, I remember seeing an evangelical Christian in Israel telling some Jews there that they should “stick to their guns” and support the Jewish occupation. On another occasion on a Christian channel, I saw a program where Christians were trying to get other Christians to donate money to send Jews to Israel.

What I perceive from such things is that in an effort to demonstrate the power of their god, Christians are willing to betray their own kind by supporting Jews.

Coupling this with everything Jews do to support themselves, it's no wonder they're in such a disproportional position of influence. Now I have never read Hitler's "Mein Kampf." So I can only wonder what his thoughts on such matters were. I also wonder how much Jewish behavior had to do with the suffering they endured in other countries in the past. But I can see why such things happened. Then there is the matter of the holocaust. In referring to it, I have often heard Jewish people say "never again." That leaves the Jewish people with a paradox to overcome which they didn't have before the holocaust. Because on top of the things they did before the holocaust that caused people to dislike them, whatever they plan to do to make sure that it never happens again is probably going to cause people to dislike them even more. What such strategies could be is hard to say.

For instance, unless I'm mistaken, even before the holocaust, I think Jews were willing to let others join their religion. Despite what is taught in the old testament. (Though why anybody would have wanted to is beyond me) So it couldn't be that. Also, unlike what is taught in the old testament, Jewish men often seem to be willing to use their money, power and influence to condescend and buy the

75

finest brainwashed white whores they can get to interbreed with. Eventually making it harder for those they consider to be their enemies to spot them. But they most likely did that before the holocaust too. So it couldn't be that either. From what I have seen, I would say that their plan is to use their influence in the entertainment industry to an ever greater degree against "whity." Given what White people did for them in WW II, I am reminded of a story about a frog that gives a scorpion a ride across a river on its back. The strategy I mentioned has caused White people to become less patriotic toward their own kind.

These things may not be warfare in the common sense, but it is still warfare. So don't say that you weren't warned. The question this then brings up is what the White man is going to do about it. Roll over and take it like a dog? Well for me at least, that isn't an option. Is the White man to retaliate in kind? The government would never allow it. There is always Hitler's final solution. Which though is not out of the question, I have a much better idea in mind. Though they and those they have fooled into painting themselves into a corner with paint that never dries will likely still scream bloody murder, what exactly that idea is and why it is necessary is something you will have to wait until later to find out. There is another negative aspect to the Jews sewing confusion amongst their enemies. Which is the "lets all hold hands and think happy thoughts" politically correct dogshit they try to sell to further their own aims. Like it or not, you can't have any real national unity without racial unity. And without racial unity, what

does it matter who does the work or where they do it. Brainwashed people should stretch their corrupted brains and wonder why the U.S. is sending so many jobs over seas.

Apart from being “politically incorrect,” consider why the U.S. is doing nothing useful in keeping foreign scabs out of the U.S. who take your jobs. Which is probably about the same reason why they let so many foreign scabs come here legally to underbid and take your jobs. On top of that, one of the many stupid ways I’ve heard American officials try to explain all this away was as America heading for a service oriented economy. Which isn’t possible in a society that depends on manufactured goods. It might also be helpful to look at the reason behind the opium war between the British and the Chinese. Then there is the U.S. letting the Japanese virtually destroy our consumer electronics industry. Or leaving American manufacturers at the mercy of foreign companies that have been known to use the book “The Art of War” by Sun-Tzu as a model on how to conduct business.

Another thing is that seeing American officials wonder at how the Chinese are getting so much top secret information with all the Chinese American scientists working here would be hilarious if it wasn’t so tragic. Though at least I can see, along with apparently many of them, that what you are is more important than where you are. Or what your system of government is. So you can see what Jewish control of the media has gotten the larger minority of White people on this

76

planet. Making treason the clarion call for our age. Especially to those who vote Democrat or Republican. Though as far as politics is concerned, people need to stop listening to lies and look at the world as it really is. If you want to think I’m lying to you, that’s ok. Because considering somebody who is telling the truth to be a liar isn’t as bad as considering somebody who is lying to be telling the truth. One reason being that the truth has a tendency to make itself known. But lies by their very nature seek out the shadows and avoid detection. I have gone into the subject of Jewish warfare a little more deeply than I wanted to. If you are troubled by what I said, I can’t help it if the truth leads to where it leads to. Also, if you have any arguments against what I’ve said here, don’t worry. Because, as usual, they will likely be answered later.

For another example of god’s despicable sense of justice, let’s go to Num. 35:23-27. It says:

“Or with any stone, wherewith a man may die, seeing him not, and cast it upon him, that he die, and was not his enemy, neither sought his harm:

Then the congregation shall judge between the slayer and the revenger of blood according to these judgments:



And the congregation shall deliver the slayer out of the hand of the revenger of blood, and the congregation shall restore him to the city of his refuge, whither he hath fled: and he shall abide in it unto the death of the high priest, which was anointed with holy oil.

But if the slayer shall at any time come without the borders of the city of his refuge, and the revenger of blood kill the slayer; he shall not be guilty of blood:"

Now if somebody kills somebody by accident, they should be punished. But they shouldn't be killed. Because, depending on the circumstances, a purposeful killing is worse than an accidental one. The level of this persons punishment should also be dependent on the level of his negligence. Also, it says the slayer will stay in the city of his refuge until the death of the high priest. After which, according to what the following paragraph said, he will apparently be able to go wherever he wants without the person seeking revenge having the right to kill him. But the unfair thing about that is that the slayer could wait six years or sixty years before he has the freedom to leave and be protected by the law. I would hate to see a fundamentalist state come about where people would use these screwed up rules as a guide for their society.

This next paragraph told of what should be done if one of the Israelite cities decided to worship other gods. In Duet. 13:15, it says:

"Thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that is therein, and the cattle thereof, with the edge of the sword."

Well if their idea of a city was anything like my idea of a city, I doubt if everybody in it would be guilty of worshiping other gods. So killing everybody and everything would be a pretty rotten thing to do. Also, there could be people

77

in such a city that have no need for gods at all. Killing them would be devolutionary and therefore evil. Then there are the children. Maybe killing them would be meant to weed out the genetic tendencies to worship other gods. But it would still be a rotten thing to do. They also say that even their animals should be killed. Which doesn't hold out much hope for any slaves. Most if not all of which were probably forced to be there. But to teach such a disregard for the lives of animals and probably slaves is terrible. Now killing animals and destroying things is something the Jews apparently often did when attacking various places. Though to be fair, it's possible that they did such things to remove any profit motive in attacking other people. But rather than be so bloodthirsty, I would have let any animals or slaves go free.

We're given a confusing and rotten message about prophets in these next few paragraphs. In Duet. 18:20-22, it says:

“But the prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that prophet shall die.

And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken?

When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.”

Here it says basically that a false prophet will die. So what. We all die. They don't say they should be killed. It later says that they shouldn't be afraid of such a prophet. But does this mean that they shouldn't be afraid of killing him or that he isn't worth bothering with. It's hard to say. But the thing I don't like here is their teaching of people asking how they are to know if what a prophet has to say is actually the word of god. As if people should listen to everything prophets have to say and decide later if they were right or wrong. Which is a good try at making people suckers. I wonder what they'll try next. Another thing is that I don't like prophecies anyway. Because they are for those who are too stupid to think for themselves. Or for those whose stupidity and greed makes it more expedient to turn a blind eye toward the future. If you are in doubt as to what the future may hold, prophesy is the last place you should look for an answer. Also, it's possible to predict the future to a large extent, given the correct knowledge on which to make a logical extrapolation toward future events. Now as far as any religious prophets goes, highly unlikely as it is, what if somebody was gifted enough to see into the future and mistook this ability as communication from god. It would be a mistake to think that such a person was in communication with god. Or worse yet, worship god because of it.

Next, you're told what should happen if a man accuses his wife of not having been a virgin when they married. In Duet. 22:18-21, it says:

“And the elders of the city shall take that man and chastise him;

78

And they shall amerce him an hundred shekels of silver, and give them unto the father of the damsel, because he hath brought up an evil name upon a virgin of Israel: and she shall be his wife; he may not put her away all his days.

But if this thing be true, and the tokens of virginity be not found for the damsel:

Then they shall bring out the damsel to the door of her father's house, and the men of the city shall stone her with stones that she die: because she hath wrought folly in Israel, to play the whore in her father's house: so shalt thou put evil away from among you.”

First of all, there's a big difference between being a whore, a slut, and simply

not being a virgin. Though none of those things should make a woman worthy of death. Another thing I don't like is that if the husband wrongly exposes his wife to the possibility of death, he will only be chastised and charged some money. It would have been better if they had stoned the man to death if he was wrong. Or at least let the woman take half of what was her husband's and leave him if she wants to. Instead, the poor woman who everybody has been treating like property has to spend the rest of her life with the asshole who tried to get her stoned to death in front of her family! And who is probably going to be even more pissed off over being chastised and fined. What kind of fiend could call such a hellish existence justice! Also, as far as being fined goes, as I said before, one size doesn't fit all. They should try to make the fine fit the person's monetary status. Otherwise you're basically rewarding people for being rich. Or punishing the poor more for being poor.

Some of god's bloodthirsty instruction on warfare can be found in Josh. 6:21. It says:

"And they shall utterly destroy all that was in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword."

I again have to wonder why the bible has things like this in it. The best answer I can come up with is that their aim is to screw people up. Because doing such a thing is pretty rotten. Also, the people the Jews were supposed to do this to were probably Semitic themselves. But when people are against the Jews, they like to call them anti-Semitic. But how can they call somebody something they themselves are guilty of. Now we all know that all this was supposedly done for religious reasons. And anytime anybody tries to justify their actions on religious grounds is bad enough. But there is something particularly filthy about committing warfare for religious reasons. Unless of course the reason was to wipe out religion. Another bad thing they teach here again is the disregard for animal life. As I said before, if they didn't want the animals they should have let them go.

As you may have noticed, there is sometimes quite a bit of text between one paragraph in the bible that I comment on and the next. The main reason for which is that the bible largely consists of pointless information. But instead of exercising their ability to talk seemingly endlessly, they should have given more  
79

consideration toward the issue of justice. Another poor example of which can be found in Josh. 7:15. It says:

"And it shall be, that he that is taken with the accursed thing shall be burnt with fire, he and all that he hath: because he hath transgressed the covenant of the Lord, and because he hath wrought folly in Israel."

They supposedly did this to some poor fool for taking loot he wasn't supposed to. Now seeing how he supposedly sinned, I can see why they would punish him. But burning him and all that he has is too much. Yep, looks like we got ourselves a hang'n lord here. Maybe they should have given chastising and scourging a try first. After which they could have fined him and given the proceeds to the poor. Though there probably aren't a lot of poor people in a society that allows slavery. Seeing how they could probably find employment as slaves. And they weren't likely to have given much of a damn about them.

Just how far the punishment they were speaking of goes can be found in Josh. 7:24-25. It says:

“And Joshua, and all Israel with him, took Achan the son of Zarak, and the silver, and the garment, and the wedge of gold, and his sons, and his daughters, and his oxen, and his asses, and his sheep, and his tent, and all that he had: and brought them into the valley of Achor.

And Joshua said, Why hast thou troubled us? The Lord shall trouble thee this day. And all Israel stoned him with stones, and burned them with fire, after they had stoned them with stones.”

First of all, as I said before, from a eugenic point of view I can't really blame them for killing the children of criminals too. But considering the nature of the crime, this seems a little excessive to me. Another bad thing about all this is the further disregard for the lives of animals that they teach. Maybe they want you to think of animals as being as inferior as possible so you can think of yourselves as being as superior as possible. Though even if that wasn't their aim, the lesson is still the same. Also, I hope this person didn't have any slaves. Because as I said before, if they were willing to go as far as to kill even the animals in this case, any slaves would likely have been killed too. At least, in such cases, I don't remember them ever having said “except for the slaves.”

Some of you out there may have been wondering how long it was going to take them to get around to justifying human sacrifice. Well this next story tells of a person named Jephthah. He was the son of a whore, who was made chief of the Gileadites. Jephthah was going to lead them against the children of Ammon. So in return for the lord's help in the battle, he makes a pledge to him. In Judg. 11:31, he said:

“Then it shall be, that whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, when I have returned in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt offering.”

As it turned out, his daughter, his only child, meets him at the door. So he  
80

sacrifices her. Needless to say, I think it's terrible to teach that you can slaughter

your daughter to keep some promise to the lord. Also, it's no surprise to me that the lord would allow or accept this sacrifice. And after some of the things I've pointed out to you so far, it should be no surprise to you either.

Next, we have a rotten story of an unmarried man, his concubine and a servant who go into a city for the night. They end up staying with some old man. But some men of the city come along who apparently wanted to rape the traveler. To keep this from happening, the old man offers the men his daughter and the concubine to keep the traveler's sphincter from getting more reamed than it probably already was. So much for chivalry. Then in Judg. 19:25, it says: "But the men would not hearken to him: so the man took his concubine, and brought her forth unto them; and they knew her, and abused her all night until the morning: and when the day began to spring, they let her go."

As it turned out, the concubine dies from her ordeal. So what is this trying to teach. That it's ok to be a sniveling coward? The bible does teach that a live dog is better than a dead lion. But as you know, I don't agree with that. Now they may have done whatever to him and taken her anyway. But that would have been their fault, not his. They didn't treat her like a piece of expendable meat to be thrown to the wolves. He did. And his cowardly action only proves to me that his cowardly ass wasn't worth the price that was paid. Also, if they didn't believe in polygamy back then and there were more women to go around, those men probably wouldn't have been so eager to find what they probably considered to be "sweet man ass" to rape.

Being a sniveling coward wasn't good enough. This guy later added lies to his little misadventure. As you can see, in Judg. 20:5, he says:

"And the men of Gibeah rose against me, and beset the house round about me by night, and thought to have slain me: and my concubine have they forced, that she is dead."

Here he says the men thought they had slain him. What a liar! According to the earlier story, they didn't even touch him. But even if they had, (which they apparently didn't) it would have meant that he threw her to the wolves for nothing. Then he says that they forced her. But he himself probably had to force her to go to them. In fact, he probably would have gift wrapped her if he thought it would have helped him. So what's the moral of their story. If you're a cowardly scumbucket, you can lie to cover your shame? I can't stomach that idea.

This next story covers quite a bit of text. So I'll just tell you what happens. In the first book of Samuel, a person named Saul is anointed and made king. But he transgresses against the lord and is not forgiven. So a person named David is anointed and proclaimed to be the king. Then Saul tries many times to have David killed, but fails. But then David too has some opportunities to kill Saul, but lets him go. So what ever happened to that eye for an eye stuff. Saul's trying to

kill David gave David every right to kill Saul. Unless of course David deserved to be killed. Which as far as their story tells, he didn't. So why didn't David kill Saul? I would have to say that the reason probably was because Saul had been anointed. Which is a bunch of crap.

Saul's transgression should have been enough to unanoint him. What's going on here reminds me of their story about Jacob stealing Esau's blessing. Their father's blessing wasn't written in stone. Though they wrongly acted as if it were. But when Isaac had discovered that he had been deceived, he should have recanted his blessing and have given it to Esau instead. Likewise, Saul's anointment shouldn't have been treated like it was written in stone. I say that when justice dictates, even things written in stone should be broken. Though I can see what they taught coming in handy when you want to promote a "let the buyer beware" attitude. But I have a better idea. Which is to let the seller beware.

Now even though Saul was grateful for another act of David's mercy, after David let him go, Saul still tried to have David killed. Which just goes to prove that David should have killed him when he had the chance. Then Saul is killed in battle. After which in 2 Sam. 1:23, David said:

"Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant in their lives, and in their death they were not divided: they were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions."

So what is this trying to teach. That if some lying scumbag keeps trying to kill you, they should be forgiven? Even thought well of? Well forget that! After what Saul did, calling him lovely and pleasant is like calling evil lovely and pleasant. And nobody should believe that.

These next two paragraphs describe what supposedly happened when somebody tried to protect an object called the arc of the covenant while it was being transported. In 2 Sam. 6:67, it says:

"And when they came to Nachon's threshing floor, Uzzah put forth his hand to the arc of God, and took hold of it; for the oxen shook it.

And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah; and God smote him there for his error; and there he died by the arc of God."

This again shows that God isn't very nice. All that poor sap did was to try to keep that artifact from hell from getting smashed. I don't think he deserved to be killed for that. I would also like to say again that just because the Bible teaches such vile behavior on the part of the Lord, it doesn't mean that you should accept such behavior. Let alone pray to a creature that supposedly did these sorts of things.

As you know, the Bible shows many examples of unseemly behavior. Which as

I said before, has no place in a book meant for religious instruction. Another example is what supposedly happened when David saw a married woman named Bathsheba bathing. In 2 Sam. 11:4, it says:

82

“And David sent messengers, and took her; and she came in unto him, and he lay with her; for she was purified from her uncleanness: and she returned unto her house.”

Well if a supposedly great man who was supposedly chosen by god to rule can do something like this, then it must be no big deal if regular people weaken and do the same thing. Which isn't a very good message to be sending. Even though he later does get punished in part for this misdeed.

Those of you who have read or heard of this story, you know that David didn't stop at adultery. The married woman he had sex with had a husband named Uriah. And wanting his wife, David cooks up a little plan for him. Which is told of in 2 Sam. 11:15. It says:

“And he wrote in a letter, saying, Set ye Uriah in the forefront of the hottest battle, and retire ye from him, that he may be smitten and die.”

I can only wonder why the Jewish people hold so much reverence for this adulterous, murdering scumbag. It sure doesn't speak very well for them. Also, divorce seemed to be easy enough to obtain back then. He probably could have just paid Uriah to “put away his wife.” Though to be fair, if David had tried to get Uriah to give up his wife and he said no, killing him to get her would have been a little more trickery. But if he had tried and Uriah had said no, a better plan would have been to forget the woman. Then, what do you think the lord does to David for his misdeeds. The answer is nothing. He supposedly kills his son instead. Which from a eugenic point of view, harsh as it may have been, I can't really argue with. Though if anybody was to be killed for those misdeeds, it should have been David.

This next paragraph teaches something pretty disgusting. In speaking of a king named Solomon, in 1 Ki. 11:4, it says:

“For it came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his wives turned away his heart after other gods: and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as was the heart of David his father.”

So despite David's crimes, to god his heart was perfect. Well David may have repented his crimes afterwards, which being punished has a tendency to cause people to do, but that wouldn't make his heart perfect. Also, maybe you're supposed to believe that as long as you have a pure heart concerning god, that's all that matters. Which is an idea they can stick you know where. Another thing is that god supposedly made Solomon the smartest man in the world. Solomon

also supposedly did a lot of communicating directly with god. So if Solomon turned to other gods, I would have to say that the reason was because all of the interactions the bible says he had with god was a bucket full of brown, steaming, smelly lies. As most likely were all the other interactions the bible teaches that people had with god. Or any interactions that anybody claims to have had with god for that matter.

More vile teachings on this matter can be found in 1 Ki. 11:11-12. It says:

83

“Wherefore the Lord said unto Solomon, Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes, which I have commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and give it to thy servant.

Notwithstanding in thy days I will not do it for David thy father’s sake: but will rend it out of the hand of thy son.”

Here they go again. Punishing the perpetrator’s son instead of the guilty person himself. It amazes me that people can worship something that is capable of such filth. So I have to say again that it is the guilty person himself that should be punished. One reason being that people could see a clear association between the sinner and the punishment. But with the bible teaching an apparent necessity for evil, it’s no surprise that god wouldn’t want to punish the guilty person directly. Also, it’s pretty terrible for god to punish Solomon’s innocent son for the sake of an adulterous murderer.

The next story I would like to talk about concerns two prophets. The first prophet is told by god that there are only two places where he can eat and drink. But the second prophet wants him to come to his house to eat and drink. So in 1 Ki. 13:18, it says:

“He said unto him, I am a prophet also as thou art; and an angel spake unto me by the word of the Lord, saying, Bring him back with thee into thine house, that he may eat and drink water. But he lied unto him.”

A prophet telling a lie? What a surprise! But I don’t think the bible should be exemplifying such behavior. Also, needless to say, the first prophet goes with him. And what happens to the first prophet for believing him? God causes him to be killed by a lion. If only such things happened to anybody who would believe a prophet. Then, guess what happened to the second prophet for lying. A big fat nothing.

It is my belief that the most basic way to teach people is by example. But the example of behavior they give in these next two paragraphs is so terrible, it’s incredible. In speaking about something that happened during a famine that was caused by a besieging army, in 2 Ki. 6:28-29, it says:

“And the king said unto her, What aileth thee? And she answered, This woman



said unto me, Give thy son, that we may eat him to day, and we will eat my son to morrow.

So we boiled my son, and did eat him: and I said unto her the next day, Give thy son, that we may eat him: and she hath hid her son.”

It's easy for somebody who hasn't suffered this kind of depravation to judge somebody who has. But I still find it difficult to believe that anybody could be so cold and rotten. Though even if such a thing did happen, it has no place in a book meant for religious instruction. Unless they meant to teach that during a famine such behavior is ok. Which it isn't. Sure, there may have been times when it has been unavoidable to resort to cannibalism to survive. But the example they give here is beyond terrible. Though this story does bring up an

84

interesting topic. Which concerns trust. Now on the topic of trust, let me give you some advice. It's not your enemies you have to look out for, it's your friends. Because you know what to expect from an enemy. But you don't always know what to expect from a friend. Especially from one who may have a screw loose somewhere. Also, a friend may do you less harm than an enemy would. But the trust you put into a friend also makes you more vulnerable. So you should still be on your guard. Another point about friendship concerns some pretty good advice I once heard. Which is that you should choose your friends. Don't let your friends choose you.

An example of morality that is almost as bad as their last one about cannibalism is in 2 Ki. 20:17-19. It says:

“Behold, the days come, that all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store unto this day, shall be carried into Babylon: nothing shall be left, saith the Lord.

And of thy sons that shall issue from thee, which thou shalt beget, shall they take away; and they shall be eunuchs in the palace of the king of Babylon.

Then said Hezekiah unto Isaiah, Good is the word of the Lord which thou hast spoken. And he said, Is it not good, if peace and truth be in my days.”

What a self centered, selfish asshole! These morals they are teaching are terrible! Here he finds out that his kingdom will be sacked and his sons made eunuchs. But he thinks it's good just because it isn't going to happen to him? Such kingly and fatherly concern is underwhelming. This guy must have been a conservative. Now as I said before, there may be people out there who would say they are merely recounting history here. (supposedly) But when it is in a book meant for religious instruction, it becomes more than that. Also, though I am in favor of freedom of expression, I see no value in examples of such behavior. Except as something to speak against.

These next few paragraphs show the Jews being stingy with their god. In Ezra 4:1-3, it says:

“NOW when the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity builded the temple unto the Lord God of Israel;

Then they came to Zerubbabel, and to the chief of the fathers, and said unto them, Let us build with you: for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esrahaddon king of Assur, which brought us up hither.

But Zerubbabel, and Joshua, and the rest of the chief of the fathers of Israel, said unto them, Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God; but we ourselves together will build unto the Lord God of Israel, as king Cyrus the king of Persia hath commanded us.”

So why would the Jews behave this way. They were all likely Semitic people. And if there was any difference in culture, it was probably because the Jews wanted it that way. Sure, the Jews probably figured that having been given  
85

some power by the king of Persia, those other people probably just wanted to latch on like a lamprey and get in on the action. I see the same sort of thing happening here in the U.S. today. But given other things I've read in the bible, I would have to say an even bigger reason was that they didn't want to lose their position as the chosen of god. Another motivation for their actions could have been to regain land they say their god gave to them. But if god really wanted them to have it, they probably wouldn't have lost it to begin with. Which means they didn't deserve to get it back. Also, they may have had prophets come along and tell them that god wanted them to take back the land. But if what they worked to do was all that stood between them and what god wanted to happen, then he wasn't much of a god.

Now you just heard me speak about the Jews believing that they are the chosen of god as likely being the main reason for their wanting to separate themselves from other people. But in Ezra 9:2, it says:

“For they have taken their daughters for themselves, and for their sons: so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of these lands: yea, the hand of the princes and rulers hath been chief in this trespass.”

They're not satisfied with being the chosen and therefore master race. But here they consider themselves to be the holy race too? What a bunch of shit! Unless they measure holiness, among other differences, according to the size of their noses. What they teach only drives the wedge deeper between them and the rest of us supposedly unholy and unchosen scum. And these people have the nerve to accuse White patriots of being White supremacists? What they teach goes beyond any supremacist attitude. Now I'm sure that there are Jews around

today that would say of such teachings, “we don’t believe in such things any more.” But from their behavior, I would say they still do.

Also, as I said before, people can’t disavow such teachings. Because the word of god is not something that can evolve over time. The only way to renounce such teachings is to renounce the religion in its entirety. If the Jewish people in particular were to do so, who knows. Despite the damage that has been done, after enough time, sane people may be able to trust the Jewish people. Also, Jewish scripture contained more than was recorded in the protestant old testament. But because I have no desire to read any of it, I can only wonder how much more of this Jewish supremacist garbage can be found in it. Though on a side note, there is a Jewish religious work that they hold in high regard called the Talmud. I heard about and looked up something in it concerning “3 years and a day.” In it, they talk about having sex with a female child of that age. Which is extraordinarily disgusting.

The non-Jewish morons who decided to join the Jewish religion or the traitors who kowtow to them should also consider what is taught in Neh. 7:63-64. It says:

“And of the priests; the children of Habaiah, the children of Koz, the children of  
86

Barzillai, which took one of the daughters of Barzillai the Gleadite to wife, and was called after their name.

These sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy, but it was not found: therefore were they, as polluted, put from the priesthood.”

Seig Heil! That’s right, persecute those with polluted, impure blood. What a joke! And these are the same people who use every trick in the book to sell the idea of race mixing here in the U.S. Another stupid thing about what they taught is that the people they were speaking about here were probably more closely related genetically than the Negroes they consider to be their own kind. And the Jews have the nerve to complain about what the Nazis did to them. They only did to the Jews what god supposedly told the Jews to do to many other people. Another thing is that I have heard some people say that the Jews who were killed in W.W. II, in what is referred to as the holocaust, never happened. But with the bible promoting the undeserved Jewish supremacy that it does, the issue to me becomes regret that the Nazis didn’t kill more of them. Also, as far as this genealogy thing goes, I have heard that Jewish criminals from elsewhere in the world can emigrate to Israel to escape the justice of other countries. And you would think that they would only do such a thing if they found better treatment there.

But what if somebody’s blood is polluted because they are only a turncoat

gentile who converted to Judaism. I wonder if they would be given the same opportunity. Another thing is that as far as the apparently lowlife Christians are concerned, it's disheartening to see them being beaten over the head with Jesus to justify their support of their Jewish masters in Israel. One example is the nuclear weapons which about everybody suspects they have. If they have them, would you care to guess where they got them? Yet the U.S. puts up a big enough fuss about other countries obtaining them. And rightly so. Also, who are the morons who gave other foreigners the education to build such things. Now on this whole religion thing, I know I have been pretty rough with the Jewish people lately. For which they only have themselves to blame. But one thing in their favor is that as far as their religion is concerned, I would equally like to see all religion swept away.

One of the most natural things for people to do is protect their land from invaders. Because it is the right thing to do. You simply wouldn't be much of a human being, let alone a man, if you didn't stick up for yourself. But in these next few paragraphs, it shows that god decided to punish forever some people who felt this way. In Neh. 13:1-3, it says:

“ON that day they read the book of Moses in the audience of the people; and therein was found written, that the Ammonite and the Moabite should not come into the congregation of God for ever;

Because they met not the children of Israel with bread and water, but hired

87

Balaam against them, that he should curse them: howbeit our God turned the curse into a blessing.

Now it came to pass, when they had heard the law, that they separated from Israel all the mixed multitude.”

Here the Israelites used something that was written a long time before this was written to justify persecuting people. Which shows again that, as I said before, even a strong building that is built on a rotten foundation is and always will be rotten. Also, just because centuries have passed and there is likely a lot more noise from later teachings that may somewhat differ, you apparently can't discount what had been written earlier. One reason is that with such teachings being closer to the beginning of this religion and the god that supposedly created it, I would have to imagine that earlier writings would hold more relevance than writings that may have come thousands of years later. A proof that this has turned out to be the case can be seen in the Jewish re-conquest of the “holy land.” (Among other things)

But the main point I wanted to make here is that it's pretty rotten for god to

permanently condemn those people for defending their land. Get real. Besides, I doubt if rolling out the red carpet for them would have made much difference. Another thing about what they said here is what they meant about the “mixed multitudes.” Were those mixed multitudes simply other peoples, or did it included Jews that had interbred with non- Jews. Which considering things that they had written earlier, I would put my money on it including Jews who had impure blood. Another thing is that they call god “their” god again. For about the zillionth time. But if god created everybody as they said he did, wouldn’t that make him everybody’s god?

This next story is a little lengthy. So I’ll just tell you what happens. It concerns a person I had talked about earlier named Job. In the first chapter of Job, god and satan make a bet. The bet concerns Job. Even though Job was supposedly perfect, upright and god fearing, satan bets god that if he lets him screw up Job’s life, Job will turn from god. So to prove that he will not turn from him, god agrees to let satan do his worst to him. Except that he can’t harm Job himself. What a couple of jerks! These two creatures were going screw up Job’s life just to prove a point? Now from what satan was supposed to represent, I could see him doing something like this. But this only shows again that god is an asshole! One reason being that I’ve always believed that if you are big and powerful, you don’t need to go around trying to prove it. So for god to try and prove his godhood like this only shows how feeble that godhood is. Neither do I like the choice they give you here between a “good” asshole and a bad asshole.

They also talk about fearing god here as if it were a good thing. Well as far as god liking people to fear him goes, I can see how some people could get some sort of enjoyment out of having other people fear them. But you would have to be morally depraved to seek or enjoy the fear other people may have in you. Let  
88

alone the fear of creatures that are clearly beneath you. As would be the case with god and humans. Now what supposedly happened to Job to screw him up was that all his “innocent” children were killed. Some of his servants were also killed and various kinds of animals were either killed or carried off. All of that just to prove Job’s faith to his devil? And as you can imagine, Job doesn’t turn from god. Which means that god won the bet. But I say that such undeserved, stupid and blind faith is a victory for satan. That is if our harm is what satan seeks.

You have seen many of the stupid attempts the bible made to try to justify what happened to Job. Next are some of the more rotten ones. First, in Job 4:17, it says:

“Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his maker.”

This is a pretty stupid way to justify evil. Though any attempt would be. But one thing I don't like about all this is that if it's ok for god to be a jerk, how bad can it be for you to be one too. Though I say that god's being a jerk doesn't justify your being a jerk too. This also implies that you have to be greater than god to judge him. But what is wrong is wrong. It doesn't matter who says it is wrong. Now there is another way to look at all this. Which is that, for instance, from a human's point of view, killing a bird wouldn't be as bad as killing another human. So there are different levels as to how bad certain actions can be. But people should always be mindful of trying to do what is right.

We're given another example of how god harms you in this next paragraph. In Job 5:12, it says:

He disappointeth the devices of the crafty; so that their hands cannot perform their enterprise."

It's easy to see how impeding mankind would serve a useful purpose for god. As it does, for instance, through its retarding influences and status quo sustaining influences. But I don't like the idea of god impeding at all. Because as far as I have reasoned, as long as our cause is just and we don't behave like parasites, we have the right to achieve whatever destiny our abilities give us the right to achieve. So to promote this, among many other reasons, you should renounce all religions.

We only have to move forward to the next paragraph to see another good exemplification for god's negative influence on humanity. In Job 5:13, it says: "He taketh the wise in their own craftiness: and the counsel of the forward is carried headlong."

Despite what god may like, there is nothing wrong with being wise. Which they imply by associating the word "wise" with the word "craftiness." Because craftiness implies being deceitful. But just because you may be wise doesn't mean you would be deceitful. Neither does being deceitful show in any way that you are wise. Now I would be happier if god "took" the wicked in their own wickedness. Though I can see why he wouldn't want to do such a thing.

89

Because that could put us in danger of running out of wicked people. And without the wicked to torment them, people would have less reason to pray. Also, I can agree with the bible's disapproval here of those who are forward. Because it isn't good for people to be immodest or lack proper reserve. And people like that shouldn't be giving advice to anybody. So as you can see from this last point, the bible doesn't always have something bad to say.

The bible often brings up the subject of pride. Another example of which can be found in Job 26:12. It says:

“He divideth the sea with his power, and by his understanding smiteth through the proud.”

As far as god dividing the sea goes, I'm not too sure what they're talking about. Tides, shifting land, etc. So it's hard to poke holes in it. But what I don't like here is their teaching that it's good that god should smite through the proud. Because pride is not a sin. Being egotistical or arrogant are sins. Pride is only self respect and self esteem. Which within reason, there is nothing wrong with. One reason being that if you don't have any regard for yourself, you aren't likely to get any regard from others. Also, seeing how the bible teaches that god has no respect for you, it's no surprise that they would teach that you shouldn't have any respect for yourselves either. One reason for that being that self respect isn't very fertile ground for worship. But to renounce pride for such a reason is just another reason to hate god.

Another bad thing about calling pride a sin is that it could make people more likely to become asskissers. Such “brown nosers” are likely the only ones to see nothing wrong with such actions. But “boot licking” is a devolutionary process that has been going on for too long. It causes those who value their self respect to be less able to afford to breed than those who are willing to “bend over and take it.” Now being humble is one thing. But being a sycophant is quite another. Also, having such people around may make it easier for people in a position of authority, but it is lousy for the rest of us. One reason being that sooner or later, such “toadies” may find themselves in a position of authority. And with being a “yes man” being immoral behavior, I would have to assume that such people and their offspring would be more apt to commit other immoral acts to maintain any position of authority.

Still trying to justify what god let happen to Job, in Job 25:6, it says:

“How much less man, than is a worm? And the son of man, which is a worm?”

It looks like what he is saying is that god's being a god gives him the right to do whatever he wants. Which is not something I can agree with. Though humans would be worms to a real god, even worms have rights. Now if smashing Job's life helped god to survive, that would be one thing. But to do it just to settle a bet between these two devils is sick. I myself wouldn't cut a worm in half just to settle a bet with some other jerk as to how it would squirm. And though it tries, the bible shouldn't be trying to justify such behavior. Also, we may be gods

90

compared to worms, but it would be a bad idea for worms to worship us if they could. Neither am I so depraved as to want their worship even if they could give it. So just as it would be bad for worms to worship us, it's a bad idea for you to worship god.

The person counseling Job here tells him why god instructs man. In Job 33:17, it says:

“That he may withdraw man from his purpose, and hide pride from man.”

Now I had figured out a long time ago that a good way to get somebody to accept something they normally wouldn't would be to openly proclaim it. Which would make people think that it was good. Because they would be apt to think that if it were something bad, they would never talk about it in such an open manner. Which is what I think is happening here. Because the idea of impeding or imprisoning us, for instance, by trying to get you to think of yourselves as somebody else's sheep and belonging to their flock, is obviously evil. The bible and religion in general exposes mankind to many devolutionary traits as it is. To impede mankind on top of that is terrible. So to this latest exemplification for impediment, I say god can go fuck his impeding self! And those who have been fooled into accepting this situation that god supposedly created should change their minds. Because there is a better destiny for mankind. One that requires freedom from these sorts of self serving superstitions and promotes personal responsibility for your actions.

Also, they again put down pride here. And as with most of the other rotten and vile things the bible tries to promote, it is said over and over and over again. What this accomplishes is what I see as one of the most basic principals of brainwashing. Which is that if you tell or otherwise expose somebody a lie often enough, they will probably start to believe it. Especially when there is some sort of comfort to be found overall in the religion that contains it. Another thing is that when those lies come from some fool who seems to believe the lies themselves, the believability of the lies increases. These tricks could even sway some people who try to fight it. Which would be truly unfortunate. I hope you have the strength to do what is right.

These next two paragraphs supposedly have god himself trying to justify what he let happen to Job. In Job 40:8-9, it says:

“Wilt thou disannul my judgment? Wilt thou condemn me, that thou mayest be righteous?”

Hast thou an arm like God? Or canst thou thunder with a voice like him?”

First, god asks if Job will “disannul” his judgment. Well he should at least renounce it. That he can't do anything else about it doesn't prove anything. Then god asks Job if he will condemn him so he can be righteous. But being righteous wouldn't be the point. The point would be in condemning what is wrong, trying to gain some measure of justice and keep god from wrongly claiming that his actions were righteous. God then asks if Job has an arm like



him or if he can thunder like him. So it seems that god does believe that his being a god gives him the right to do whatever he wants. Well I don't care if god himself supposedly said it. Because it is wrong. Might doesn't make right. Only right makes right. Also, as I said before, I don't like the idea that creatures inferior to you don't deserve justice. And at the rate our ecosystem is being destroyed and polluted, I would say that their lesson has been learned too well.

God again spouts off against pride in these next two paragraphs. I hate to talk so much about the same subject. But there are many more examples on this subject in the bible than I will be commenting on. This time, in Job 40:11-12, it says:

“Cast abroad the rage of thy wrath: and behold every one that is proud, and abase him.

Look on every one that is proud, and bring him low; and tread down the wicked in their place.”

Well it's too bad that I have to burst their bubble, but if the emotion of pride didn't serve some useful purpose, it probably wouldn't exist. Even a normally humble person needs to exercise some pride. Also, if god doesn't like pride, it doesn't seem to be a very good idea to supposedly create people with the capacity for it. Though you already know why they call pride a sin. Which is that a proud person would be more likely to do what they reasoned to be the right thing to do rather than what these would be “shepherds” told them what the right thing to do is. Another thing is that being a reasoning person, the “right” thing to do would naturally lean toward considering the rights of others. So I say that only a devil would call your self esteem wicked. Another thing I don't like here is their association of the proud with the wicked. They go on to mentioning treading down the wicked in their place. Though what they meant is unclear and I could be wrong, what I am guessing they meant to suggest is that you tread down the wicked where they are at. Not to tread down the wicked instead of the proud. But one thing that is clear is that god supposedly creates the wicked. Neither am I wrong to think that for god to create them and tell you to tread them down is a waste of time. So I say we go right to the source and tread down god in his place.

For another of the contradictory things that the bible said, let's go to Ps. 1:1. It says:

“BLESSED is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful.”

Earlier, you were told to abase and bring low the proud. Which I would imagine they told you to do because pride is supposedly sinful. They also said to tread down the wicked in their place. And I would consider a wicked person to be a sinner. But according to what they say here, one of the things that makes a man blessed is if he doesn't stand in the way of sinners. Talk about mixed messages!

Another thing is that to abase and bring low the proud, or tread down the wicked,  
92

you would first have to be scornful of them. But here it basically tells you that you shouldn't be scornful. So there is yet another contradiction. Though the main point I wanted to make here is that telling people that they shouldn't stand in the way of sinners is an incredibly evil thing to do. I say that where the severity of the sin is great enough, you should stand in their way as well as you reasonably can. Do everything you reasonably can do to impede or contain them. The reason I say "reasonably" is that I wouldn't want to see people going all kamikaze over matters where it isn't called for. Or in doing more than observing for the police when the situation can be best handled by them.

Another brainwashing idea the bible mentions an incredible amount of times is the shepherd-sheep analogy between god, Jesus, the clergy, etc. and you. With you as the sheep of a sheep of a sheep of course. I won't be commenting on all of those exemplifications for enslavement either. But one I would like to mention is in Ps. 23:1. It says:

"THE Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want."

As I said, the bible endlessly tries to acclimate you to the idea that you are sheep. But you are not sheep. Even though some people may like treating other people like sheep and some other people may like being treated like sheep, you're much better off being free. Letting some supposed god take of you would only help cause your ability to take care of yourself to atrophy. And what would be evil to you. Weakness or strength. Now life can be hard and unforgiving. But I say it should be handled with strength and resolve. Not with cowering and evasion. Obviously, the writers of the bible, among others, would like to turn you into domesticated sheep. But in the wilderness, a wild sheep would survive easier than a domesticated one. And in the wilderness of infinite thought, knowledge and experience, a free mind would survive easier than domesticated one.

Putting your problems and worries on god's shoulders can only be devolutionary. It's in overcoming life's pressures that helps us adapt and evolve. I know people understand the need for strength. They let their children cry when they always want to be held, teach them to behave correctly, make them go to school, etc. But to mentally disarm them by creating a dependance on god is sickening and criminal. Take for example some of the questions some are said to find to be mysterious. Like, "is this life all there is; where did I come from; why is life so hard; what's my worth; doesn't anybody love me;" etc. Handling such questions may not be easy for some, but it's far from impossible. And it's one hell of a lot better than trying to sugar coat such ideas. If you're having troubles

in the average course of life, just think of how much better you have it than a grasshopper or shrew. That should help you grow up a little.

Strength could also come in handy if you're superstitious. Because if you're worried about evil spirits or demons, it's likely that they would find it more pleasurable to torment a lamb rather than a lion. Also, as for being sheep, I  
93

can't say it's impossible for some supernatural entity to be living off the power of your prayer and belief. Just as a shepherd lives off the milk, meat and skin of his flock. But you and I know that the cattle don't do well in that relationship. Strength could also come in handy in one of those theorized cases where you pray for something, but god says no. Though in the spectacularly unlikely event of there actually being a god, a more likely reason for its refusal to help would probably be that it has far better things to do. So despite what all those human shepherds and Judas goats tell you, it is your own self determination and destiny that is best for you.

The rest of their sentence said "I shall not want." Though from what they say, I don't know if that's supposed to mean that you just shouldn't want or if you won't need to want. But wanting something is what the bible often speaks about. Like wanting to be saved; their enemies conquered; to be put on or back on a throne; being given a place to live; having children; etc. etc. etc. And if I had a quarter of a penny for every time a believer's prayers went unanswered, I would be a very rich man. So it's unlikely that what they said meant that you wouldn't need to want. They probably meant that you shouldn't want. Which in one aspect, I guess is a good thing to teach. Because chances are you won't get. Though there are a couple of bad things that overpower such a good aspect. One is that if you don't seek more, there is even less chance that you will get more. The other negative aspect of what they teach here is that such an attitude is something that, for instance, a master would like his slave to have. Teachings like this must have gone over really big with those with power and money.

Next, the bible describes some supposedly evil attributes of man. In Ps. 36:3, it says:

"The words of his mouth are iniquity and deceit: he hath left off to be wise, and to do good."

First of all, it says man's words are iniquitous and deceitful. Which sadly, sometimes they are. But not all the time. Trying to portray mankind in such a negative manner sounds to me like they are just trying to create problems to keep mankind in a dither. To make them more in need of control. Which for too many reasons to go into right now, seems to be the whole point of the bible. And as you may guess, I don't have a very high opinion of those who would add to

mankind's troubles like that. It goes on to call being wise and doing good bad things. Now there may be some of you out there who think that I had taken something out of context here and that they actually meant to say was something else. But you would be wrong. Besides, when it comes to really being wise or really being good, there isn't a whole lot of room for interpretation.

So let's start with the notion that being wise is bad. I say that only the filthiest of filthy scum would even give the slightest hint that being wise was in any way a bad thing. One reason being that those who are wise would be less likely to do bad things. Because being wise demonstrates that they have the capacity to

figure out why bad things are bad and be able to avoid them. Then, as far as doing good goes, there may be times when it can do more harm than good. Take for example the old saying that I pointed out in the introduction that says "The road to hell is paved with good intentions." But for the most part, I would have to say that doing good is good. So they can take their idea that being good is bad, tie it to a firecracker, light it, and stick it up their ass!

Another of the bible's better slimy teachings can be found in Ps. 37:7. It says: "Rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for him: fret not thyself because of him that prospereth in his way, because of the man who bringeth wicked devices to pass."

It first says here to rest in the lord. But what I think what they meant is that you should give your brain a rest, permanently. Which is a bad idea. Then it says that you should wait patiently for him. Which is stupid. Because it's like telling people to wait until they die. But I say people should concern themselves more with life. Though what I especially don't like here is their talk of wicked devices. What wicked devices were they talking about. The sandal; candle; sundial; lamp; loom; plow; hinge; saddle; vase; etc. etc. etc. I wish they would have said which devices were wicked. So I could thoroughly mock them about it. It also wouldn't have given the impression that all devices were wicked. Though I wouldn't put it past them to have considered all devices to be wicked. Now some modern devices may have some significant downsides. Largely due to mankind's desire for more and more. And to the attitude that the bible and probably religion in general usually promotes. Which is to basically let people do whatever they want. Especially where making money is concerned. And "let the chips fall where they may." Also, the simplistic devices those people could have likely dreamed of couldn't have had very negative consequences.

There is quite a bit to dislike in this next paragraph. In Ps. 49:10, it says: "For he seeth that wise men die, likewise the fool and the brutish person perish, and leave their wealth to others."

Guess what. We all die. So they aren't saying a lot on that point. Unless they

are trying to say god causes these people to die prematurely. Though in the case of a wise person, that would be an astonishingly evil thing to do. Because it would be eugenics in reverse. Which coincidentally is just what would be needed to subdue people who shouldn't, don't want to and don't need to be subdued. At least not by these kinds of fools with their desire to be shepherds and desire to get you to think of yourselves as their flock. Another thing I don't like is their grouping the wise in with the fools and brutish people. Though that they do is no surprise to me. Also, unlikely as it is, it is indeed possible that a fool or brutish person could accumulate enough wealth in their lifetimes to leave to others. I just don't like the way they suggest that such people would naturally be able to do so.

One of the things that I think is nearly impossible to do is to change a  
95

brainwashed person's mind. Not surprisingly, this next paragraph promotes such a close minded attitude. In Ps. 57:7, it says:

"My heart is fixed, O God, my heart is fixed: I will sing and give thee praise."

Well despite what this says, you shouldn't have a "fixed heart." You should always be willing to consider other ideas. Nothing useful could depend on close mindedness or fanaticism. Least of all religion. Also, look at the "fixed hearts" of the people of the inquisition; the witch hunters; the followers of Jim Jones or David Koresh, etc. etc. etc. I'm just glad that I wasn't "Bible thumped" too badly from a young age. Or that I am not susceptible to the pleasurable brain drugs produced by whatever comfort religion may have to offer. Because I too may have fallen victim to developing a "fixed heart."

Of the justifications in the bible for baby killing, this next one is a little more obscure. In Ps. 58:8, it says:

"As a snail which melteth, let every one of them pass away: like the untimely birth of a woman, that they may not see the sun."

Now most of you have probably heard of the practice in some cultures of killing newborn female babies. One of the reasons they do this is because they want their first child to be a male. Another is that females in such cultures often require a dowry. Yet another reason is likely because they can get more work out of a male child. Now as a last ditch effort to control overpopulation, or in an effort to save the child from enduring a dysfunctional life, I could see some possible justification for the euthanasia of newborns. But for the bible to be promoting such a thing for the reasons it probably does is vile and disgusting. Also, of those religious, brainwashed morons who would commit or support murder to keep abortions from happening, just out of a sort of morbid curiosity, I would like to hear what they think of this teaching. Where they don't simply

advocate stopping a collection of cells from turning into a baby, but actually advocate killing a fully mature baby that was actually born.

If you thought their last paragraph was pretty rotten, just wait till you “get a load” of this next one. In Ps. 62:10, it says:

“Trust not in oppression, and become not vain in robbery: if riches increase, set not your heart upon them.”

As far as not trusting in oppression goes, you can't get any more oppressive than what god has shown himself to be. So it would indeed be a very good idea to distrust him. But the thing I wanted to point out here is where it says not to become vain in robbery. Though I have an even better idea. Don't rob! So whoever wrote this can take a flying leap to kiss my ass! Now I say that if you're depraved enough to rob for a living, or even as a part time hobby, then go ahead and be vain in doing so. Because you're all fucked up anyway!

From what I have heard, some people's perception of the devil is that he sometimes likes to do bad things to those who serve him. Not surprisingly, this next paragraph shows god behaving the same way. In Ps. 116:15 it says:

96

“Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.”

I would hate to think of how he feels about the deaths of other people. Or those he doesn't like. Also, though there is one part that sounds like it, there is actually nothing around here that suggests that these saints souls will be going to heaven or anything like that. It might also be helpful to go back and look at Ps. 115:16-17. So it seems that god just likes to see them dead. Well at least we can agree on that point. But it sure makes suckers out of them.

In promoting religious people's mental whoredom, these next paragraphs had a number of bad things to teach. In Ps. 127:2-5, it says:

“It is vain to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows: for so he giveth his beloved sleep.

Lo, children are an heritage of the Lord: and the fruit of the womb is his reward.

As arrows are in the hand of a mighty man; so are the children of the youth.

Happy is the man that hath his quiver full of them: they shall not be ashamed, but they shall speak with the enemies in the gate.”

First of all, I believe what they start out trying to say is that to do various things is in vain. So what are you supposed to do, roll over and die? But despite what they say, your lives are not in vain. That you exist proves that you matter. If there is anything that is in vain, it is religion. Then they say that it is vain to eat the bread of sorrows. “Sorrows” could mean either grief or regret. But there is nothing wrong with grief. As long as it isn't carried too far. And as far as regret goes, it is helpful in preventing you from repeating whatever it is that you may be

regretful for. Then it says he gives his beloved sleep. But I can't be too sure if he means sleep or death. Seeing how the deaths of the saints are apparently precious in his sight. Though each of those things would happen sooner or later anyway. But if what they said means death, I would like to say right now on their behalf, thank`s for nothing! Another thing is that how the "vanity" they spoke of is supposed to give god a reason to give them "sleep" is beyond me. Which is where I hope it stays.

It then says that your children are god's heritage and reward. Which they are not. This is just another attempt by the writers of the bible to get you to accept the master-slave, shepherd-sheep relationship you're supposed to have with god and its promoters. But no matter how often they say it, you shouldn't accept it. Because any heritage or reward that comes from having children is yours. Not god's. Then they go on to compare your children to arrows in a quiver. And I don't like that analogy at all. Sure, if you're going to have wars, it comes in handy to have many children. But unfortunately they don't mention that having too many children is often the cause of wars. Because that would be counter to one of the bible's and apparently many other religion's aims. Which is to screw you up in any way you can be fooled into accepting. In this instance, by telling people that they can have as many children as they want and call it god's will.

97

Not surprisingly, the strife and environmental destruction that would eventually come from this is fertile ground for religion.

One of the reasons the bible gets away with saying some of the things it does is exemplified in Ps. 131:1. It says:

"LORD, my heart is not haughty, nor mine eyes lofty: Neither do I exercise myself in great matters, or in things too high for me."

The first thing they suggest here is that it's not good to have a haughty disposition. Which I can agree with only to a point. Because on the other hand, I don't feel that being a source of amusement for other people is all that high of an ideal to strive for. So on that point I would say that you should behave in whatever way seem right with you. Then it teaches by example here that your eyes should not be lofty. But as the old saying goes, you can't "reach for the stars" if you refuse to look at them. It then suggests that you shouldn't exercise yourselves in great matters. But when those great matters involve what happens to you, I would say that you had better exercise yourself in them a great deal. Besides, most forms of exercise are good for you. Including this kind. They go on to suggest that you shouldn't exercise yourself in matters that are too high for you. But given the education, I would say that there isn't a whole lot that is too

high for you. Though even if there were things that were too high for you, if you didn't exercise yourself in such matters, they would likely remain too high for you. Now the behavior he was trying to teach to you by example here would make you simple, stupid clowns. This would make it easier for god and his agents here on earth to use you and keep you as their play things. But I find the whole idea disgusting. As it would be to any normal person.

Now promoting the idea that you shouldn't use your brains too much or that you should confine your thoughts to your station in life is bad enough. But moving on to Ps. 131:2, it says:

"Surely I have behaved and quieted myself, as a child that is weaned of his mother: my soul is even as a weaned child."

This isn't the last time you will hear the bible telling you that you should be like a child. Or that you should consider your station in life to be like a child's. Which is pretty disgusting. Also, if this person actually "behaved" and "quieted" himself, it was probably like somebody who was given a lobotomy. Or somebody who was weaned from their free will. Which is terrible. Now people should strive to be serene. But how they want you to go about it is all wrong.

These next two paragraphs again show that god isn't a very nice "thing." In Ps. 147:10-11, it says:

"He delighteth not in the strength of the horse: he taketh not pleasure in the legs of man.

The Lord taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in those that hope in his mercy."

First of all, it's no surprise that god would take no pleasure in the strength of a horse or in the legs of man. Because he showed his vile contempt for all living  
98

things when he supposedly destroyed most of the living things in the great flood. Then it says that the lord takes pleasure in those that fear him. Yeah, like a bully takes pleasure in the fear his victims have of him. But I think it's extraordinarily perverse myself. It also says that the lord takes pleasure in those who hope for his mercy. What a slimy thing to teach! How could anybody take pleasure in somebody's hope that, for instance, you would do something for them. Or in a hungry person's hope that they will find or be given food. It doesn't take much imagination to think of all of the other instances or the number of times where people's hopes go unfulfilled. So I say that only a devil could take pleasure in your hopes.

Also, while we're on the subject of hope, there are some other things I would like to say about it. The first being that just as with many other things, it can be carried too far. As it is in the case of whatever it is that you may hope that religion can do for you. Then there is the level to which false hope can



disappoint you to consider. Another thing is that I have bought lottery tickets in the past. And I must admit that the little bit of hope that it bought me was kind of nice. Though you can't put that much hope in something so spectacularly unlikely as winning the lottery. In such a case, I would say that the hope was worth the disappointment. Because I wasn't expecting anything to happen to begin with. Also, there's an analogy I would like to make about hope. I hate to use such an analogy, but let's say that there was a shepherd with a flock of sheep. Let's say that these sheep were intelligent enough to want a better life. Which the shepherd had no intention of giving them. But the shepherd's position and profit margin depended on the sheep being happy. It would be in the shepherd's best interest to give the sheep hope that their lives might improve. Even though this hope would be a false hope. In this government - populace analogy, I would say that no hope is better than false hope.

What these next two paragraphs had to say is both stupid and rotten. In Prov. 9:7-8, it says:

“He that reproveth a scorner getteth to himself shame: and he that rebuketh a wicked man getteth himself a blot.

Reprove not a scorner, lest he hate thee: rebuke a wise man, and he will love thee.”

The first thing I should point out is that to rebuke and reprove is pretty much the same thing. Now they are correct in saying that you shouldn't reprove a scorner. But that only applies if the person being scorned deserves it. Though one of the things I really don't like here is it telling you that you shouldn't rebuke a wicked person. What kind of evil, slimy bullshit is that! Also, if a wicked person is truly wicked and it isn't simply a matter of a difference of opinion, I say you should be given a medal if you kill them. Let alone rebuke them. Even if it is one wicked person rebuking another wicked person, at least it would be a step in a positive direction. Unlike in jail, where to bolster their image, criminals often show

99

respect for each other's misdeeds and discuss how to accomplish them better. Another thing I don't like here is that after telling you that you shouldn't rebuke a wicked man, they go on to say that it is apparently ok to rebuke a wise man. What an incredibly evil thing to teach! But a wise man would be grateful for being shown any mistake on their part. So it should be tried if you feel the need. Though it would be difficult. Because by definition, they would probably know better than you.

Well I didn't have to go very far to find another really bad teaching. In Prov. 9:12, it says:

“If thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself: but if thou scornest, thou alone

shall bear it.”

First of all, it says you should be wise for yourself. But it's hard to tell if he meant that you should keep any wisdom to yourself or that you should only use your wisdom to help yourself. Now if he meant that you should keep any knowledge to yourself, I can see why he would say such a thing. Because in their line of work, they wouldn't want something like wisdom getting around. And if they meant that you shouldn't use your knowledge to help others, I would say that as a general, rule wisdom is meant to be shared. You just need to set emotion aside and make sure that such knowledge doesn't come back to haunt you or harm those you give it to. Then it says that if you scorn somebody, you should bear it alone. But I say that if the person being scorned deserves it, you should support the scorner if they need support. Because we should all support what is right and condemn what is wrong. Just be careful that you don't make a big deal out of a small matter.

The variety of disreputable things the bible teaches is quite impressive. Another example can be found in Prov. 12:9. It says:

“He that is despised, and hath a servant, is better than he that honoureth himself, and lacketh bread.”

Sorry asshole. A poor person who is esteemed is better than a rich person who is despised. Now what I think they are trying to say here is that if you have to screw people over to succeed, then it's ok to do so. But I say that as a general rule, if you have to screw people over to succeed, you should be dead. Though where the evolutionary imperative comes into play amongst different species is a different matter. Another thing I don't like about all this is that it gives the impression that if you lack bread, it is because you are unwilling to disgrace yourself by committing unsavory acts to succeed. But not only is committing unsavory acts no guarantee of success, it is also a pretty rotten thing to teach.

You can find many things in the bible that show the lords displeasure with those he considers to be wicked. But as you should know by now, there are also many things in the bible that support the wicked. Another example is in Prov. 15:8. It says:

100

“The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord: but the prayer of the upright is his delight.”

Now I doubt if the sacrifice they speak of here is the same kind of sacrifice they do with animals. Though even if it were, I would rather see the wicked sacrificed before any innocent animals were. One reason being that to varying degrees and in varying ways, the wicked sacrifice other people all the time for their gain.

Even often doing so with, or just for, the slight transitory emotion of pleasure. So again, I would rather see the wicked “sacrificed” rather the good and innocent.

Next, we’re given one of the examples in the bible where it says god creates the wicked. In Prov. 16:4, it says:

“The Lord hath made all things for himself: yea, even the wicked for the day of evil.”

Well first of all, no god would create the wicked. Only a devil would. You may not believe this yet, but I am telling you that if you are a believer, you have been praying to a devil! Also, maybe if god didn’t create the wicked, he wouldn’t have had to supposedly destroy the world in the great flood. Or maybe there would be no need for this “day of evil” thing. But that would spoil all this devil’s fun.

Another thing is that saying that god creates the wicked itself promotes wickedness. Because it could lead some people to believe that there is some need for the wicked. Such people may not believe this yet either, but there is no need for the wicked. And those who think there is are very, very wrong.

What could any need for the wicked be. To make you stronger from fighting it? Well we have plenty of things in life to struggle with to make us stronger. Could it be to help you tell the difference between good and evil? Well that would be self evident. Neither in my opinion do you need the wicked to keep the difference between good and evil in perspective. All creating the wicked would likely do is what a devil would like it to do. Which is make people more tolerant of evil. But we don’t need that.

Unfortunately for you believers out there, there is a more vile and disgusting reason why the writers of the bible probably taught that god creates the wicked. Which is that they simply had no choice but to do so. Because on the one hand, they were trying to promote the idea of a god that was all powerful, all knowing, just and righteous. But on the other hand, there are wicked people in the world. So either god is nothing, because he can’t prevent evil in the world, let alone keep it from those that worship him. Or they must teach that there is some sort of need for evil people in the world. And there is little in the bible that is more profoundly disgusting than that. Though on that point, other religions are probably equally misguided. Now if the explanations against evil that I’ve given here aren’t good enough for you, don’t worry. I’ll be talking more on this subject later.

I must say that I feel sorry for all the priests, nuns, mullahs, rabbis, monks, etc. out there who may have been duped into promoting religion. Most may feel that

101

they’re doing good, but too often they’re not. Especially when it comes to promoting religion. Lies may sometimes be comforting, but where they lead is

not. It also seems to me that those people could find something more constructive to do than proclaim what some bogeyman in the sky says. Now there may be some people out there who would say that people get what they deserve. But just because you can take advantage of somebody doesn't necessarily mean that they deserve to be taken advantage of. Also, a person who has been taken advantage of would be more apt to do the same thing to others. So I say that if these people want to do and promote good, they should renounce any religion that promotes any need for the wicked.

For more of the bible's evil, let's move on to Prov. 19:25. It says:  
"Smite a scorner, and the simple will beware: and reprove one that hath understanding, and he will understand knowledge."

The question this first brings up is if the scorner they speak of is correct in their scorn. Not only in the quality of it but in it's quantity as well. But a normal well adjusted person would only be likely to turn to scorn when reasoning something out in discussion hasn't worked. So chances are that a scorner is correct in their scorn. In which case I would say that striking them would be a terrible act. Another thing is that if a scorner doesn't "dish out" anything other than scorn, they shouldn't receive anything more than scorn. Also, if making the "simple" beware is in any way the goal for striking somebody who is justified in their scorn, it would make the act even worse. Being stupid and aggressive is no good substitute for being smart and moral. It is also easy to see why the bible would be against scorners. Seeing how it is so worthy of scorn itself. Yet another thing I don't like is that by saying that striking a scorner will make the simple beware, they are suggesting that the scorner was simple too.

It then says to reprove those with understanding. How much more evil can they expect people to accept! There is nothing wrong with having understanding or knowledge. Now if the understanding they spoke of was wrong, then it wouldn't be understanding at all. So the understanding they spoke of must be correct understanding. What they say is something you might expect to hear from a mafia boss. Which as it turns out isn't far off the mark. Hopefully you don't need me to tell you that it would be better to blame, censure or condemn somebody who doesn't have understanding. Or those who think they do, but don't. Then it says that to reprove somebody with understanding will cause them to understand knowledge. But what knowledge would that be. That understanding is bad and should be kept to yourself? Well they can take that sort of knowledge and stick it up their ass!

Another good example of bad advice can be found in Prov. 20:19. It says:  
"He that goeth about as a talebearer revealeth secrets: therefore meddle not with him that flattereth with the lips."

First of all, I take this to mean that the talebearer who reveals secrets obtains

those secrets by means of flattery. But earlier they said basically that if you have knowledge, you should keep it to yourself. And now they're saying that you shouldn't interfere with somebody who is using flattery to obtain knowledge to reveal? There's decisive thinking for you. Another thing is that obtaining secrets isn't the most likely thing a flatterer is trying to do. They are probably giving excessive, untrue or insincere praise to the person they are trying to ingratiate themselves to for their own gain. Also, that could lead to some degree of harm to the person being flattered. Because they could begin to feel they are as great as they are being made out to be. So I would say that it would be a kindness to the person being flattered to "meddle" with the flatterer.

The bible again seems to be saying that you should treat the wicked well. In Prov. 20:22, it says:

"Say not thou, I will recompense evil: but wait on the Lord, and he will save thee."

Well if they meant to say something against revenge here, they sure went about it in a lousy way. Though I say that if the wrong done to you is indeed unjustified and you have no other course to seek justice, then I support revenge. Just make sure you don't let its pursuit do you more harm than the wrong done to you. Another justification for revenge would be to make it less likely that they would do the same thing to other people. Then the reason they give for not seeking revenge is because you should wait for god to take care of the matter for you. But if you don't seek actual justice, chances are you won't get justice. Also, if you were to look, you would see an almost endless number of examples where the faithful have not been "saved" by god. Another thing is that if god created the wicked for some purpose, you would be stupid to think that he would save you from them in this life or any possible afterlife.

Taken together, what these next two paragraphs have to say isn't something I could support. In Prov. 24:28-29, it says:

"Be not a witness against thy neighbor without cause; and deceive not with thy lips.

Say not, I will do so unto him as he hath done to me: I will render to the man according to his work."

Taking this all together, they could be saying that you shouldn't falsely accuse your neighbor to pay them back for a misdeed they did to you. Admittedly, that wouldn't be the best way to seek revenge. Though it speaks of doing to the neighbor what they did to them. Which could then have been a false accusation too. In that case, I would find doing the same to them to be acceptable. Though it would be a good thing to look at yourself and judge if you may not have been in some way responsible for your mistreatment. An unfortunate thing about the

world we live in world is that too often, people are willing to step on you to get what they want. They may also do it just for a thrill. Or they may even do it for both reasons. In such a world, you must be willing to step back on them in at  
103

least equal measure. Otherwise, there would be less opportunity for them to learn a lesson. This could lead to future victims. It may be unpleasant, but if there were any possible positive reason for god's creation of the wicked, forcing you to fight them could be it.

Next, the bible gave a teaching of incredible evil. In Prov. 26:10, it says: "The great God that formed all things both rewardeth the fool, and rewardeth transgressors."

Assuming the fools and transgressors they speak of are indeed those things and not simply those that they consider to be those things, then rewarding them would only give me another reason to spit on god. Only a devil would say or do anything so bad. So what are some of the things you've been told recently. You've been told that you shouldn't stand in the way of the wicked; the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination; that god creates the wicked; to rebuke the wicked is bad and that you shouldn't seek to pay back a wrong that somebody has done to you. And now you're told that god rewards fools and transgressors. These things alone easily smashes to pieces anything good the bible has to say. Also, one of the bad things about their promotion of the wicked is that there is probably a limit as to how good somebody can or should be. But there is practically no limit as to how bad somebody can be.

Another of the bible's various promotions for slavery can be found in Prov. 27:18. It says:

"Whoso keepeth a fig tree shall eat the fruit thereof: so he that waiteth on his master shall be honoured."

The fig tree here is supposed to represent the slave. The master keeps the slave and receives the fruit of his labor. But despite what they say, slavery is bad. One example of why can be found in the insect world. There is apparently a race of ants that has evolved with the practice of enslaving other ants. It has apparently screwed them up so bad that they can't even feed themselves without the help of the slave ants. It would be pretty bad if humans found themselves in any kind of a similar situation. Another thing they say here to sell the idea of slavery is that the slave should be honored. Well I would hope that they would at least receive more honor than the fig tree. Which if they do, it would likely be because a fig tree isn't in much danger of running away from its owner. Also, there is another aspect to slavery which you should take into consideration. Though like other things I have written, most of you will probably think it's "racist."

But if political correctness were an atom bomb, there are plenty of people who ride it like Slim Pickens in the movie, "Dr. Strangelove."

First of all, look at the reason why Negroes were brought into this country. Which was greed. Then look at the reason why traitorous U.S. companies feed off the stupidity generated desperation of other third world countries by sending our jobs over there. Or, as I said before, why they do nothing useful to stop people from third world countries from coming here illegally. Then, as I also said

104

before, there are all those that they let come here legally. The reason is again greed. Now when the reason behind actual physical slavery and our current economic system is exactly the same, you can't say there is a whole lot of difference between them. You've also heard me mention before about the bullshit that our economy is supposed to be heading toward a service based economy.

Then consider the amount of debt that the U.S. is piling up with, for instance, China. You had better hope that the kind of service expected from the kind of slavery this is likely to bring about is less onerous than the kind of service actual slaves were compelled to provide to their masters in the past. (Which probably included both anal and oral) Though from what I have seen, the American people can be manoeuvred into accepting about any situation. Also, there is no kind of honor that any "masters" can give that can even begin to make up for our slavery. Such as an interracial mess, a crippling trade debt, increased poverty for poor Whites, an increasingly damaged ecosystem, etc. Now you may be wondering what I would do to change things for the better. But don't worry. I'll be getting to that later.

As you may guess, I don't care much for something this next paragraph had to say. In Prov. 28:16, it says:

"The prince that wanteth understanding is also a great oppressor: but he that hateth covetousness shall prolong his days."

When they say that this prince wants understanding here, what I think they are trying to say is that he wants knowledge. Because when they go on to speak about covetousness, I think a prince would be more likely to covet other people's knowledge rather than covet being understood on a personal level by his underlings. So in other words they are saying that if a prince or you are stupid, rather than be oppressive, you should be satisfied to be stupid. Which I don't agree with for various reasons. But the main thing I don't like here is their teaching that if you envy other people's knowledge, you will be more likely to be a oppressive person. Because I believe that envying other people's knowledge would cause you to seek more knowledge yourself. Which there is nothing

wrong with. And even if knowledge did cause you in some way to be oppressive, it would likely be because that is the right way to be.

This next paragraph gives some advice on how to handle slaves. In Prov. 29:19, it says:

“A servant will not be corrected by words: for though he understand he will not answer.”

That’s right, tell them that they have to beat those uppity slaves! Needless to say, this doesn’t make me very happy. To say the least. Didn’t these jerks ever stop to think that those so called “servants” would be more likely to listen if they weren’t treated like property? Probably. But they were probably more interested in profit than they were in justice.

105

Another unfortunate exemplification for slavery can be found in Prov. 30:10. It says:

“Accuse not a servant unto his master, lest he curse thee, and thou be found guilty.”

What they say here doesn’t make much sense. Though I can agree that there may be times when it is best to not be a tattletale. But in general, I would say that if you learn of somebody doing something they really shouldn’t be doing, it would be a good idea to report it. Though a reason they say not to report a slave to his master is because the master may have no problem with whatever behavior. But because the rich and powerful are often willingly self deluded scum, you shouldn’t let them be an example for your moral behavior.

You’re next told two things that “the earth cant bear.” In Prov. 30:22, it says: “For a servant when he reigneth; and a fool when he is filled with meat;”

The only likely difference between these slaves and their masters are circumstances. In that respect, I see nothing wrong with slaves reigning. One reason being because they would better understand the value of justice for all those under them. Another reason being that they would better understand that it is the people, not just themselves, who should be served. The other supposedly bad thing they talk about is a fool who is filled with meat. But generally speaking, a fool who is filled with meat is better than one who isn’t. Because a fool who is hungry would be more likely to resort to crime to satisfy their needs. So if you’re going to have fools, they shouldn’t be left to starve. They simply shouldn’t be encouraged to breed.

Though what this next paragraph had to say may be true to some extent, the bad thing about it is that it doesn’t discourage stupidity at all. As you can see, in Eccl. 1:18, it says:

“For in much wisdom there is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge



increaseth sorrow.”

Despite what this says, I believe it is good to have a lot of knowledge. Apart from my disgust of religion, increasing people’s knowledge is one of the reasons why I’m writing this book. Even though much of what I have to say will be unpleasant to most. But a good saying I’ve heard on that account is that “if you’re not part of the sloution, you’re part of the problem.” Another reason for not being stupid is because there will likely be somebody who will take advantage of you if you are. As is the case with religion. Also, governments in various ways and for various reasons will likely fill your heads with irrelevant, untrue or misguided crap and tell you that you get the kind of government you deserve. So not only should you seek knowledge, but you should judge the validity of it for yourself as best you can.

You’re given a good exemplification for evil in this next paragraph. In Eccl. 7:17, it says:

106

“Be not over much wicked, neither be thou foolish: why shouldst thou die before thy time?”

So what this starts out saying is that it’s ok to be wicked. As long as you’re not too wicked. How much more evil can they get! Now I know that it may be unrealistic to expect perfect behavior from people, but despite what this says, you should never be wicked. Because sometimes such behavior can sneak up on you without even trying. So what do you think would happen if you allowed for it. And then, where and when would you draw the line. Also, what doesn’t seem too wicked to one person could seem to be really wicked to another person. With the bible saying some of the things that it does, it surprises me that there are devil worshipers in the world. Seeing how all the evil they could ever wish to try to justify can be found in the bible. Though it’s possible that because of the evil in the bible, satan worshipers turn to him as a source of goodness.

These people were sure fond of calling things vain. Take for instance what it says in Eccl. 12:8. It says:

“Vanity of vanities, saith the preacher; all is vanity.”

Well I have news for them. Despite what they say, all is not vanity. Because the definition for vanity is something that is futile, idle or worthless. But life is none of those things. That life exists at all itself shows that it has value and purpose.

As you know, I don’t like it when the bible calls the Jews the chosen of god. One of the many reasons being that they weren’t likely to argue with somebody that told them they were the best. Which being untrue, makes it even worse.

Then, on top of that, in Isa. 4:3, it says:

“And it shall come to pass, that he that is left in Zion, and he that remaineth in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem.”

Of course, given all of their writings on the topic, I would have to assume that this only goes for pure blooded Jews. As if considering themselves the chosen of god wasn't bad enough, here it says that at some point the Jews in Zion and in Jerusalem will be called holy. Well I wouldn't pray to them no matter what anybody said. Also, this would likely mean that there would be holy gays, thieves, liars, child molesters, etc. among them. I suppose that when they go the bathroom they will even take a holy shit! What a joke. Now apart from the almost warlike drive to achieve that their culture instills in them, or apart from the nose thing I mentioned earlier, there is nothing above average about the Jews. Let alone holy.

This next paragraph seems to be promoting some rather unfortunate behavior. In Isa. 5:1, it says:

“NOW will I sing to my wellbeloved a song of my beloved touching his vineyard. My wellbeloved hath a vineyard in a very fruitful hill.”

In speaking of Isaiah's wellbeloved, it says “his” vineyard. Which gives this a  
107

homosexual connotation. But I swear by Alexander the great's buttplug that they shouldn't be teaching things like that. Though a couple of paragraphs later, he refers to this vineyard as his own. Which in turn suggests excessive narcissism. And I don't think they should be promoting that either.

The bible is again talking about getting tough with the children of Israel. Part of which can be found in Isa. 8:13. It says:

“Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself; and let him be your fear, and let him be your dread.”

Like I said before, anybody who would require that you fear and dread them isn't worth your respect. Worse yet would be to sanctify them. Also, fear of punishment for criminal behavior could be a small reason why god requires that you fear him. Though the most likely reason they promote such fear is to keep you from seeking freedom from his enslavement. But for a multitude of reasons, if he were real, there would be more to fear from his enslavement than there would be from him. Now in the case of secular law, there is no doubt that the fear of punishment is a deterrent to crime. But people should refrain from doing wrong because it is wrong. And because of its effects on others. Not because of fear of punishment.

Now you all know that god supposedly creates the wicked. Along with

everything else. Which makes what this next paragraph had to say pretty bad. In Isa. 13:11, it says:

“And I will punish the world for their evil, and the wicked for their iniquity; and will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease, and will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible.”

So it says here basically that god will punish world and all the wicked in it for their evil. But as I said before, if god can't punish the wicked without punishing everybody else, then he isn't much of a god. Also, as I just again pointed out, god supposedly creates these wicked people. Though only an exceptional fiend could create somebody to be a certain way and punish them for being that way. Along with everybody else. Now for a god, this may be one way to give yourself something to do. I just don't think much of the idea. To say the least. It also says here that god will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease. Well after all the attacks they've made against pride, it's about time they said something about one of the real culprits. Which is arrogance. But I'm sure they will go back to their old way of thinking. (and I use the term loosely) It goes on to say that god will lay low the haughtiness of the terrible. But it would be better to lay low the terrible. Not their haughtiness.

These next two paragraphs are part of a prophesy given by Isaiah. In Isa. 19:21-22, it says:

“And the Lord shall be known in Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation; yea, they shall vow a vow unto the Lord, and shall perform it.

108

And the Lord shall smite Egypt: he shall smite and heal it: and they shall return even to the Lord, and he shall be intreated of them, and shall heal them.”

First of all, god supposedly recently said here that he didn't want sacrifices to him. So for this prophesy to come true, he would have to change his mind, again. But the thing I especially don't like here is that after they start to worship god, he smites them. What a rotten thing to do!

The level of evil that the bible teaches seems to have no bounds. We're next shown that simply creating and sometimes protecting the wicked wasn't bad enough. In Isa. 23:9, it says:

“The Lord of hosts hath proposed it, to strain the pride of all glory, and to bring into contempt all the honorable of the earth.”

Despite what this extraordinarily depraved teaching has to say, I say it would be better to strain the pride of all infamy. Which in justifying their actions, the infamous likely take pride in. And as far as glory goes, if it is real and honorable glory, to strain its pride would be terrible. Also, there is another aspect to glory

other than great and epic deeds that would make straining its pride a terrible thing to do. Which is the glory of doing what is really right. Not simply in doing the kind of emotionally self indulgent things that even a dog would probably do. There is also the glory of practicing self restraint for the greater good.

Unfortunately there isn't likely to be as much overt praise in doing what you should as there is in a brave, dangerous deed. But the honor is there none the less. Then, as far as the honorable they speak of goes, wouldn't it be better to bring into contempt all of the dishonorable of the earth? Now this may just be a prophesy of the general doom and gloom that god had supposedly promised. But it is still a filthy and disgusting way to go about performing any punishment.

More of this doom and gloom can be found in Isa. 24:1. It says:

“BEHOLD, the Lord maketh the earth empty, and maketh it waste, and turneth it upside down, and scattereth abroad the inhabitants thereof.”

You know, this paragraph works much better when you substitute the word god with the word devil. Go ahead and try it, I'll wait. Now as I said before, the bible teaches that god is responsible for everything that happens. Including creating the kinds of people that got god mad enough to do such a thing. So I have to say again that it is pretty depraved for god to do such a thing.

Though I've only read the bible once, (which was more than enough) I don't remember ever seeing anything in it concerning ecological conservation. In fact, it often teaches just the opposite. Another example of which can be found in Isa. 29:17. It says:

“Is it not yet a very little while, and Lebanon shall be turned into a fruitful field, and the fruitful field shall be esteemed as a forest?”

I myself think it's pretty rotten to teach that it's ok to turn a whole country into agricultural land. There should always be places left for wilderness. And not just deserts, swamps or on top of volcanoes. They also try to sell the idea here that

109

a fruitful field should be as esteemed as a forest. But I can tell you that a fruitful field is not as good as a forest. Because forests support a wide range of plants and animals. They also hold water, fight soil erosion and stabilize temperatures. Fruitful fields just can't compare to that. Also, as it is, I doubt if Lebanon could support a self sustaining, ecologically diverse forest anymore even if they tried to make it do so. The main reason is probably because of the kinds of agricultural practices they support here.

Another blow against conservation can be found in Isa. 32:15. It says:

“Until the spirit be poured upon us from on high, and the wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted for a forest.”

For what this sort of teaching does to our planet, it would have been more

appropriate for them to exchange the word spirit for the word spit. If you know anything about ecology, go ahead and give it a try. See if it doesn't work better.

Yet another misguided teaching on this matter can be found in Isa. 32:20. It says:

"Blessed are ye that sow beside all waters, that send forth thither the feet of the ox and the ass."

As you know, this blessing has turned into a curse. You only need to look at all of the problems caused by agriculture to see that. Though I am no expert on agriculture or water conservation, it seems to me that places where fresh water tends to accumulate is the last place where you should create a plowed field. That is if you want the water to stick around as long as possible. Now in ecologically vulnerable areas, they should try something like leaving one square acre of forest for every square acre of cultivated land. Also, without speaking about limitations, what they teach is in fact evil. Though it's easy to see why they teach things like this. But just because people are more likely to follow a god who lets them do almost anything they want is a pretty poor reason to do so.

I guess it's about time to mention another of the bible's many attempts to get you to accept a shepherd-sheep relationship with god. In Isa. 40:11, it says:

"He shall feed his flock like a shepherd: he shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and shall gently lead those that are with young."

First of all, I'm sorry that I have to be repetitive on subjects like this. But as I said, the bible mentions them a lot more than I do. And mentioning only a few examples out of the huge number of such examples that they give wouldn't be right. So I have to say again that trying to make people out to be cattle is evil. One reason being that we are quite capable of taking care of ourselves. Also, not to underestimate the importance of looking out for the interests of the environment, we basically should be looking out for our own self interests. Because we are most important to ourselves. But god and those who act in his name would think that they are more important. It would be in their best interest to treat you like and get you to think of yourselves as cattle. Also, even if there were a shepherd-god, what is it he would likely be doing. Could it be that he

110

would like to breed you to be dependant, fat, lazy, weak or stupid? Just as some people unfortunately do with their cattle? Could be! But just as such treatment isn't in the cattle's best interests, neither is in yours to be led, sacrificed, slaughtered, etc.

Some people may like to be led and be taken care of like cattle. But that doesn't make it right. Sure, we may need some controls in our society. I just can't go along with the shepherd-sheep approach of doing so. Then, as far as

god carrying you in his bosom or being gentle with you goes. Just reflect on some of the things the bible taught or the way he has supposedly sometimes treated people. You can also consider what it says in Isa. 40:16-17. It says: "And Lebanon is not sufficient to burn, not the beasts thereof sufficient for a burnt offering.

All nations before him are as nothing; and they are counted to him as less than nothing, and vanity."

Well even if you were criminally stupid and chose to be led, is this the kind of asshole you would want leading you? Here you're told that all the nations of the earth are less than nothing to god. As probably are all the people in them. Which is just as well with me. Because he is less than nothing to me too. It amazes me that people would worship some "thing" that thought so little of them. At least we think more of our cattle. Which even then, as you know, hasn't worked out well for them. Then they speak again of vanity. But as I said before, life matters. Though as far as humanity is concerned, it only matters as much as you might expect the life in an overcrowded petri dish to matter. Which is a condition that most, if not all, religions are partially responsible for by playing the role of enabler.

These next two paragraphs show both stupidity and evil. In Isa. 41:23-24, it says:

"Shew the things that are to come hereafter, that we may know that ye are gods: yea, do good, or do evil, that we may be dismayed, and behold it together.

Behold, ye are of nothing, and your work of nought: an abomination is he that chooseth you."

The first thing I wanted to point out here is god challenging you to foretell the future so he can tell if you are gods. But it would take more than an ability to do that for me to consider anybody to be a god. Also, if god himself can see into the future, how could he be dismayed. Seeing how he should already know what was going to happen. Or how could he be dismayed by creatures that mean so little to him. Though the main thing I don't like here is his open ambivalence toward your doing good or evil. Of course, doing good is usually a good idea. But doing evil is something that should never be suggested. Because some jerk might just do it.

They also say here that you are of nothing. Well from the bible's point of view, I can agree with that. Because you are supposed to be of god. And I know that

111

he is nothing. Also, as far as being taught that you are of nothing goes, I can agree that after some of the things that the bible has taught, your egos could use some deflating. But suggesting that you are nothing is going a little too far.

Neither do I agree that your work means nothing. Because what we do or how we act means something to us. They go on to call anybody an abomination who chooses the people he is speaking of here. Which I also can agree with. Because god supposedly chose the children of Israel to be the chosen of god. And that means god is an abomination. Seeing how he “chose” them.

You’re told in these next two paragraphs what qualities god’s servants and messengers should have. In Isa. 42:18-19, it says:

“Hear, ye deaf; and look, ye blind, that ye may see.

Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I sent? who is blind as he that is perfect, and blind as the Lord’s servant?”

So first he tells the deaf to hear and the blind to see. But seeing how he calls his servant blind and his messenger deaf, it seems rather strange that he would want them to see or hear. Though I would guess that what they are getting at with all this is that god’s servants and messengers should be deaf and blind to others. Now being mentally blind and deaf may be crucial when it comes to keeping people from changing their minds about god, but I say such teachings are evil. Because just as being blind or deaf isn’t good physically, it isn’t good to be those things mentally either. They even go as far as to say that being blind is perfect. Which is something only a devil could suggest. I on the other hand have my own ideas about perfection. The first being that a good step toward imperfection would be to claim perfection. You should always assume that you could be wrong. That is why I told you before that you should make up your own minds about the things that I write about. Because though I have reasoned things out to the best of my ability, nobody’s perfect. Also because it’s a good idea to use your brain. It didn’t get to be the way it is from disuse. Then, for reasons I have already told you and reasons I have yet to tell you, another good idea would be to throw away all religious documents. Unless you need toilet paper.

It would also obviously be a good idea if you didn’t give worship or servitude or accept worship or servitude from anybody stupid enough to give it. Though it’s ok to pay somebody to serve you. Yet another good idea would be to look at and be considerate of both the short term and long term effects of your actions. Because doing what is right should always be foremost in your thoughts whenever you do anything. It would also be a good idea if you only killed animals if you need food. Or if it is an unavoidable way to save somebody’s life. It should never be done for sacrifice or fun. One last step toward perfection that I would like to mention here concerns warfare. Somebody once wisely prophesied that “only the dead have seen an end of war.” At least in the

foreseeable future. One reason for that being that history has shown that war has most often been about greed, “glory” or stupidity than anything else.

Then take into account the exponential human population growth. Especially among the poor, stupid or ugly. And ugly as they are, even proboscis monkeys would likely fight to increase the population of their own kind. I don't see these things lessening the likelihood of war. So with surrender not being an option, a good step toward perfection would both to prepare for war and to try to avoid it. People should identify the likely causes for conflict and attack those before they resort to attacking each other. Which as you can imagine would be quite difficult to do when people are also concerned about their standard of living or possibly having to find a different line of work. Now fighting the causes of war may not be easy, but it is far from impossible. And promoting being “blind” or “deaf” in any way definitely isn't the way to go about it.

God next supposedly gives a reason for forgiveness that is selfish. In Isa. 43:25, it says:

“I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions for mine own sake, and will not remember thy sins.”

Here god supposedly says that he forgives transgressions for his own sake. Well seeing how he is the one who supposedly makes people sin, I can see why he might forgive them. But he isn't the one who has to live with the jerks who commit bad deeds. So when it comes to forgiving, maybe he should give some consideration toward the sake of those who are victimized by these sinners. Not that it would make any difference. Seeing how when god punishes the bad, it would seem that he doesn't hesitate to punish the good along with them.

This next paragraph speaks of some of the things god does. In Isa. 44:25, it says:

“That frustrateth the tokens of the liars, and maketh diviners mad; that turneth wise men backwards, and maketh their knowledge foolish;”

First of all, I don't know what the tokens of the liars are. Though it's nice to hear them say something negative about liars. But with the bible being full of lies, saying something against liars loses most of its significance. As it also does when you take into consideration that god must create liars for some supposedly useful purpose also. Though the main thing I don't like here is their saying that god turns wise men backwards and makes their knowledge foolish. Which is something only an evil creature would do. Now it's possible that a god could turn a wise man backwards. But not even a god could make their knowledge foolish. Because if any knowledge were foolish, it wouldn't be what I would consider to be real knowledge to begin with. Also, as far as turning wise men backwards and making their knowledge seem foolish goes, I can tell you one way it could be done. Which is by doing what religions advocate. That being to rely on faith



instead of common sense. Because that would screw anything up. The purpose of this book on the other hand is to turn back the unwise and expose the  
113

foolishness of what knowledge they think they have. But unfortunately, this book isn't likely to become as popular as the bible.

Back in Isa. 42:18-19, it called god's servants and messengers blind and deaf. Which was bad enough. But now, in Isa. 44:26, it says:

"That confirmeth the word of his servant, and performeth the counsel of his messengers; that saith to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited; and to the cities of Judah, Ye shall be built, and I will raise up the decayed places thereof."

So god was going to confirm the word of his servants, who are blind, and perform the counsel of his messengers, who are deaf. Well with gods like him, who needs devils! It would be better if god confirmed the word of and performed the counsel of those who can see and hear. Not do these things for some "hear no evil, see no evil and speak no evil" monkeys.

Another exemplification for evil can be found in Isa. 45:7. It says:

"I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things."

The first thing I would like to say here is that the rotation of the earth has more to do with forming light and creating darkness than the lord does. In fact, he would be hard pressed to stop it. Then it says here again that the lord creates evil. Well there you have it. That puts the devil out of a job! Now you've heard me speak earlier about how in order to justify the evil that happens, the writers of the bible have no choice but to say that god creates evil for some positive purpose. But believing such garbage is one of the killing poisons in religion's spoonful of sugar. Evil may be unavoidable, but it isn't necessary. As I said before, one possible reason god could have for creating evil could be to help people tell the difference between good and evil. But if somebody steals something from you that you value; slaps you in the face for no good reason; murders a good person; kills and rapes your child; steals and eats your baby; etc. etc. etc, I don't think you would need god creating the wicked to help you perceive such things as being bad or punishing the wrongdoers accordingly.

Another justification some people may give for god creating evil is that too much of anything, even good, can be bad. But I have been unable to construct any viable scenarios in my mind where a lack of evil could be bad. Now sometimes doing what is necessary could be hard to do. Even though its objective is good. Though it seems unlikely to me that a lack of evil would screw people up so much that they would fail to do the things that are necessary to do. Brainwashing might accomplish something like that. But in my opinion, not a lack of evil. So I

come back to the conclusion that god should be vilified for creating evil.

For another evil teaching, let's see what it said in Isa. 46:12-13. It says:

“Hearken unto me, ye stouthearted, that are far from righteousness:

I bring near my righteousness; it shall not be far off, and my salvation shall not tarry: and I will place salvation in Zion for Israel my glory.”

114

What I am going to assume this starts out saying is that you have to be stouthearted to hearken to him. But I wouldn't call anybody stouthearted who would listen to somebody like him. I would use words like stupid, moronic, weak or mentally lazy. Which are the kinds of attributes you would expect those who are far from true righteousness to have. Then it says god will bring his righteousness near to them. So are people supposed to believe that if the unrighteous won't go to god, then it's acceptable for god to bring his “righteousness” near to them? Well I'm not buying that. It then says god's righteousness won't be far off from the unrighteous and his salvation will be quick. But I don't think that those who are far from true righteousness deserve such obliging and speedy service. Though with god supposedly creating the wicked, I'm not surprised that he would take good care of them too.

Part of what this next paragraph said seems to be a prophesy about Jesus. In Isa. 53:10, it says:

“Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shall make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.”

Well if this is some sort of prophesy about Jesus, the part about his suffering and his soul being made an offering for sin sounds like him. But the part about his seeing his seed and prolonging his days doesn't. Though what I especially don't like here is that the lord didn't find it regrettable or necessary to hurt him and cause him grief. It actually pleased the lord to do so. Now I'm sure there are people out there who would say that what they meant to say here is this or that. But despite their arguments, I say that taking pleasure in such things is sick. Also, if this is supposed to represent Jesus and the same pleasure prospered in his hand as the pleasure the lord felt in hurting him, it would be a very good idea to have nothing to do with god.

Continuing this unwholesome story, in Isa 53:11, it says:

“He shall see the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.”

So god will be satisfied by his torment. But it would take a pretty low god to be satisfied by such a thing. Though at least it's an improvement over taking pleasure in it. Also, if this is supposed to represent Jesus, it calls him god's

servant here. Not his son as you're later led to believe he is. Maybe god just doesn't know that yet. But what I especially don't like here is that it says that his knowledge will justify many. Because as you will be seeing, most of the knowledge Jesus had was worthless at best. Take for example their saying that he will bear people's iniquities. Whoever they were talking about, I say that any such person had no more ability to bear your iniquities than the goats Israel used to place their sins upon and let go into the wilderness had the ability to actually bear those sins.

Also, forgiving people by bearing their iniquities can't be compared to, for  
115

instance, god forgiving a mink for being hairy. So I say people should be held accountable for their own actions. One reason being that if you take away people's accountability for their actions, what's going to restrain them from doing more wrong things. Nothing works as well as accountability for your actions. Neither can those who have sinned use the excuse that if they can't be forgiven, what's the point of trying to do good. One reason being that sooner or later, they are likely to be caught and punished for whatever bad things they continue to do. Or they, or somebody they care about, may someday suffer in some way because of the filthy nature in which they interact with the world. Then the wicked will see the value of changing their ways. Another thing is that forgiveness is best when it is earned. Not given.

Something this next paragraph said strengthens the leash that religious leaders put upon you. Which for the good of humanity, I am trying to break. In Isa. 55:12, it says:

"For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands."

As you probably know, the part that distresses me here is the crap about being led. Because most normal people don't need to be led. Given the proper tools, we are perfectly capable of leading ourselves. It may be easier on your brain to be led. But there comes a time when you must break mommy's apron string and live your own lives. It may not always be pleasant, but neither are many of the things you have to learn to do in life. Though having learned them, you know that you are better off because of it. On the other hand, we have these idiots who largely for their own self interests pander to your laziness and fears to keep you supposedly under god's control. But god doesn't control you any more than he can tax you by your throwing money up in the air and having him keep what doesn't fall back to earth. I hope you will forgive me for stating the obvious, but believers are actually led by people who in effect say things to them like "let me

lead you and you will live in paradise after you die. Do whatever you want because whatever you do is god's will. Let me take care of you, just bury your head in this sand and you will be happy." Etc. I on the other hand know there is a better way than having the slime lead the slime.

Also, even though times have changed since this "leading" crap was written, if you don't put an end to it, there will always be religious leaders who will "lead" you. And then in whose name and by whose written teachings will they be leading you. God, allah, Jesus, Mohammed, Buddah, Conficius, etc? But what did they ever have to say about the many varieties of dinosaurs that once existed; or ice age cycles; DNA; electromagnetism; the speed of light; etc. times millions. The answer is nothing. Yet in the face of such astonishing ignorance, you're supposed to be willing to let yourself be led by their teachings. Now I know that as far as knowledge goes, what I have to say isn't breaking any new 116

scientific ground. But I think it stands on its own merits. Such as the knowledge that letting these kinds of people lead you for the reasons that they do is compleatly filthy and disgusting! And as far as their "knowledge" goes, to me it is mostly just history. But even though there is some value in knowing history, if you are going someplace, it is best to look where you are going, not where you've been.

Now though the bible says otherwise in places, the religious leaders who promote it would probably say that they aren't against knowledge. As probably would the religious leaders who promote other religions. But you would see support for knowledge evaporate quickly enough when that knowledge challenged their authority over you or any claim to righteousness they may make. Such as the knowledge I promote. Unavoidably fragmented as it is, the statements of logic I make in this book is only common sense to me. It's not nearly as complicated as something like electrical engineering. Yet I can imagine how this knowledge will make religious leaders and their brain drug addict followers howl. Now as for the rest of what they said here goes, it's nice to hear them say something positive about the outdoors. I just wish they would have made it sound a little less like a hallucination.

Next, we have another addition to the list of rotten things that god allows. In Isa. 56:4-5, it says:

"For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold of my covenant;

Even unto them will I give in mine house and within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off."

Cut off. Now there's an appropriate choice of words. But the thing I wanted to point out here is that by not saying anything against the practice of making people eunuchs, the bible is approving of the practice. Which is terrible! Now I could see them using castration as an emergency measure to control overpopulation. Or possibly as a means of eugenic control. But to do so to give the rich and powerful a more loyal and trustworthy kind of slave is sickening and rotten! Which it seems god is. So with the bible trying to justify things like the genocide of man, plants and animals; animal and human sacrifice; incest; evil; repression; stupidity; etc. etc. etc; and now making people eunuchs, I wonder what will be next. Also, what they're saying here is that faithful eunuchs will be given a place to live with god after they're dead. But as you know, there are other places in the bible that says that when you're dead, you're dead. Could it be that they are only trying to placate the eunuchs here? Trying to sell them on the same kind of crap that they try to sell the rest of you on? Could be!

From what this next paragraph said, it seems that god was going to punish these people, again. In Isa. 66:4, it says:

"I will also choose their delusions, and will bring their fears upon them; because  
117

when I called, none did answer; when I spake, they did not hear: but they did evil before mine eyes, and chose that in which I delighteth not."

The reason god gave for this punishment is that those people didn't answer when he called or listen when he spoke. But that only speaks well for those people. Because as you know, most if not all of the times that god spoke, he did it through one of his prophets. He apparently used the same kind of voice that a delusional person might hear. Or that a liar may claim to hear. And he was going to punish them for that? Well he can kiss my ass! Though as I said before, even if god came down and performed some miracle in front of me, I still wouldn't listen to him. Another reason being that just as god can lay claim to his life and a worm can lay claim to its life, I will lay claim to my life. Even if I am as powerless to god as a worm is to us, I will still insist on my own destiny. Because I am not a dog! Also, giving such complete obedience to god on the kinds of flimsy evidence that I just spoke about would most likely do us real harm. Not the kind of imaginary harm that such storytellers come up with.

What these next two paragraphs had to say isn't the first time they've tried to say that crime pays. This time, in Jer. 5:27-28, it says:

"As a cage is full of birds, so are their houses full of deceit: therefore they are become great, and waxen rich.

They are waxen fat, they shine: yea, they overpass the deeds of the wicked: they judge not the cause, the cause of the fatherless, yet they prosper; and the

right of the needy do they not judge.”

First of all, it's nice that they speak disparagingly about those who don't judge the cause of the fatherless or the rights of the needy. But the rest of it is pretty bad. Take for example that after they say that their houses are full of deceit, they say that “therefore” they have become great. As if greatness just naturally results from the use of deceit. Which I don't believe it does. Sure, it's possible to succeed through the use of deceit. But that doesn't mean you will. Though even for those who succeed through deceit, in one way or another, it's likely that others will find the price of their success too high. Another thing is that it's bad enough that they say that you will succeed through the use of deceit. But it says that such people even shine. Well the shining must be through this beholder's eyes. Because I wouldn't consider anybody to shine who succeeded through deception. Or those who, as they put it, overpass the deeds of the wicked.

Jeremiah didn't waste much time in saying something else disgusting. In Jer. 5:30-31, it says:

“A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land;

The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests rule by their means; and my people love to have it so: and what will ye do in the end thereof?”

Well in my highly considered opinion, all these things are horrible. It's horrible for prophets to even exist and it's horrible for the priests to rule by their means. Because one of the means by which the priests rule is with the help of the false  
118

prophets. And as you know, the other means by which priests rule is by preying on your emotions, superstitions and fears. It is also horrible for people to love to have it that way. Then they ask what you will do in the end thereof. Which promotes the idea that there is nothing you can do. Well there is something I can and have done. And so can you. Which is to reject religion completely and think for yourselves.

Also, as I said before, just because you can take advantage of somebody doesn't make it right to do so. Likewise, as I also said before and may have to say again later, just because somebody may like to be taken advantage of doesn't make it right to do so either. Generally speaking, I would say that people should do what is best for each other. Whether or not they want you to. Hopefully religious people, who of course need to, can learn what is in fact best for each other. Another thing is that this guy may not know what to do about people who like being taken advantage of. But I know what not to do. Don't make things worse! When there is a fire burning in the city that is the condition of man, only an extremely vile person would add to that fire. Let alone seek converts to promote the action.

You're told in this next paragraph what the blessing will be for those who believe in god. In Jer. 17:8, it says:

“For he shall be as a tree planted by the waters, and that spreadeth out her roots by the river, and shall not see when heat cometh, but her leaf shall be green; and shall not be careful in the year of drought, neither shall cease from yielding fruit.”

What this is basically saying is that as long as you believe in god, you will be ok. If only I had an eighth of a penny for all the times where that has not turned out to not be the case. I would be rich! Then, more specifically, one of the blessings of believing in god is to not see when heat comes. Which in human terms would be to not see trouble coming. But to not see trouble coming isn't a blessing, it's a curse. It also says that they will not be careful during a drought. Yeah, just like they often aren't careful about the environment, how many children they have in an overpopulated world, etc. How sickening! But despite the garbage they teach here, you should use your brain and look out for trouble. Be careful in good times or bad times.

This next paragraph doesn't set a very high standard for people. In Jer. 17:9, it says:

“The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?”

I feel sorry for anybody who would believe an evil statement like this. Though I feel even sorer for those who have been victimized by anybody who was fooled into believing such an untrue statement. And why would the bible try to get people to think of themselves in this way? It's likely because such people would be more in need of god. Now some people can be extremely deceitful and

119

others can be desperately wicked. But I would say such people are in the minority. Then they ask who would know it. As if nobody would. But people can find such things out. As I have with the writers of the bible and many of the things they write about. Also, for those of you who are deceitful to an unusual degree and can realize it, likewise with the desperately wicked, don't let what they say here fool you into believing that you're normal. Because you're not.

No matter how you look at it, what this next paragraph had to say isn't very good. In Jer. 18:8, it says:

“If that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them.”

Now if the nation they were speaking of were indeed doing evil, then their punishment shouldn't be considered evil. Because punishment for evil is not evil. So the lord was wrong on that point. Though there's the possibility that this nation they speak of was in fact not doing evil. Which they probably weren't if the

lord considered it evil. But for the lord to consider punishing them under such circumstances would indeed be evil. So when they called this punishment evil, that could be just what they meant. That would disgust me too if that were the case.

We next have a parable that is supposed to represent people. In Jer. 24:2-3, it says:

“One basket had very good figs, even like the figs that are first ripe: and the other basket had very naughty figs, which could not be eaten, they were so bad.

Then said the Lord unto me, What seest thou, Jeremiah? And I said, Figs; the good figs, very good; and the evil, very evil, that cannot be eaten, they are so evil.”

So what I don't like about their using figs to represent people is that figs are meant to be consumed. They even talk about the fitness of these “figs” to be “eaten.” It's bad enough that the bible tries to get you to think of yourselves as god's sheep, but now you're being led to accept the idea that you're his food too? Well most creatures exist by eating other creatures. But I would say that it is the duty of any life form being used as food to resist it. Also, any god that would need to nourish itself in any way on a sentient creature like man, in my considered opinion, isn't much of a god. Another thing is that it is possible that someday technology will give us the ability to sustain ourselves without the need for killing at all. Any worthwhile god would do as much even in a metaphysical sense. Yet another thing I don't like about all this is the option they give you to avoid being food. Which is to be a rotten person.

One of the many bad things the bible teaches is hypocrisy. An example of which can be found in Jer. 33:17. It says:

“For thus saith the Lord: David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel;”

First of all, why would god care what a dead adulterous murderer wants. Isn't  
120

the whole point of the bible about what god wants? Also, when David was alive, he didn't seem to mind a king named Saul sitting on the throne. So why would he be against such a thing here. But the main point I wanted to make here is that at one time, David himself was a king. And it would be hypocritical for him to consider it to be ok for him, but nobody else.

This next paragraph seems to show god telling the truth about his evil. In Jer. 42:10, it says:

“If ye will abide in this land, then I will build you, and not pull you down, and I will plant you, and not pluck you up: for I repent me of the evil that I have done unto you.”



So god says here that he did evil to them. But the question here is if he indeed meant evil. Well as I said before, punishment for some infraction is not evil. It's justice. Also, if the punishment given was indeed just, you should never repent performing it. So when god supposedly said here that he had done evil, I believe that is what he meant. So god, by his own admission, is evil! Because anybody who does evil is evil. Neither does his repentance here impress me at all. I would also like to add that anybody who would follow a creature that does evil is evil. Another thing I don't like here is that one reason why god could have supposedly told you of his evil here was to make the idea of evil from him more acceptable to you. But I don't plan to let this devil succeed in such a plan without a fight.

There are a couple bad things in these next two paragraphs. In Jer. 44:10-11, it says:

“They are not humbled even unto this day, neither have they feared, nor walked in my laws, nor in my statutes, that I have set before you and before your fathers.

Therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold, I will set my face against you for evil, and to cut off all Judah.”

First, god says here that they were not humbled as if it were a bad thing. But it isn't. Because people shouldn't be humbled or repressed. Unless of course they had done wrong or are really screwed up. Which is not a judgment I would trust from somebody that does evil, creates the wicked, etc. Then he again speaks of wanting to be feared here. But as I said before, if they didn't fear god, it was a good thing. Because anybody who would require your fear should be reviled. And definitely not worshiped. Also, you may fear somebody who is more powerful than you, but you shouldn't give into that fear. Then, as far as his continually increasing and changing statutes go, it's no wonder if they hadn't been followed.

So for these things the Lord is going to punish them, again. I'm not surprised. It then says that god was going to set his face against them for evil. But as I said before, if god's punishment of them was just, he would have been setting his face against them for the sake of goodness. So I would take what they said as meaning that god's purpose wasn't good. Well if he wasn't interested in treating

121

them justly, he should have left them alone. Now I have met people who said that you take what you want from the bible. But one of the problems with that is that what the bible says can be used to justify evil as well as good. And when any actual goodness in the bible is tied up with evil; deception; escapism; long winded irrelevance; etc., what little good there is in it loses much of its significance.

The reason god gave in these next two paragraphs for punishing the Ammonites is pretty terrible. In Jer. 49:1-2, it says:

“CONCERNING the Ammonites, thus saith the Lord; Hath Israel no sons? Hath he no heir? Why doeth their king inherit Gad, and his people dwell in his cities?

Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will cause an alarm of war to be heard in Rabbah of the Ammonites; and it shall be a desolate heap, and her daughters shall be burned with fire: then shall Israel be heir unto them that were his heirs, saith the Lord.”

Well if god had to ask why the Ammonites took the land of Gad, he must be pretty stupid. If you read the bible you would know that they probably took it because it was mostly vacant land. Because god supposedly caused most of Israel to be taken away captive. So why shouldn't the Ammonites take vacant land. Maybe they thought things like “Waste not, want not. Shuffle your feet, lose your seat. Finders keepers, losers weepers. Turnabout is fair play. Etc.” Also, if god didn't want their king to take that land, he should have said something. Which he apparently didn't. So he shouldn't be complaining. But because they did take it, god is trying to justify destroying their cities and causing their women to be burned with fire. Well I'm not buying it. Because under such circumstances, only a depraved sort of god would do such a thing.

These next few paragraphs show again that god isn't very nice to his servants. First, going back to Jer. 25:9, it says:

“Behold, I will send and take all the families of the north, saith the Lord, and Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon, my servant, and will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all these nations round about, and will utterly destroy them, and make them an astonishment, and an hissing, and perpetual desolations.”

Well I guess god was pretty lucky to have a servant like Nebuchadrezzar to do his bidding. But how does god show his gratitude to this servant for doing his bidding? In Jer. 50:17-18, it says:

“Israel is a scattered sheep; the lions have driven him away: first the king of Assyria hath devoured him; and last this Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon hath broken his bones.

Therefore thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel; Behold, I will punish the king of Babylon and his land, as I have punished the king of Assyria.”

So earlier god said Nebuchadrezzar was his servant. Then here he says “this Nebuchadrezzar.” Like he was something that just crawled out from under a

122

rock. That wasn't a very nice way to treat him. Neither was punishing him for something he himself supposedly made him do. It then says that god was even

going to punish his land. But what could his land have done to deserve punishment! I guess that god figured that if he was going to be unfair, he might as well go all the way. But I say that only a devil would do such things. So again, if you worship god, that makes you a devil worshiper. Not that any of the other religions are any better. Though most of these devil worshipers can take some solace in the fact that they believe what they do, to a large extent, because they have been fooled into doing so. For which having been fooled is one thing. But to choose to stay fooled is quite another. Also, some of you may wonder that if religious people are devil worshipers, why do so many do good. Well to begin with, they don't always do good. And they wouldn't get very far by performing acts of blatant evil. There may also be some sort of "honor among thieves" thing going on. Also, at times, even wicked people will do good. But the main reason such people sometimes do good is probably for the same reason that normal people do good. Which is because good is better than evil.

Yet another example of the lord's guilt concerning the maltreatment of the king of Babylon and his land can be found in Jer. 51:7. It says:

"Babylon hath been a golden cup in the Lord's hand, that make all the earth drunken: the nations have drunken of her wine; therefore the nations are mad."

Well having been a golden cup in the lord's hand would seem to make the lord responsible for their actions. Like driving other nations mad. Which wasn't a very nice thing to do. Another thing is that from what I have read, I can guarantee you that what the lord would consider to be madness and what I would consider to be madness are two different things. Also, seeing how they brought up the subject of "madness," there are a few things I would like to say about it. First, if you have ever seen any films showing the effects of mental illness on WW 1 shell shock victims, you have some idea about how bad it can be. It also lends credence to the saying that there are no atheists in foxholes. Which if true would be because of the mental illness that the stress of warfare can induce. Which is just one of the many reasons why I consider belief in religion to be a form of mental illness. And mental illness is never a good thing. Another thing about such mental illness is that though its causes and effects in civilian life can be less extreme, with religious leaders extolling worshipers to whatever extreme of faith they can get, this mental illness can in some ways be even worse than what can be experienced in warfare.

Again, despite the lord having made his servant Nebuchadrezzar attack Israel, in Jer. 51:24, it says:

"And I will render unto all Babylon and to all the inhabitants of Chaldea all their evil that they have done in Zion in your sight, saith the Lord."

All "their" evil? Try as they might, there is just no getting around the fact that supposedly god was the one who caused this evil to happen. (let alone all the

other evil that happens) So for god to try and lay the blame elsewhere shows yet another aspect to his evil. Now as you know, most religions are old and experienced organizations with hordes of followers. Despite this, I hope I can in some way convince the unfortunate believers that religion is just no good. I also hope that just as Chinese women learned to do away with foot binding, such people will be able to put aside their induced dependence on religion and grow up.

For one last example of these rantings against Babylon and the destruction caused by that empire, let's go to Lame. 3:64-66. It says:

“Render unto them a recompense, O Lord, according to the work of their hands. Give them sorrow of heart, thy curse unto them.

Persecute and destroy them in anger from under the heavens of the Lord.”

One of the bad things about Jeremiah whining about god's punishment is that he himself supposedly revealed from god that the people he is wishing ill upon here were only god's instrument in punishing them. So what is he doing cursing them. What a sickening thing to teach! Despite what they say, if you receive punishment you deserve, you shouldn't seek vengeance against those who punished you. Now as far as this latest unfortunate teaching goes, as I said before, chances are that people who are susceptible to behaving in such a slimy manner would be able to discover how to be scum on their own. They don't need the bible's instruction or justification of such wickedness. Neither do those who may be less susceptible to, but still in danger of, believing in the righteousness of any of the disreputable things the bible teaches.

Though there are other examples that are a little too lengthy to copy, these next two paragraphs seem to show god instructing Ezekiel on how to perform voodoo. In Eze. 4:1-2, it says:

“THOU also, son of man, take thee a tile, and lay it before thee, and pourtray upon it the city, even Jerusalem:

And lay siege against it, and cast a mount against it; set the camp also against it, and set battering rams against it round about.”

So instead of a voodoo doll, he has a voodoo model of Jerusalem. But as I said before, being another manifestation of religion is one reason why I don't approve of voodoo or witchcraft. I wonder what the hypocrites who used to persecute witches thought of these writings promoting such magical hocus pocus.

Another example of this sorcery can be found in Eze. 5:1-2. It says:

“AND thou, son of man, take thee a sharp knife, take thee a barber's razor, and cause it to pass upon thine head and upon thine beard: then take thee balances to weigh, and divide the hair.

Thou shalt burn with fire a third part in the midst of the city, when the days of

siege are fulfilled: and thou shalt take a third part, and smite about it with a knife:

124

and a third part thou shalt scatter in the wind; and I will draw out my sword after them.”

I suppose such witchcraft is only bad if it isn't done for god. Also, this again shows that what this religion is generally perceived to be and what it actually is aren't quite the same.

A seemingly more straightforward exemplification for evil can be found in Eze. 7:5. It says:

“Thus saith the Lord God; An evil, an only evil, behold, is come.”

Now when it speaks of evil here, I would have to say that they mean just that. Evil. But causing evil would make the lord evil. And despite what this suggests, evil isn't good. Also, the evil spoken of here is supposedly punishment for some wrong that was done. But as I said before, punishment for some wrong act is not evil. In fact, though I am not ruling out the possibility of forgiveness, I would say that generally speaking, a just punishment is in fact very good. So the lord is screwed up on both accounts.

These next few paragraphs speak of killing in the name of the lord. In Eze. 9:4-6, it says:

“And the Lord said unto him, Go through the midst of the city, through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon the foreheads of the men that sigh and that cry for all the abominations that be done in the midst thereof.

And to the others he said in mine hearing, Go ye after him through the city, and smite: let not your eye spare, neither have ye pity:

Slay utterly young and old, both maids, and little children, and women: but come not near any man upon whom is the mark; and begin at my sanctuary. They began at the ancient men which were before the house.”

Only an evil asshole could order such a thing to be done! And as far as killing children goes, seeing how they would be too young to judge such things for themselves, I would have to assume that such actions were supposed to be because some sort of eugenic consideration. Such as something people may do to create a different breed of dog. (which is an apt example) But killing off the children of non believers would be eugenics in reverse.

Now you already know that for this religion (and most others) to prove god's omnipotence, they must say that he is responsible for everything that happens. Which also sickeningly states a need for evil. Another example of this evil can be found in Eze. 14:9. It says:

“And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the Lord have

deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel.”

So it says here that if a prophet says something that is wrong, the lord made him do it. How convenient. Though of course, I don't believe it. Another thing is that even if there were a god, why would he want to cause a prophet to say something that wasn't true. To have an excuse to kill him? He should be able to

125

do that if he wants anyway. So the only sensible reason that the lord would want to make a prophet say something that wasn't true would be to confuse, repress and cause people to become disillusioned with him. Then he could order another reverse eugenics massacre or something. But I spit on any god who would do such a thing! Even if to a god it would only be worm spit, at least I would have the satisfaction of knowing that I had done something noble.

Another good example of the lord punishing the innocent can be found in Eze. 20:46. It says:

“Son of man, set thy face toward the south, and drop thy word toward the south, and prophesy against the forest of the south field;”

Well what in the hell could a forest have done to deserve punishment! I could only hope that the lord would have done such a thing only to punish the people who may have been dependant on the forest in some way. Because with god, you can never be too sure. Also, as with the great flood the bible described, it is astonishingly evil to harm many species for the supposed crimes of one.

Especially when, as I said before, his being a god should give him the ability to punish only the guilty species.

You can also see in these next two paragraphs that the lord doesn't care who he kills. In Eze. 21:3-4, it says:

“And I say to the land of Israel, Thus saith the Lord; Behold, I am against thee, and will draw forth my sword out of his sheath, and will cut off from thee the righteous and the wicked.

Seeing then that I will cut off from thee the righteous and the wicked, therefore shall my sword go forth out of his sheath against all flesh from the south to the north:”

First of all, what they say here is both stupid and rotten. Because I would imagine the whole point of this religion is to make people “righteous.” But if god is willing to kill the righteous along with the wicked, it doesn't give much incentive to be “righteous.” Also, as I said before and will probably have to say again, if god were any kind of worthwhile god at all, he would punish only the guilty and leave the rest alone. But again, he doesn't do this. So either he is unworthy of your worship, or he is something evil, vile and something to be spit upon. But

luckily, it is extremely unlikely that there is a god that is what they say it is or does what they say it does. So you don't have to waste your time hating it. Though I myself do have an extraordinarily large amount of disdain for those who would worship such a thing or promote its worship.

This next paragraph is a parable about the fall of Assyria. Which unfortunately makes hell sound like a very nice place. In Eze. 31:16, it says:

“I made the nations to shake at the sound of his fall, when I cast them down to hell with them that descend into the pit: and all the trees of Eden, the choice and the best of Lebanon, all that drink water, shall be comforted in the neither parts of the earth.”

126

So I would take the neither parts of the earth to mean hell. And with the trees of eden, the best of Lebanon and all that drink water being comforted there, it sounds like a very pleasant place indeed. But who needs to be good to get to heaven when hell sounds so nice. From a religious point of view, where's the incentive to refrain from being bad when even if you get sent to hell, you will still be happy. What a thing to teach! But I say that only a devil would promise you comfort in hell. Though with just the idea of god being what it is, if he is in heaven along with his worshipers, I would rather be in hell. No matter how bad it is. Especially after all of the terrible things the bible says that god had done or said.

In his thirst for innocent life, this next paragraph again shows god promoting the destruction of innocent animals. In Eze. 32:13, it says:

“I will destroy also all the beasts thereof from beside the great waters; neither shall the foot of man trouble them any more, nor the hoofs of beasts trouble them.”

What a terrible thing to teach! You and I both know that animals are unlikely to be deserving of destruction. So what was he doing advocating their destruction. But this religion isn't the only one to promote such disregard for the ecosystem. For instance, by justifying people having large families. Which you should know can only end in disaster. It's no wonder that people would want to say that such things are in god's hands. But such a stupid excuse doesn't work. People who behave in such a reckless manner are richly deserving of anything bad that happens to them. Unfortunately, they are not the only ones who will suffer.

There are too many shepherd-sheep analogies in the bible to bother to comment on. But as I said before, I must make some effort to comment on some of them. Even if it is a bit repetitive. A good example of one of these teachings can be found in Eze. 34:17. It says:

“And as for you, O my flock, thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will judge

between cattle and cattle, between the rams and the he goats.”

First of all, when it speaks of god judging his “cattle” here, from what I have seen, he doesn’t judge very well. As for what he says here specifically, if I were god, this is what I would have said in their crude fashion. “And as for you, O my free people, thus saith the nobody me; Behold, I will judge between the pandering misguided shepherds and the pandering misguided shepherds, between the gods and the priests.”

Now even though I am not a god, prophet or anything like that, I have still concluded in a multitude of ways that these religious leaders are delusional parasites and vampires. Weakening our species more, through your own weaknesses, for their own gain. So it would seem that I have to say again that what they teach is evil. No matter how often they tell you it isn’t. I say that despite those with a weak desire to be taken care of through religion, neither they or anybody else should think of themselves as cattle. Just as people

127

shouldn’t think of themselves as subjects or slaves. You should free individuals. As long as that freedom doesn’t come at the cost of others. This is the greatest strength you can attain. With allegiance to yourselves first and consideration and fair play toward others.

The bible promotes genocide again in these next two paragraphs. Now as I see it, there could be two possible justifications for it. One would be as a last ditch effort to save the ecosystem. The other would be to protect yourselves from those whose filthy desire to overpopulate caused them to invade your land. But back when the bible was written, people had no such justification. Because not only was the human population much smaller, but mortality rates were much higher. Yet in Eze. 39:11-12, it says:

“And it shall come to pass in that day, that I will give unto Gog a place there of graves in Israel, the valley of the passengers on the east of the sea: and it shall stop the noses of the passengers: and there they shall bury Gog and all his multitude: and they shall call it The valley of Hamongog.

And seven months shall the house of Israel be burying of them, that they may cleanse the land.”

With the bible teaching things like this, the hypocrisy of the Jews complaining about what Hitler did to them amazes me. At least the Nazis did what they did, as much as possible, in a less terrifying and bloody manner than was practiced by the Jews back then. Also, back in those days the Jews apparently weren’t as willing to suffer subjugation from within as they seem willing to subject the population of other countries to these days. It would seem that both approaches are going to screw them up. And rejecting this filthy religion of theirs isn’t likely to



happen. So maybe they should consider suicide. Another thing that amazes me is that people can believe in a religion with not only a stupid beginning, but an evil one as well.

For instance, say that if in the beginnings of a religion, they taught that things like cannibalism or necrophilia were ok. There is no way that they could effectively reject such practices these days without rejecting the religion completely. I also remember seeing something once where a catholic priest was talking about how they didn't believe various things anymore. Which makes me wonder how they can promote their religion and still look in a mirror without vomiting. Also, as I said before, with so many of the things that religion used to teach having been proven wrong, it's extremely likely that anything new that religion may have to teach these days is equally wrong. I would also like to point out that a religion that isn't based on fact is just a comfortable lie. Among other unsavory things.

It's surprising that many Christians use the bible to appose homosexuality to the extreme that they sometimes do. Because one teaching in favor of it can be found in Dan. 1:9. It says:

128

“Now God had brought Daniel into favor and tender love with the prince of the eunuchs.”

Tender love. It sounds very romantic. But I don't think that god should be promoting homosexuality. Another thing is that the real reason behind this relationship wasn't god. It was likely just Daniel trying to cozy up to somebody in a position of power. Now I am not against homosexuals to the point where I would punish them. Mainly because for many, it's not completely their fault they are the way they are. Though I am against legitimatizing it. For more reasons than I will be listing here. But one such reason is that enough people become bisexual or homosexual as it is. If the practice were to become legitimized, more people would fall prey to it. One negative effect of that would be to add more stress to normal heterosexual relationships that are difficult enough as it is. Also, as a culture, we shouldn't allow every social deviation to become legitimized. Because there are people who equally advocate sexual relationships with children, animals and even corpses. So only normal heterosexual relationships should be promoted.

It seems that the angel gabriel shares god's fondness for destruction.

Because while explaining a vision, in Dan. 8:24, it supposedly says:

“And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the

holy people.”

In this context I just can't see calling destruction wonderful. Such destruction could be unfortunate or unavoidable. But wonderful? I don't think so. Also, as with god's willingness to destroy the righteous along with the wicked that they mentioned earlier, it seems that not even being "holy" may help you. So much for acting in a way you're told he likes you to act.

The good treatment of the wicked that the bible sometimes promotes is sickening. To say the least. Another example of this vile philosophy can be found in Dan. 12:2. It says:

“And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and everlasting contempt.”

First of all, it says that many of whom I take to mean the dead shall awake. Though not all of them will “awake.” Just many of them. Yet of the lucky ones to receive what I take to mean resurrection, some of them will be deserving of shame and everlasting contempt. Which I also take to mean the wicked. But for them, I'm sure that everlasting shame and contempt would be a small price to pay for resurrection. Besides, they would be consoled by the fact that god says that he creates the wicked and causes bad things to happen. Which would take some of the blame off them. Also, anybody worthy of real shame and contempt would be unlikely to feel the shame you think they should feel and your contempt would mean little to them. So I don't like their teaching of a future after death for the wicked. What a stupid and terrible thing to do! I say that the

129

wicked should have been left to rot as well. And what of those who were left sleeping in the dust to rot. Though the bible doesn't say so, it could be argued that they were worthy of more than just shame and contempt. But given some of the other things the bible has said, you never know.

Just to make a stupid point, the lord tells a person named Hosea to do some pretty rotten things. First, in Hos. 1:2-3, it says:

“The beginning of the word of the Lord by Hosea. And the Lord said unto Hosea, Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms: for the land hath committed great whoredom, departing from the Lord.

So he went and took Gomer the daughter of Diblaim; which conceived, and bare him a son.”

Here god tells him to take a wife of whoredom. But does this mean that the woman he takes should be a whore, or just the child of a whore. Luckily, I don't care. And then, though he is told to, it doesn't mention him marrying her. Though maybe back then they had different ideas as to what being married meant. Then it says that he should take to himself children of whoredoms.

Which I take to mean that he should adopt her or someone else's bastard children. Because if he married her and they had children, you couldn't consider the children to be bastards. But here he apparently creates the bastard children himself. What a rotten thing to do! Just because Israel may have screwed up again is no reason to create innocent children to suffer this stigma. Though one of the things that gets me here is that god supposedly gave the orders he did because Israel hadn't followed his teachings. But here, apparently Hosea himself can't follow god's orders correctly. Because he was supposed to take to himself a wife of whoredoms. Not just play house with a whore. And he was supposed to take to himself children of whoredoms. Not make children of whoredoms.

On a side note, even though you are being given the condensed version of much of the crap in the bible, I wonder if you're getting as tired of all of this straying and punishment crap as I am. Also, though he was half Jewish, Einstein was a pretty smart guy. Though he was probably speaking of scientific matters, he once basically said that a good definition of insanity was to keep doing the same thing, but expecting different results. It's the same thing with the Jewish people straying from god and god punishing them for it. Or in this case, using some prophet to show his displeasure. But maybe these people weren't insane. (In the common sense) Maybe having these things happen over and over and over again is what they want to happen. Though to me, it was at least a waste of time.

Getting back to Hosea's sordid story, this next paragraph confirms that he in fact didn't marry this woman. In Hos. 2:2, it says:

"Plead with your mother, plead: for she is not my wife, neither am I her husband:

130

let her therefore put away her whoredoms out of her sight, and her adulteries from between her breasts;"

Well if she wasn't a whore before, she is now. Also, after stating that they weren't married, he says "therefore" she should stop acting like a whore. But they weren't married. "Therefore," he in fact had no right to tell her what to do. Another thing is that this guy seemed to dislike his girlfriend acting like a whore. But with he or anybody like him trying to sell people on something as worthless as religion, I would say that they were even worse than a whore. Or in trying to force it upon them, it makes them worse than a pimp or pusher.

Continuing on, these next few paragraphs help show just how bad he was. In Hos. 2:3-5, it says:

"Lest I strip her naked, and set her as in the day she was born, and make her as

a wilderness, and set her in a dry land, and slay her with thirst.

And I will have no mercy upon her children; for they be the children of whoredoms.

For their mother hath played the harlot: she that conceived them hath done shamefully: for she said, I will go after my lovers, that give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, mine oil and my drink.”

First of all, since he wasn't her husband, he had no right to punish her. Then he says that he will have no mercy on her children because they are the children of whoredoms. What an asshole! If he was going all the way in playing house, there's a good chance that they were his children too. And having not gotten married, their legitimacy would likewise be his fault. Not theirs. So if anybody deserved punishment, it was him. Then, another reason he gave for his displeasure was that she said that she would go after her lovers for the things she needs. But maybe if he at least acted like a husband and gave her the things she needed to survive, she wouldn't have needed to seek them from others.

As if all those things weren't bad enough, god supposedly told Hosea to get involved with another woman. In Hos. 3:1-2, it says:

“THEN said the Lord unto me, Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress, according to the love of the Lord toward the children of Israel, who look to other gods, and love flagons of wine.

So I bought her unto me for fifteen pieces of silver, and an homer of barley, and an half homer of barley.”

So this time the lord tells him to get involved with an adulteress. But it doesn't mention her being an adulteress here. It would have also helped define this story if they told who was paid for this woman. Though this does bring up an interesting question. If you pay for adultery, is it still adultery? Which I don't think it would be. I would judge such a thing to be just plain prostitution. Then he is told to love her according to god's love toward Israel. It's no wonder the Jews are always getting screwed! Also, it seems to me that god could have

131

found a less wicked way to make his point. But I'm sure Hosea wasn't complaining.

Though the prediction this next paragraph made was supposed to be good news, it in fact wasn't. As you can see, in Hos. 3:5, it says:

“Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days.”

First of all, I would say it's bad news to seek a murderous, adulterous, imperialist scumbag like David. Maybe they figured that nobody's perfect. But

this is ridiculous. Though if they were depraved enough to seek god, they may as well seek David too. Then it says that they will fear god and his goodness. How sublimely evil! There are many things to fear in the world. But for me at least, goodness wouldn't be anywhere near the top of the list. Only a fiend would try to convince you that goodness was something to be feared. Though after some of the other things the bible has said, this doesn't surprise me.

This next paragraph gives some pretty screwed up advice. In Hos. 4:4, it says: "Yet let no man strive, nor reprove another: for thy people are as they that strive with a priest."

The first thing they tell you here is that you shouldn't strive. Which apart from being contradictory to something else in the Bible that I mentioned earlier, is bad advice because if you don't strive, you atrophy. And atrophy is something we must stay away from. Then you're told not to reprove others. But as I said before, if somebody does something wrong, they should be reprimanded accordingly. Only a devil would tell you to let somebody get away with a wrong act without so much as a critical word. Then as far as striving with a priest goes, the reason they would probably figure that somebody was striving with a priest is because they were seeking knowledge. So maybe they were saying here that having a lack of knowledge, such people shouldn't strive or reprove others. Whatever the case is, it's bad to promote sloth or a non involvement in society.

Another bad teaching can be found in Hos. 4:14. It says: "I will not punish your daughters when they commit whoredom, nor your spouses when they commit adultery: for themselves are separated with whores, and they sacrifice with harlots: therefore the people that doth not understand shall fall."

If I'm not mistaken, it is by not punishing these people that god plans to punish them. That by letting whores, adulterers and likely even worse kinds of wicked people run amok without his punishment, they will screw themselves up. Or at least he hopes. Considering some of the things god had supposedly done, taking this approach could only be an improvement.

Again exemplifying god's evil, in Hos. 12:7, it says:

"He is a merchant, the balances of deceit are in God's hand: he loveth to oppress."

So here you're told that the balances of deceit are in god's hand. Not the balances of truth, justice or anything good sounding like that. What they say

132

here makes deceit sound like a good or at least unavoidable thing. Which I don't agree with and obviously don't like at all. Now though we are all probably guilty of deceit to some degree, I think it would have been more positive to judge people according to goodness or justice. Not their level of deceit. Though

another reason they say that god uses balances of deceit could be because they were being honest. In so much as god, being a merchant, deals in deceit. Which if he existed, I would say is true. But it is still an unhelpful thing to teach. Because deceit is not a good thing. Though I doubt if, for instance, a used car dealer would agree. Fortunately for such people, lying is not against the law. (at this time) Then it says that god loves to oppress. Though usually your run of the mill, slimy tyrant only finds it necessary to oppress. But god loves to? I say that morally that makes him one of the lowest forms of life possible! And just for this reason, let alone all the others, I say that anybody who likes this god or would obey it for whatever reason can eat shit and die!

Yet another good exemplification of god causing evil can be found in Amos 3:6. It says:

“Shall a trumpet be blown in the city, and the people not be afraid? shall there be evil in the city, and the Lord hath not done it?”

You're again led to believe that the lord is responsible for everything that happens. That things like disease, lying, stealing, sexual perversion, murder, etc. is all god's doing. Now I've already told you why they have to say that god causes evil to happen. Though no matter how often they say it, evil is not necessary. And only an evil, slimy devil would cause evil. It may be comforting to hear that there is some purpose behind bad things happening. But trying to justify bad things through god can also promote people committing unsavory or evil acts. Also, consider those who debate things like the location of noah's arc, where the holy grail is, how many angels can dance on the head of a pin, etc. Apart from wasting peoples time, they are promoting the cause of evil. So anybody out there who would shout at the devil would be better off shouting at the real devil. God.

Though you have to believe in something to shout at it. So I would rather you ignore god. One of the multitude of reasons being just in case there is some sort of collective psychic phenomena that could cause a parasitic entity like "god" to exist. Another thing I would like to say while we're on the subject of psychic phenomena is that of you need the assistance of some supernatural being to effect the natural world, you're doing something wrong. Knowledge and the work of your hands will always accomplish more in the natural world than the supernatural will. For example, I have personally seen many tens of thousands of houses and other structures that were built by man. But I have never heard of one that people watched being built by supernatural means. I could just imagine wood being sawed with saws and nails being hammered all by themselves. Yet there are many deranged people who think that religion and all the supernatural

crap that goes along with it is about the most important thing there is. If not THE most important thing there is. Also, even if there were some sort of favorable supernatural effect to come from faith in some religion, the overall harm that it does to our species would make it not worthwhile.

Apart from creating evil, it seems that god also prefers that you live in dirt. Because in Amos 6:8, it says:

“The Lord God hath sworn by himself, saith the Lord God of hosts, I abhor the excellency of Jacob, and hate his palaces: therefore I will deliver up the city with all that is therein.”

I guess god got tired of complaining about their bad actions, so he decided to abhor the excellency of Jacob too. Which I don't think was very nice. As long as any opulence is deserved; isn't overdone or harmful to the environment, or isn't at the unreasonable expense of the poor, I see nothing wrong with it. Then, because god hates the “excellency of Jacob” and his palaces, he apparently was going to cause the city to be taken in war. But to me, as the old saying goes, that would be “throwing the baby out with the bath water.”

This next paragraph shows another example of the bible trying to get you to accept something that is unacceptable. In Hab. 3:8, it says:

“Was the Lord displeased against the rivers? Was thine anger against the rivers? Was thy wrath against the sea, that thou didn't ride upon thine horses and thy chariots of salvation?”

I would first like to say that it's sickening to punish the rivers or the sea. Because those things are incapable of malicious intent and are therefore unworthy of punishment. So it seems we have another example of god causing unwarranted destruction. Now the rivers and sea could be a parable for something else. But what it says would still be bad because it gives the impression of punishing the innocent. Then it refers to god riding his horses and chariots of salvation. Not the horses and chariots of destruction, woe or something like that as you would expect. Instead, you're led to believe that affliction is salvation. Which is something only a devil would do. Though it's possible that punishment could lead to “salvation.” But of itself, it is not “salvation.” It is punishment.

You probably all know that sometimes little things mean a lot. But in Zec. 4:10, it says:

“For who hath despised the day of the small things? for they shall rejoice, and shall see the plummet in the hand of Zerubbabel with those seven; they are the eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro through the whole earth.”

All I have to say here is that I don't think that they should be exemplifying the despising of small things.

There are a couple of bad things about what this next paragraph says. In Zec. 10:4, it says:

“Out of him came forth the corner, out of him the nail, out of him the battle bow, out of him every oppressor together.”

First it says that the corner, nail and battle bow came from god. So it seems that you're again expected to believe that everything comes from god. Which is stupid. Also, you may remember the bible making disparaging remarks about people prospering because they created “wicked devices.” But according to this, god is responsible for the creation of those “wicked devices.” Then it says that every oppressor comes from god. And of course god wouldn't create them unless they served some useful purpose. Which is not only untrue, but a stunningly vile thing to teach. But with god himself being a tyrant, it's no wonder that he would feel that people need tyrants here on earth as well. Though sadly, with most people cherishing stupidity or freedom from responsibility, as telling them that god is responsible for everything allows them to do, oppressors or tyrants are unavoidable.

Now to revisit the idea of the necessity for god to create evil, the wicked, oppressors or whatever, there may be some of you out there who would say that if evil wasn't necessary, why does it exist. Well to answer that, the first question to ask is what evil is. Though a whole book could be written on the subject, I'll do what I can in what little space I allow myself here. First of all, as I talked about before, there are many different levels of evil. For example, stealing candy from a baby is evil. To keep stealing candy from babies is really evil. To kill the baby and take the candy would be extremely evil. Worse yet would be to kill the baby, eat it, and save the candy for desert. So I would say on this point that the worse or more frequent a crime is, the less possibility for any perceived necessity for it would be. Then, in judging its necessity, the next question to ask is why it happens.

Well most of the answer to that lies in the animal world. Which despite what the bible teaches, we are part of. Animals commit “evil” acts themselves. But unlike other animals, we have the ability to articulate what wrong acts are, why they are wrong and the future consequences of wrong acts. Despite this, people to varying degrees still sometimes commit wrong acts. There are more reasons why than I will bother going into. But the biggest reason is in the human mind receiving chemical rewards. Because often in life, that is the only kind of reward we receive. Every disreputable human action that I have mentioned in this book has been due to receiving pleasurable brain drugs. Along with many others that I haven't mentioned. Such as picking a fight with somebody or relatively harmless ones like jumping out of airplanes. The key to fighting evil certainly



can't be found with religion and its justification for evil. It is done by trying to control your impulses. In most cases, you don't need to do it completely like a monk. All you need to do is recognize and control them.

Though this becomes more difficult to do where the Jewish controlled media is concerned. Where for cheap thrills, all sorts of unfortunate things are promoted.

135

Such as gangsters; outlaws; bikers and other lowlifes; rich criminals; egomaniacal pro wrestlers; violent sports, etc. It may not be good for the human psyche, but it apparently doesn't matter as long as it makes money. Also, I remember hearing about a study in which somebody once categorized over a hundred different kinds of intelligence. I would have to imagine that there an equal number of ways that somebody could justify various kinds of unsavory acts. Then when you add to that the examples set for us by corrupt officials, ignorant parents, greedy companies who pander to mankind's destructive nature and treat employees like expendable machines, etc, it's a wonder that we manage to do good at all.

That we do manage to still do good challenges any notion that evil is somehow necessary. There are a few other possible justifications for evil that I would also like to mention. First, as far as a learning process in children goes, it could be helpful for a child to experience what is wrong to appreciate what is right. Unfortunately, a child could also develop a taste for the thrill of getting away with some wrong act. Or discover the usefulness of lying in such an instance. But an adult would likely be able to reason why such things are bad even in the absence of such experiences. It may also be helpful for some stupid criminal to appreciate how bad unsavory acts are when they are committed against them instead. But that hardly justifies evil either.

A criminal may also feel justified in criminal behavior to reciprocate against a perceived social injustice. But one of the problems with that is that social "injustice" could possibly sometimes be justified. Another thing is that criminal behavior could reinforce a possible oppressor's feelings that even an unjust social maltreatment is justified. So committing those criminal acts wouldn't be helping matters much. Also, no matter how foreign the concept of something harsh like criminal behavior became to people, it's likely that they would do what is necessary to survive. So in my opinion, evil to some degree may be unavoidable, but I can't see it being necessary. Especially not to the level that the bible would have you believe it is.

In a surprising bit of honesty, this next paragraph speaks of god's rather benign reaction to being called evil. In Mal. 2:17, it says:

"Ye have wearied the Lord with your words. Yet ye say, Wherein have we

wearied him? When ye say, Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of the Lord, and he delighteth in them; or, Where is the God of judgment?”

Of all the things that could anger god, you would think that being called a lover of evil would be at the top of the list. But instead of angering him it only wearies him. Well at least he isn't angered by the truth.

The last teaching of evil in the old testament that I would like to comment on is in Mal. 4:2. In it is a reaffirmation of why I believe the bible so often calls pride a sin. It says:

136

“But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings; and ye shall go forth, and grow up as calves of the stall.”

First of all, not only do they again try to promote the unfortunate act of fearing god, but they say something good will come from it. Though as far as fearing god goes, the only real good thing that interests me is obtaining freedom from that fear. The point that comes up next is another reason why I think they call pride a sin. Which is that nobody with an ounce of pride, self esteem or common sense would stand for being treated like calves of the stall. Now for those of you who don't know what calves of the stall are, chances are you will find the answer disgusting. To make corned beef, from what I have heard, they keep calves confined in stalls. If I am not mistaken, they also keep them in the dark. Which is an apt metaphor for religion. They also feed them on a diet that makes them anemic until the time comes to slaughter them. It is the most disgusting treatment of animals that I have ever heard of. And to do so just for the sake of flavor makes it even worse. So for god to treat people in any sort of similar manner at all, the proper adjective fails me in describing my complete disdain for any creature that would do such a thing.

If there were any such creature, I would hope that it would know that I am only speaking figuratively when I say that it can “eat me!” I hold an equal amount of disgust for any religious person that would try to justify god's view of us in this manner. And anybody who would accept such a relationship with god would be doing the world a favor by shooting a large caliber hollow point bullet through their “brain.” Now despite the bible's vile teachings, you should never consider yourselves or others as cattle. Or as part of some sort of “food chain” as they talked about here. Neither is it a sin to be free! People at least in theory should be allowed to be in control of their own destinies. Whatever they may be. So instead of all the shepherd-sheep garbage, which you will be seeing a good number of the additional examples of later, it would have been more helpful if they instead promoted people doing what is right. In the long run first and in the

short term second. Also, instead of all this shepherd-sheep garbage, they should have instead talked more about how to refrain from being jerks toward each other. Which in my opinion, being a sheep is a pretty useless solution to.

## CHAPTER THREE

STUPIDITY and LIES

of the

NEW TESTAMENT

First of all, if there any true believers out there who have dared to read this far, I must ask that you set aside any Pavlovian response you may have to what Jesus and Christianity are supposed to represent and let me state my case. Before I begin pointing out the stupidity and lies of the new testament, there are some things I would like to say. First, welcome to asymmetrical warfare. Obviously, more harm has been accomplished with smiles than weapons. From what I have shown you in the bible, and if you know anything about history, you know that things didn't work out too well militarily for the Jews. So what do you do if you can't accomplish what you want in one way? You try a different way. This is what humans are and do. We're pretty good at it. If as I said, we survive, this trait will outlast our current "politically correct" cult. As to how what Jesus represented could be considered asymmetrical warfare, you will be seeing by and by. But one thing that should be clear right now is that it has worked. Now apart from the Jesus thing, there are a couple other forms of asymmetrical warfare. Such as guerilla warfare and terrorism.

As for terrorism, I want you to imagine what the jet passengers felt when they were about to die on 9-11. Think for a moment how the people in the buildings must have felt when they were falling past the face of their buildings on the way to the ground. Knowing, KNOWING, that they were about to die horribly. The media didn't show these people falling very often. They didn't want to raise the racial ire of the American public. But it didn't work with me. You may not believe it right now, but if you are a Christian, you are indirectly responsible for what those people went through. For example, how much authority could Muslims feel

that Mohammed has if there were no Christians putting as much faith into Jesus. Sure, Jesus may have taken the carrot approach while Mohammed took the stick approach. But it doesn't really matter.

All religion, all religious faith is filth! Have you ever seen the movie "Human Centipede?" Well I would like to see Mohammed's lips sewn to Jesus' anus. Then I would like to see Jesus suck the maggots out of a putrefied male elephants urethra. If you think some of the things the old testament had to say were sick, wait till you get a load of what Jesus taught! Unfortunately, unlike the other prophets, whose own words were supposed to be written, here we have only second hand accounts of what Jesus supposedly said and did. Which will make it difficult to place the blame for what was said directly on him.

Not surprisingly, we run across a contradiction right from the start. In Matt. 1:1 it says:

"THE book of the generations of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham."

And all this time I've been told that he was the son of god. Well so much for that idea. Though maybe they figured that because his mother Mary was Jewish, being the son of god enabled him to use his maternal bloodline to claim

138

a paternal bloodline. Also, though they would have you believe otherwise, I don't think Jesus was any more the son of god than the rest of the Jewish men were supposed to be. As for the women, it doesn't surprise me that I had never seen anybody say anything about being a daughter of god. Considering the level of traditional and religiously justified maltreatment of women many of the lowlifes in that area of the world still exhibit.

Next, there is nothing around here that tells of anybody being told that Mary was impregnated by the holy ghost. But in Matt. 1:18, it says:

"Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found to be with child of the Holy Ghost."

First of all, espouse means to give in marriage. So somehow, somewhere between the marriage and the honeymoon, Mary was found to have been impregnated by the holy ghost. How did they figure that out. You would think that such an important detail would be worth telling another lie about. But with obedience to your master, what they call faith, being the most important aspect of what this and probably most other religions teach, it's no surprise that they would find such details unimportant. Also, there is the weird concept of the holy trinity. There is the father, god. The son, Jesus. And the holy ghost. So with the holy ghost impregnating Mary, that would seem to make it the father. But if the holy

ghost is the father, how can the father of the trinity be the father.

Jesus was supposedly fasting when he supposedly told the devil what this next paragraph says. So he may have had an excuse for saying something so stupid. In Matt. 4:4, it says:

“But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.”

I don't know where what he said was written. But one of the problems I have with it is who decides what it is that god says. Just because somebody says god said something is no reason to believe them. Also, let's set aside for now the other negative aspects of religion. Just considering some of the things that god had supposedly said, if your diet consists in part of what he said, you're not only mentally anemic, but also morally riddled with scurvy. Then let's consider the devil Jesus was supposedly speaking to here. With god supposedly being the cause of all evil, along with everything else that happens, isn't creating a devil a little redundant?

The statement Jesus made in this next paragraph is a little askew. In Matt. 5:22, it says:

“But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.”

So to call somebody raca will make you in danger of the council. Whatever that

is. But calling them a fool will put them in danger of hell fire. Which would seem to be even worse than being in danger of the council. But raca is something you call somebody in contempt. Which is worse than calling somebody a fool. Because we all act foolishly from time to time. And being called a fool leaves the path open for discussion as whether or not a foolish act was indeed foolish. But contempt is likely only to be responded to with contempt. So it was the person showing contempt that should have been in danger of hell fire. And the person calling somebody a fool should instead have been in danger of the council.

What this next paragraph had to say is excessively moralistic garbage. In Matt. 5:28, it says:

“But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.”

I am going to assume that Jesus was speaking of married men here. But as the old saying goes, “just because you're married doesn't mean you're dead.” Also, there's a big difference between thinking adulterous thoughts and acting on them. Another thing is that it's healthier for men and women to lust after each

other. As long as there is no overt display of misplaced or unwelcome desire. Any sort of mental lust is also likely to lessen the possibility of their lust turning toward some sexual perversion.

For another good example of bad advice, let's go to Matt. 5:30. It says:

“And if thy right hand offend thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members shall perish, and not that thy whole body shall be cast into hell.”

What I believe this is saying here is a parable. Which as you will be hearing more of later, I don't like. Now what I think he was trying to say here is that you should be willing to go to whatever extreme of penance is necessary to make up for a misdeed. Though I myself don't believe that if you are penitent to begin with, such extremes of penance would really be necessary. Also, it's likely that the regret for any offence would be felt because of its effect on others. To which a personal punishment isn't likely to do much good. So he would have been better off saying that they do restitution in some manner and in equal measure, on top of what they may normally do, to make up for any wrong that was done.

The teaching Jesus supposedly gave in this next paragraph is bordering on the “evil” category. In Matt. 5:40, it says:

“And if any man sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also.”

The purpose of any such action would likely be to make the person who sued them feel guilty for suing them. But if you deserve to be sued, the person suing you shouldn't be made to feel guilty for doing so. Maybe they could look at being sued as somebody cutting off an offence hand and casting from them, for them.

140

Then, a reinforcement of my assertion that such an action was meant to make the other person feel guilty can be found in Matt. 5:41. It says:

“And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain.”

Again, I would have to assume that the purpose of going farther than you are compelled to would be to make the person compelling you to do so feel guilty for compelling you to go any distance at all. Which isn't right. Also, what if the compeller is in the wrong. In such a case, going with them even one mile would be wrong. Because wickedness should always be fought. Though the way they would have you go about fighting it is stupid. One reason being that if you give a wicked person more than they ask for, they will be at least as likely to take advantage of you or somebody else again as they would be to feel guilty. You need to rely on more than a possible emotional guilt to keep them from doing the

same sort of thing again. Another thing is that the wicked probably have quite a number of philosophical justifications for doing the sorts of things they do. Which, though being stupid, may seem profound to them. Such as not wanting to be made a sucker by “taking it” without “giving some of it back.” Then you have to take into account the more insane justifications they may have for doing the things they do. Any guilt you could make them feel, especially by the means they suggest, would likely mean little in the face of such justifications.

Another example of Jesus being wrong can be found in Matt. 5:46. It says: “For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?”

What this seems to be saying is that the more you love, the better it is. But the way I see it is that if you spread your love around too thinly, it will become thin for everyone. Also, to the contrary of what he says, I would have to say that giving and receiving love from those close to you would be much more rewarding than doing so with a stranger.

Next, Jesus’s idea about giving alms doesn’t seem to be too helpful. In Matt. 6:3, it says:

“But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth:”

Now I don’t know how many different kinds of coins they used back then. But it seems that it would have been pretty difficult for them to give somebody alms without knowing how much they were giving them. Though if it could be done, it could work out well for the needy or not so well. As if their form of welfare back then wasn’t inconsistent enough for the poor bastards. Now being the son of god, you would think that Jesus could have come up with and promoted a better form of welfare than this. Which he probably could have if, like most if not all other religious leaders, he didn’t likely have more interest in people’s faith than interest in the people themselves. Though to be fair, the patriotic fervor secular leaders try to instill in their fellow citizens too often isn’t a lot better.

The views on the subject of forgiveness that the new testament teaches range

141

from misguided to outright evil. The first example from the new testament that I would like to comment on concerning this subject is in Matt. 6:14. It says:

“For if ye forgive men their trespass, your heavenly Father will also forgive you:”

The first thing I would like to say is that to forgive somebody so god can forgive you is a rather selfish reason for doing so. It would also have been nice if they told you here to what extent you should forgive others. Because as I said before, there is a place for forgiveness. But there are limits. Besides, most wrongdoers probably wouldn’t have committed the wrong acts that they did if they were



deserving of forgiveness. Another thing is that even the most wicked of people would probably like to be forgiven if they were held accountable for some misdeed. Which likely wouldn't do much good. Also, what they say could be used as a ploy by the wicked to be forgiven their crimes. That by openly forgiving somebody for their minor or infrequent crimes, they could seek forgiveness for their more severe or more frequent crimes. Though I wouldn't be interested in any forgiveness from the wicked anyway. Yet another thing is that though there are different levels to which somebody can be "forgiven," I would have to say that you should only forgive others if you think they are deserving of it.

Also, for some analogies on forgiveness, what if you always forgave a puppy for urinating on the floor instead of punishing it. How long do you think it would take for it to stop doing it. Or if you always forgave a child for doing something wrong instead of punishing it. Somebody else sooner or later would likely have to deal with their misbehavior. Etc. Giving out punishment instead of forgiveness may be a bitter pill to swallow, but you have to do what you have to do. Another thing is that if somebody has wronged you and you can't find it in yourself to forgive them, you should try and not let the anger of what they did eat away at you. Because it would likely do more harm to you or those around you than the offender. So if the law can't help you and you're not guilty of the same sorts of actions yourself, etc, I would recommend an appropriate revenge.

These next paragraphs tell a pretty poor story. But it is a little too lengthy to copy. So I'll just tell you what happens. In Matt. 8:28-32, it tells a story of Jesus coming across two people who are possessed by devils. Now these devils must have been gluttons for punishment. Because they ask that if they are to be cast out that they be put into a herd of swine. So with more regard for the devils than the poor innocent pigs, or their owners, Jesus puts these devils into the pigs. Then the whole herd runs down a steep embankment and drown. So what's the moral of this story. That you should never give a devil a break? Maybe it's that animals deserve no regard. Or maybe it's that a devil can fool even Jesus. Though maybe they were trying to teach that even Jesus can make a mistake. Just as god had apparently done in the past. Whatever they were trying to teach here, luckily I don't care.

142

In these next two paragraphs Jesus answers his disciples question as to why the Pharisees fast often and they don't. In Matt. 9:16-17, it says:  
"No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse.

Neither do men put new wine into old bottles: else the bottles break, and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish: but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved.”

First of all, I'm not going to go into the faulty aspects of these statements this time. But what I think he was trying to say here is that their new religion shouldn't be tied to old customs. Though what I really don't like here is the way he answered their question. Because if he had something to say, he should have just said it. He shouldn't have tried to make some sort of long winded word puzzle out of his answer.

One of the things this next paragraph says Jesus supposedly did was not only useless, but probably harmful. In Matt. 11:5, it says:

“The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them.”

Well most of the things this says Jesus supposedly did seems nice enough. But all the poor get is the gospel preached to them? Big deal! Now having been poor most of my life, I am as much of an expert on the subject as an observant American can be. From personal experience I know that it often means that you don't eat well; can't afford transportation; have inadequate places to live; (not counting the time that I had no place to live at all) have poor clothing; have trouble keeping clean; can't afford to date; are worthy only to associate with the often damaged people of your social status, etc. Neither did these things give me much desire to bring children into this world to share my plight. And knowing that there was a good chance that I would eventually be thrown in jail for doing so didn't help much either.

These things were made even worse by things being so bad that the average literate laborer like myself would have had trouble finding employment even as a slave. Then, back when they had welfare, the harassing harpies of the welfare system would grind any self respect you may have managed to salvage into the dirt. Even though they themselves were quite adept at the absorption of public funds. Believe me, I could go on and on about this subject. Not only about the problems of poverty, but more importantly about equitable and humane solutions to it. And I can guarantee you that preaching the gospel to people isn't one of them. Especially in a religion that is accepting of the concept of slavery. All preaching to people would likely do is make them more accepting of a bad situation that most probably don't deserve. So anybody who thinks that trying to get people involved into a fantasy world as a solution to poverty can suck it! And suck it hard!

From what this next paragraph says, heaven isn't a very good place to be. In Matt. 11:12, it says:

“And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force.”

I wonder what god was doing while his kingdom was being taken by force. Unless they meant that the kingdom of heaven was here on earth. Which doesn't make any sense. Now this violence means that either the entities in heaven or those who took it by force were screwed in the head. This too is a scatterbrained thing to teach. One reason being that with things like this going on even in heaven, it doesn't set a very good example for people here on earth. Also, any believers out there would be making a pretty poor assumption in thinking that the violent may turn out to be nice. So in the unlikely event that there is a heaven waiting for them, they shouldn't be too surprised if it doesn't turn out to be as nice as they hoped.

In an argument between Jesus and the Pharisees, they both surprisingly admit that Moses was lying. As you can see, in Matt. 19:7-8, it says:

“They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?

He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.”

Well from what I remember reading, Moses did very little, if any, commanding on his own. He supposedly only repeated the commands god told him to tell others. But the Pharisees didn't ask why god commanded Moses to say what he did. Neither did Jesus suggest that god was behind the law that Moses gave. They say Moses did it. Which would seem to make Moses out to be a liar. And if Moses was a liar, so was Jesus, the Pharisees, and anybody else who spread this “word of god.”

Moving on to the next paragraph, Jesus gives his views on divorce. In Matt. 19:9, it says:

“And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery.”

I'm glad that despite religious dogma, our morality has evolved since those days. I myself believe that people should be allowed to divorce if they feel the need to. Forcing people to stay together is no answer. Though for the health of the society which they themselves depend on, they should first think clearly about the commitment they intend to make and try to stick to it if they make that commitment. Also, look at some of the more politically barbaric and socially stagnant countries where some women go to the extreme of setting themselves on fire to get out of a bad marriage. (though I have only heard of this in arranged marriages) This is one reason why I say that if a man is able to “put away” his

wife, a wife should be able to “put away” her husband too.

144

Also, while we're on the subject of treating women badly, look at how women in Muslim countries are often treated. To me the only difference between a collar and leash and the coverings they often make their women wear (or brainwash them into wanting to wear) is that somebody has to hold on to a leash. Women deserve better than this. And as for the men, on the one hand, they probably love their mothers. But on the other hand, they must often look at them as such lowlifes that they need to be kept under strict control. I just can't see how anybody can hold such divergent feelings and still be sane. And the world could use less reasons for insanity. Now getting back to the subject at hand, it also says here that anybody who marries a woman who is “put away” commits adultery. But it is unrealistic to expect a woman who is “put away” for whatever reason to dig a hole and bury herself. Though the vast majority of women who are “put away” wouldn't be deserving of that fate anyway.

This next paragraph had Jesus repeating some scripture. In Matt. 22:32, it says:

“I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not a God of the dead, but of the living.”

What Jesus seemed to be getting at here is that there is life after death. Because with the people mentioned here being dead, if god is their god and he is a god of the living, then they must be living. But if there were some sort of existence after death, I think it is a bit of a stretch to call it life. So it would be stupid for anybody to throw away this life in hopes of living the kind of life we live here in some afterlife.

A small example of the afterlife that Jesus promoted can be found in Matt. 26:29. It says:

“But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.”

Now even though I don't know what it would be like to be a ghost, I find it difficult to believe that drinking ghost wine in a ghost world would be the same as drinking physical wine in our physical world.

How would you react if you were a Pharisee back in those days and you saw somebody's withered hand restored before your eyes on the sabbath. Well in Mark 3:5-6, it says:

“And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, he saith unto the man, Stretch forth thy hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored whole as the other.

And the Pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel with the Herodians

against him, how they might destroy him.”

Now the reason they were so mad at him was because he did this miracle on the sabbath. But I find it hard to believe that they would be more mad at him for performing this miracle on the sabbath than they would be impressed by the miracle itself. Also, if they were mad enough at Jesus for performing this miracle

on the sabbath that they would want to kill him for it, I find it hard to believe that they would go straightaway to plot against him on the sabbath. I am dubious about the whole story. Especially the miracle part.

This next paragraph asks a stupid question. In Mark 3:23, it says: “And he called unto them, and said unto them in parables, How can Satan cast out Satan?”

I should first tell you that the reason he said this was because of the supposed miracles he did, there was speculation that he could be the devil. So it asks here how satan can cast out satan. Well if such a creature existed, I can't see it having any trouble fooling people by misrepresenting itself and putting on a good show by appearing to cast out evil.

The writing in this next paragraph is even more terrible than usual. In Mark 11:11, it says:

“And Jesus entered into Jerusalem, and into the temple: and when he had looked round about upon all things, and now the eventide was come, he went unto Bethany with the twelve.”

So it says here that Jesus went into the temple and looked around. Then it jumps to saying that the even tide had come. Their statement would have been a little more coherent if they had only said that Jesus looked around “until” the even tide had come. Though to be fair, in copying this, somebody may just have accidentally left out some words.

Next, we're given an unlikely story about the crucifixion of Jesus. In Mark 15:37-39, it says:

“And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost.

And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom.

And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God.”

I would first like to say that Jesus must have given one hell of a yell to make the centurion think that he was the son of god. But they don't say that he yelled to any phenomenal degree. Nor do I think it would be impossible for him to yell loudly at what the centurion perceived to be the point of death. So from what is written here, I don't know what the centurion could have based such an assumption on. Now the lies Matthew told about the event were more exciting.

With the earthquakes, rocks being rent and the graves opening with many bodies of the saints rising. And the reason I call them lies, apart from the obvious ones, is that Mark would have had every reason to tell of these events also. But since he didn't, I have even more reason to doubt the whole story.

Part of what happened after Jesus supposedly rose from the dead is what this next paragraph talks about. In Mark 16:12, it says:

“After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.”

I have no doubt that what supposedly happened here would be explained as  
146

Jesus testing their faith or some such stupidity. But I would have to say that it is spectacularly stupid to tell people that you are going to raise from the dead and then appear in another form.

Jesus had a cousin named John the baptist. I find it suspicious that he too was in the prophet business. This next paragraph has him giving some rather strange advice to some soldiers. In Luke 3:14, it says:

“And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse any falsely; and be content with your wages.”

Well if these soldiers didn't do violence to people, they should be content with their wages. Seeing how they wouldn't be earning them. Though to be fair, he could have meant that they do no violence to men outside of duty. But if that is what he meant, that is what he should have said. Now there may be some out there who would say that doing no violence outside of duty was what he was inferring. But given the often excessively peaceful teachings of Christianity, you can't be too sure that he didn't mean that they should do no violence to people while they were on duty too. Also, I don't like his telling these soldiers that they should be content with their wages. Because it suggests that you should be too. Though given things like inflation and the greed of employers, the eventual result would likely be virtual slavery. Now as far as inflation goes, the best way to fight it and other unfortunate things is with an economic system that is based on stability and conservation. Not growth and waste.

Then as far as the greed of the rich goes, you have to take into account that they are as greedy as anybody else. If not more so. Despite having more to begin with. To rearrange an old saying, “They've got most of the bread, but they want cake. There's no end to what they'll take.” Which is unfortunate. Though generally speaking, there's nothing wrong with being rich. I just feel that commanding a larger share of resources than others, or the time of workers, should result from performing a proportionally difficult and valuable service to

mankind. On this matter, I saw something unfortunate about a taxi driver in Moscow once. He was a physicist. If I remember correctly, he drove a taxi not because he was unemployed, but because he could make more money as a taxi driver. Even though being a physicist to me is more useful to mankind than being a taxi driver is. Apparently being content with his wages didn't seem to be a very good idea.

Coincidentally, the rich are one of the kinds of people Jesus spoke of in these next few paragraphs. In Luke 6:24-26, it says:

“But woe unto you that are rich! For ye have received your consolation.

Woe unto you that are full! For ye shall hunger. Woe unto you that laugh now! For ye shall mourn and weep.

Woe unto you when all men shall speak well of you! For so did their fathers unto the false prophets.”

147

Here he first speaks poorly of the rich. Suggesting that they won't go to heaven. But there's always the chance that they deserve the things they have because of fair dealings and hard work. There's nothing wrong with that. Then he tells those who are full that they will hunger. But there's nothing wrong with having food. It sure beats being hungry. Besides, I would rather be full now rather than take a chance on believing the crap that Jesus spread and be hungry now. Another thing is that striving for a comfortable living isn't easy. So generally speaking, I see nothing wrong with succeeding in it. It then says woe unto you that laugh now. Suggesting that you will mourn and weep in the afterlife if you do. But as long as merriment isn't excessive or out of line, again I see nothing wrong with it.

Then it says woe unto you if people speak well of you because they did likewise with the false prophets. (as if there were any other kind!) But the danger of flattery aside, it would be better if people had reason to speak well of you rather than ill of you. Besides, the prophets most likely purposefully sought praise. Now the main thing Jesus was likely getting at with all this is that the miserable are more likely to get into heaven than anybody else. Which unfortunately is a pretty useful message for a slaveholder to give to his slaves. Though I say that heaven doesn't matter. It's your lives here on earth that count. Any "heaven" can take care of itself. Also, just because the miserable are more likely to worship is a pretty poor reason to make people accepting of being that way. Another thing is that with all the trials and tribulations that people have to go through to survive, trying to get them to be accepting of a bad situation isn't being very helpful. Because it could cause them to be less likely to try and change the things that are troubling them.

Something that Jesus had supposedly said earlier has changed in this next paragraph. In Luke 6:29, it says:

“And unto him that smiteth thee on one cheek offer also the other; and him that taketh away thy cloke forbid not to take thy coat also.”

The first thing I would like to mention here is that they say that you shouldn't forbid somebody to take your coat. So it would have made more sense for him to say that if somebody smites you on the one cheek, you shouldn't forbid them to smite you on the other cheek as well. Instead of offering them the other cheek to strike. Now it's true that if a dog is attacking you, it is more likely more to keep doing so if you offer resistance. But I say you should still act like a man. There may be times when your personal honor may not be worth dying for. But it is always worth fighting for. Now the part that has changed here is that, apart from the bit about being sued, is that earlier you were told that if somebody took your coat you should give them your cloak also. Though it says here that if somebody takes your cloak you should simply not forbid them from taking your coat also. Well at least that beats giving them one of your garments without their asking for it. But though this teaching has improved, it is still stupid.

148

Continuing from their last paragraph, this next paragraph seems to delve into the realm of charity. In Luke 6:30, it says:

“Give to every man that asketh of thee; and of him that taketh away thy goods ask them not again.”

I would first like to say that there's nothing wrong with giving to people who need help. But there has to be a limit. If too many people ask for your charity or if what they ask for is too great and it effects what you think should be your fair standard of living, you should consider limiting your charity or just saying no. Then it says that you shouldn't ask again those who take away your goods. Ask them not what again. To take away your goods? Well chances are that you wouldn't have asked them to take away your goods to begin with. Or they could mean that you shouldn't ask them to come back for more. Which doesn't seem very likely to happen either. So the whole thing seems silly to me.

Moving on to the next paragraph is a teaching that, generally speaking, is good. But it can be improved upon. In Luke 6:31, it says:

“And as ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also to them likewise.”

Or in other words, do unto others as you would have others do unto you. Which from what I have heard is something that Buddah said even before Jesus. But they were both off the mark. Because what if, for instance, somebody liked other people having sex with their wife or children. What they say could justify such a person having sex with somebody else's wife or children. Or what if you were



the type of lowlife who liked to start fights with other people and didn't mind if other people started fights with you. What they say could cause such a person to justify their starting fights with other people who most likely didn't share the same casual attitude toward fighting. Etc. So I say that you should try as much as possible to treat others the way they would like to be treated. As long as it is good and honorable. If nothing else works, use your intuition and let them, not you, be the judge of how they should be treated. Barring things like causes for war or a guilty person's punishment of course.

Moving on to the next two paragraphs is a bit of a different retelling of something stupid that the bible said earlier. In Luke 6:32-33, it says:

"For if ye love them which love you, what thank have ye? for sinners also love those that love them.

And if ye do good to them which do good to you, what thank have ye? for sinners also do even the same."

Here they ask what thanks you get by loving those who love you. But it's highly unlikely that you would even expect thanks for loving those who love you. Because, being much better than thanks, the love itself would be thanks enough. Though even if you did receive thanks from a stranger for loving them, it would still mean little compared to the unnecessary thanks of loving those who love you. Also, some people could be sleazebags and undeserving of such affection. And for all you know, some others could be outright evil. Now as I said before,  
149

the only thing people should expect and get from each other is politeness, consideration and fair play. But despite the improbable situation of everybody loving each other, it would still be more satisfying to love those who love you. Because it is just natural that you would have more affection toward somebody that you are more familiar with.

There are other aspects to this loving strangers stuff that makes it all rather stupid. For one, you probably remember the bible talking about there being conflict in heaven. Whatever that was all about. Then there is the conflict between god and satan. So if the kind of love they promote can't be found in the afterlife; in heaven; amongst angels; between god and satan or whatever, what makes them think that the kind of love they promote is possible here on earth. All of this pretty much goes for doing good to those who do good to you. They also bring up what sinners do in these situations. Well sinners also breathe, eat and defecate the same as we do. But that doesn't mean that we have to do those things better than sinners either. The only thing we need to do better than sinners is refrain from committing sins.

What I think this next paragraph says is a parable about the bible. And not

surprisingly, it is completely wrong. In Luke 6:43, it says:

“For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit.”

Well if this “good tree” is a parable of the bible, by the time you get through reading my critique of it, you won’t have seen anywhere near all of the “corrupt fruit” in it. Also, despite what this says here, being the corrupt tree that the bible is and other religious documents most likely are, they still manage to bring forth “good fruit” from time to time.

In this next paragraph, Jesus gives a poor example for the even poorer idea that god will provide for your needs. In Luke 12:24, it says:

“Consider the ravens: for they neither sow nor reap; which neither have storehouse or barn; and God feedeth them: how much more are ye better than the fowls?”

First of all, some birds do store food. Which could be compared to a storehouse or barn. So that argument falls flat. But the main point that I wanted to make is that god doesn’t feed the ravens. It’s the ravens who feed themselves. Also, even though it’s Jesus’s disciples being spoken of here, just because ravens find food where they can doesn’t mean that you should leave your sustenance to fate also. Because despite our barns and warehouses, there are times when people still have trouble finding food. So Jesus’s disciples should have concerned themselves more with producing rather than being provided for. As should the rest of us.

For more of Jesus’s confused logic, let’s go to Luke 12:27. It says:

“Consider the lilies how they grow: they toil not, they spin not; and yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.”

150

So before you were told that you were better than the fowls. But here you are told that even Solomon in all his glory couldn’t compare to a lily. There’s decisive thinking for you. Though despite the supposed superiority of the lilies, I say it’s no excuse for people to not try and provide for themselves.

Continuing this faulty line of reasoning, in Luke 12:28, it says:

“If God then so clothe the grass which is to day in the field, and to morrow is cast into the oven; how much more will he clothe you, O ye of little faith.”

Well here’s your answer, O ye of little brains. Blades of grass don’t wear clothes. And anything they have that can be taken for clothing they grow. Just as we do. But we have the ability to create extra covering. Which is another thing we should be concerned with providing for ourselves. Now as to what god might provide. In the extraordinarily unlikely event that such a thing even existed, compared to what the grass receives, anything would be an

improvement.

Though I don't know much about shepherding, what this next paragraph says doesn't seem like something a shepherd would do. In Luke 15:4, it says:

"What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which was lost, until he find it?"

I could see a shepherd looking nearby for a lost sheep. But it seems to me that leaving a flock unattended for very long could leave them open to attack by wild animals. Or otherwise become alarmed and run off or be scattered. Also, with all the references toward people as cattle, flocks or whatever in the bible, they may as well have come up with a new word to describe people. My brother came up with a good one. Sheeple. Though through the efforts of the religious and all of those who have a vested interest in getting people to think of themselves as sheep, the reason why they try to make being humans synonymous with being sheep is plain enough to see. Which is bad for many reasons. One being that people don't need shepherds. We have laws to fill that role. Which as you know aren't always good. That is why we do need leaders. But with most leaders coming about through the efforts of people who have an interest in treating people like cattle, all you're likely to get are shepherds. And if you are having any difficulty making a distinction between shepherds and leaders, I can help. To me a leader is somebody whose chief concern is to perform the will of the majority of the people. Or do what is in their best interests. A shepherd's chief concern is himself. His "flock" is only a means to that end.

Part of what this next paragraph says doesn't make much sense to me. In Luke 16:12, it says:

"And if ye are not faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own?"

Here it talks of being given that which is your own. So how can anybody give

151

you what is yours. Because it is yours. It isn't anybody else's to give. Now in a convoluted way they could be saying that having been found to be unfaithful, others are unlikely to give you things to possess. But if that is what they meant, that is what they should have said.

What Jesus said in this next paragraph is pretty rotten. In Luke 19:26, it says: "For I say unto you, That unto every one which hath shall be given; and from him that hath not, even that he hath shall be taken away from him."

From what I can tell from the preceding statements to this one, what he says here is every bit as bad as it seems. So Jesus was no Robin Hood. Now I myself would suggest something different. Like taking some from those who

have plenty and providing it to those who have little. As long as they are deserving. Or that they don't add to what caused their poverty.

Next, we have an unlikely story. In Luke 22:3, it says:

"Then entered Satan into Judas surnamed Iscariot, being of the number of the twelve."

I would first like to say that as with the god they speak of, it is highly unlikely that there is a satan. Let alone that such a thing entered into Judas and used him like a meat puppet. Also, this again brings up the sickening teaching that evil is somehow necessary. Because if god didn't think that evil was somehow necessary, surely he wouldn't let satan even exist. Let alone do the bad things he is supposed to do.

For more of the bible's stupefaction, let's go to Luke 22:22. It says:

"And truly the Son of man goeth, as it was determined: but woe unto that man by whom he is betrayed!"

First of all, it again calls Jesus, who was supposed to be the son of god, the son of man here. Which should at least cast some doubt among believers on the whole son of god thing. Another thing is that if it was satan entering into Judas that caused him to betray Jesus, why do they make it sound like Judas was entirely at fault. Or are you supposed to believe that even though satan entered into Judas, that he still had control over his own will. Also, even if the supposed fallen angel they call satan just pushed this mortal man over the edge into an act of betrayal, shouldn't that be cause for at least some of the predicted woe to be lifted off him?

What this next paragraph had to say seems to be a little out of character for the supposed prince of peace. In Luke 22:36, it says:

"Then he said unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one."

From most of the things I've seen in the new testament, Jesus was really into the idea of forgiveness. So it seems strange that he would want weapons. Maybe with it being his butt on the line, his perspective changed a little. At least

152

for a short time. Though being the son of god, you would think that he would have had a little more resolve in the things he taught.

These next two paragraphs supposedly relate what one of the people being crucified with Jesus said to him and Jesus's response. In Luke 23:42-43, it says:

"And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.

And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, to day thou shalt be with me in paradise.”

Maybe we're just being given the condensed version of what supposedly happened here. But from what was written, I don't see why this guy should go to heaven. It didn't say anything about him wanting forgiveness. For all you know, he could have only been sorry that he got caught and ended up there. Neither does his being crucified mean that he earned forgiveness. Because anybody can be killed. And his being killed was probably more about punishment than earning forgiveness. So from the way this is written, it gives the impression that all you need to gain forgiveness is to acknowledge Jesus as your lord. But I know that there is more to gaining forgiveness than that. Acknowledging Jesus as your lord doesn't mean that you have earned or deserve the right to go to heaven. If such a place even exists.

There are a few bad things about what this next paragraph had to say. In John 1:29, it says:

“The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.”

And all this time I thought Jesus was supposed to be the son of god. Not the lamb of god. And as it turns out, a sacrificial lamb at that. Also, why call him a lamb. Why not a sheep? They may be cuter than a sheep, but the most likely reason is that they were trying to sell people on the demeaning nature of being a lamb. Another thing is that there is something worse than being even a sheep. As I mentioned before, it's being the sheep of a sheep. Then it says that Jesus will take away the sins of the world. Which he couldn't do. Only the victim of a crime or a legal entity acting on their behalf have any hope of relieving a wrongdoer of responsibility for their sins. And forgiveness out of hand isn't the most likely way it can be done. It is most likely to be gained through asking for it, reparations or punishment. Gaining forgiveness through these things would also help keep any similar wrong from happening again.

Apart from being confusing, this next paragraph also had something senseless to say. In John 3:13, it says:

“And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven.”

Well first you're told that nobody had gone to heaven except for those who may have come down from there. So does this mean that nobody on earth had gone to heaven? Or can you assume that with everybody having supposedly been

153

created by god, you have all in a sense came down from heaven. It's hard to say, or care. I could go on. But there isn't much sense in debating this stupidity.

Then, when it speaks of the son of man here, they are of course talking about Jesus. But at this point in John's story, Jesus is still on the earth. Yet it says here that the son of man, Jesus, is in heaven. So how can he be on earth and in heaven at the same time. Even if you want to consider him to be part of some sort of all in one holy trinity of god, the son of whatever part is still on the earth. Now if there is any sort of sense to be made of all this, I hope I never have to hear about it.

Next is the fourth version of an event that is mentioned in the new testament. In this and in one other version of this event, they mention Jesus walking on water. Which makes the story even more unlikely. Because you would think that if it happened, everybody who saw it would have mentioned such a miracle. Now in this version of the story, Jesus supposedly walked on water during a storm to a ship his disciples were on. But John has quite a story to tell about what he says happened when Jesus came aboard their boat. In John 6:21, it says:

"Then they willingly received him into the ship: and immediately the ship was at the land whither they went."

This is the first time I've heard about the boat being instantly transported to their destination. So why didn't any of the other disciples mention such an impressive miracle? To me, the answer is that the story was a load of crap. What I think was going on here was that John was just trying to prove that could be as big of a liar as the rest of them. Also, let's consider all of the prophets, mortal gods or whatever who were like Jesus. Those who came before him or were alive during his time. Along with all those who were likely to follow him. In the realm of lying, I would say that Jesus and his followers were a pretty tough act to beat. Another thing is that as far as this walking on water thing goes, I wish he would have said how rough the storm had made the waves. Because it would have helped me visualize what happened. Did he walk up one side of a wave and down the other side? Or if the waves were smaller, did he step from one wave crest to the other? Though if the waves were smaller yet, did his feet simply plow through them? Whatever the case, walking on wavy water would be pretty tricky. It would have probably been easier to simply float above it. According to this next paragraph, it would seem that believing in god didn't do the Jews much good. Because in John 6:58, it says:

"This is the bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."

This eating bread thing is supposed to represent accepting Jesus as your lord. But after all the things god put the Jews through before Jesus came along, denying them equal treatment doesn't seem very fair. In fact, the word "sucker" comes to mind. To which I would like to rearrange an old saying. "If you make a sucker out of me, shame on you. If I choose to remain a sucker, shame on me."

Not that those who came before Jesus were any bigger suckers than those who believe in him. Also, Jesus said earlier that god wasn't a god of the dead, but of the living. Suggesting that the dead were in some way still alive. But here he says they are dead. If anybody out there has an explanation to this contradiction, knowing how stupid it is likely to be, I hope I never have to hear it. Now as I said before, lies may be comforting at times. But they are still lies. And the more out of touch with reality they are, the more harmful to reality they are. So if you can't handle the reality of this world, you seriously need to grow up. Because the world is far beyond being able to absorb your stupidity. I would also like to say that the fate of the stupid doesn't bother me anywhere near as much as the fate of those they drag down with them.

This next paragraph seems to show Jesus saying something good. But it is about as untrue as any statement he could make can be. In John 8:32, it says: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

The truth they speak of here is the truth as they would like you to see it. Which far too often is not only delusional, but evil. They say here that this "truth" will set you free. But the "freedom" they speak of is the same kind of freedom experienced by sheep, flocks, lambs and even "calves of the stall." It is also the same kind of truth that is meant to be accepted by slaves, eunuchs, etc. Though he and anybody like him can take that kind of truth or freedom and stick it so far up their ass they would need a dentist to see the other end of it. Now as an average human, I may not always be exactly right in deciding what is true at any given point in time. But I do know what is true where it matters most. And I know it is what goes on outside your brain that matters most. For instance, if somebody stuck a knife in you, the reality of the knife would be more important than any acceptance you could be talked into about its being there.

Moving on to the following paragraph, it shows the Pharisees demonstrating their ability to tell lies also. In John 8:33, it says:

"They answered him, We be of Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free?"

First of all, I can't be too sure what was going on in their puny little brains. But I don't see what being of abraham's seed has to do with anything. And from the Jewish history that I have read about in the bible, or heard about elsewhere, they had been in bondage many times as a people. Also, these Pharisees may not have been actual slaves as they understood the practice. But at the time this was written, their country was being occupied by and they were paying tribute to the Romans. I would call that at least some sort of bondage.

In John 8:51, is a good example of a straightforward lie. It says:

"Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he shall never see

death.”

It's too bad for the likely few believers out there who may actually be reading this that I have to call Jesus a liar, again. Because people who keep his saying  
155

always have and still do “see death.” And sometimes in a slow and gruesome manner. Sure, it's possible that there is some sort of existence after death. But I can guarantee you that you will “see death” before you get there.

With all of the lies and other unfortunate things that Jesus taught, it's no surprise that he also liked to be confusing. An example of which is in John 11:8 - 10. It says:

“His disciples say unto him, Master, the Jews of late sought to stone thee; and goest thou thither again?

Jesus answered, Are there not twelve hours in the day? If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world.

But if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him.”

First, Jesus was getting ready here to go and supposedly raise somebody from the dead. So when he spoke of the light of this world here, he was likely speaking of himself. Also, the person having no light in him was likely the dead person he was going to bring back to life. But I don't really see what his addlebrained answer had to do with his running the risk of being stoned. Another thing is that as with Jesus's answer here or his use of parables in general, it is hard to say what is worse, a liar, or somebody who won't give you a straight answer. Though since Jesus did both, in his case, he was worse than either on their own.

Not surprisingly, this next paragraph shows Jesus being more concern for himself than the poor. In John 12:8, it says:

“For the poor always have ye with you; but me ye have not always.”

Setting aside the part about Jesus here, I have to say that I don't like his attitude that the poor are an inescapable fact of life. Sure, there will always be some who have more than others. But poverty is another matter. And seeing how he brought the subject up, it would have been nice if he had at least made some sort of negative comment on the condition. Though when the bible doesn't say anything against making people slaves, making it an acceptable alternative to poverty, what would you expect. Though I should say that these people weren't the only ones guilty of such behavior. I remember hearing of instances in the past where people not only sold their children to be slaves, but eunuchs as well. The bible also promotes poverty in many other ways. Such as by promoting the ideals of ignorance. Or by offering preaching as a solution to the troubles of the poor. Helping people avoid accountability and responsibility for



their actions would also likely have poverty as one of its negative results. But even worse is the bible's promotion of ecological destruction and overpopulation. So to end poverty, the importance of putting an end to religion cannot be underestimated.

Now because of my familiarity with poverty, there are some other things that I would like to say about the condition. The first being that a government's duty toward the poor should extend farther than waving a flag at them. Also, look at  
156

some of the things governments do. They tax you; brainwash you; allow corruption; burden you with intricate laws which are usually written for the benefit of the rich and powerful; tell you where and when you must fight and control you in every conceivable manner. Often with the help of religion. With governments doing all these things, to varying degrees of severity, they should also assume responsibility for the fair survival needs of the poor. Besides, as I have just shown, it isn't always the fault of the poor that they are poor. Unfortunately the strife that often arises as a result of poverty adds to a government's or a business' justification to treat people in any unseemly manner that they may wish to. It also promotes some people's need for the comfort of religion.

Also unfortunate is the fact that governments often find the poor more useful as cheap sources of labor or somebody for the rich to feel superior to than they do as consumers. Take for example the United States. Which to me has come to mean little more than a corporate logo. It has allowed way too many manufacturing jobs to go overseas to countries where labor is cheap and environmental standards are much more lax. (I will be talking more about this topic later in this book) Basically, sending jobs overseas is just a new form of slavery. Yet compared to much of the rest of the world, the poor here simply aren't poor enough. This is one way that somebody can work so hard in other countries to become an engineer or doctor and be more satisfied with what they have. As compared to what somebody in the U.S. would be satisfied with who worked in the same profession. The poor in other countries have it so much worse, it gives somebody working in some profession to feel superior to and be more satisfied.

So as I said before, to help increase that kind of poverty here, the U.S. does virtually nothing effective to stop illegal immigration. The U.S. also brings in millions of legal cheap foreign scabs to help take a big shit on the American worker. Though this in turn contributes to the U.S. having to pay whatever it must to jail, often repeatedly, many hundreds of thousands of people. Under the circumstances I've just listed, I have to wonder how deserving many of those people are to be treated badly. It would also help put an end to poverty to first

understand what wealth is. Apart from self restraint, health or the environment, to me the most valuable things would be food, shelter, physical labor and academic ability. Then, looking at how this government still operates while it is under trillions of dollars of debt, I would have to say that monetary wealth is largely an illusion. So I don't see a very large impediment to a more fair distribution of wealth. Though don't get me wrong. Some people really deserve to be poor. I am also in favor of those who work hard to proportionally have more than those who do not.

But to actually change all that is wrong is not a job I would relish. Because such a job would likely take a dictator. And most people would rather continue to embrace corruption and see the whole armageddon-rapture scenario play out

157

instead of having a strong leader actually restructure society. They would prefer the same "trickle down theory" of economics that most of even the worst despotic regimes have used. Like it or not, our capitalist, consumer driven economy is a disease. Though it isn't completely bad. It just needs to be changed. How to do so would require me to write another book. Which I don't intend to do. But I will tell you that things are so screwed up, (maybe on purpose, maybe not) that it would be difficult for the average person to accept. It would require throwing away the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Then replace it with something like "The Articles of Evolution." There are good elements to be taken from democracy; fascism; conservatism, liberalism; communism, free enterprise and socialism. Even for religious cults, I remember hearing some rules of one of them. I don't remember what they were, but I do remember that one or two of them seemed to be pretty good ideas.

Not to compare the two, I have heard of some laws that they have in various European countries that have been proven to work. But we don't use them here. For an example of what can be done, take the government-religion of the ancient Pharaohs. Not that I am advocating that form of government, but look at the kind of effort it took to build the pyramids or some of their massive temples. What if a smaller level of that kind of effort was redirected toward improving the living conditions of not only the poor, but the wealthy too. If they also put some effort into doing things like avoiding becoming jaded, their lives would have been much better. There is also another thing to be taken into account when it comes to improving the lives of people. It concerns the ancient Chinese. They possessed some fairly sophisticated knowledge for their time. But without any use for it by the common man being encouraged, it didn't turn out to be very useful. So including as many people in the supply and demand of whatever technologies are available, without making gluttons out of consumers or doing unacceptable

damage to the environment, is something that should be strived for.

Now to get back to the main point of this book. This next paragraph told of a voice coming from heaven to Jesus. In John 12:28, it says:

“Father, glorify thy name. Then came a voice from heaven, saying, I have both glorified it, and will glorify it again.”

When this supposedly happened, there were other people by Jesus who heard it also. Some even saying that it thundered. Now I would have to imagine that the disciples were among those other people. But among other reasons, I find it easier to believe that this event never happened rather than that only John would have mentioned such a monumental event.

There was a pretty stupid distinction made in these next two paragraphs. In John 12:47-48, it says:

“And if any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world.

158

He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same will judge him in the last day.”

Here he said that he would not judge those who do not believe his words. But then he says his words will judge them. Which is stupid because if your words judge somebody, then you judge somebody. What he says is like calling somebody an idiot and telling them that you didn't call them an idiot, your words did. Also, if somebody went up to him and told him that they thought he was wrong, but he disagreed, it would likely be because he “judged” them to be wrong.

The next little story of theirs seems quite unlikely. To set this story up, Jesus was telling his disciples that one of them was going to betray him. Of course, they wanted to know who the rat was. So Jesus told them that the one who he handed the “sop” to would be the betrayer. He then handed it to Judas. Jesus then told him to go do what he must do quickly. Then in John 13:28, it says:

“Now no man at the table knew for what intent he spake thus unto him.”

Well Jesus just got through telling them how he was going to identify the betrayer and then did it. He even gave them the added hint of telling Judas to go do what he must do quickly. But the others still couldn't figure out that it was Judas who was the betrayer? I find that hard to believe.

Let's see what we can find wrong with this next paragraph. In John 14:2, it says:

“In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.”

First of all, he said that there were many mansions in his father's house. But how can there be mansions in a house. This sounds like it could develop into one of those arguments like how many angels can dance on the head of a pin. Or as I would rather put it, how many angels can dance in the head of a pinhead. Now if these mansions were what I would consider to be mansions, they would be quite nice. Because these ghost mansions would probably have many bathrooms so you wouldn't have to go very far to excrete ghost waste. They would probably be supplied with a good quality ghost toilet paper and have a nice ghost shower to wash off the ghost sweat and dirt. Afterward, you could relax with a good quality ghost beer. Which had been ghost brewed with the finest ghost grains and ghost yeast. You might even watch a ghost movie through your ghost entertainment center. Etc. All of this sounds nice, but I wouldn't hold my breath waiting for it.

Then he said that if there were no mansions, he would have told them so. But somehow I find that impossible to believe. He then said that he was going to prepare a place for them. But there were supposedly mansions already there. So what was there for him to prepare. Also, though I would prefer not telling you what is to come later, I don't think it would do much harm this one time. Which is that later you will be seeing that this afterlife they speak of isn't supposed to

159

come about until the revelation. That is, the end of the world. So hopefully this means that believers will have many billions of years in limbo to wait before they can move into their mansions. Unfortunately there are many sick fucks out there who would like to see the end of the world come about just so they can go straight to heaven. Probably the worst of the many bad aspects of which is that it doesn't incline them much to keep their actions from causing such a thing to come about.

There's some good misrepresentation of the facts to be found in this next paragraph. In John 15:22, it says:

"If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not seen sin: but now they have no cloke for their sin."

Well I would say that people back then were doing a damn good job at sinning before he came along. So they had indeed seen sin. Neither did anything Jesus may have said have to do with whether or not those sins were sins. Then he says that since he came along, they no longer had a cloak for their sins. Which I take to mean having ignorance as an excuse. But they weren't that ignorant. Now as to how the Jews may have viewed sin from a cultural point of view is hard to say. But since civil laws came about in other civilizations in the area long before Jesus's time shows that they at least probably had some understanding of

the topic.

Apart from being excessively stupid, their next paragraph shows Jesus doing some wishful thinking. In John 16:33, it says:

“These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye might have peace. In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.”

First of all, the only way to be of good cheer while suffering tribulation is to ignore, deny, give in to or enjoy what is causing you trouble. But none of these things is a satisfactory way of dealing with trouble. Then Jesus said that he had overcome the world. Well maybe he did in his own mind. But that is the only place. Besides, his having been beaten and nailed to a cross only shows that the world overcame him. And even if he knew that he was supposedly going to raise from the dead, that would only mean that he himself was going to overcome physical death. If only for a short time. It wouldn't prove that he overcame the world. Also, look at the number of his followers. Or the overall philosophy that he taught, that was probably largely of his own invention. From those things, I would say he didn't overcome the world in that way either.

After Jesus's betrayal, all of the mentioned apostles tell differing versions of the same story. In John's version, he gives the story a little more zest. In John 18:5-6, it says:

“They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus said unto them, I am he. And Judas also, which betrayed him, stood with them.

As soon then as he said unto them, I am he, they went backward, and fell to the ground.”

160

Now we have this new story of those who came to arrest Jesus being knocked backwards and falling down. But seeing how none of the other apostles mentioned it, I would have to doubt even more than usual that such a thing ever happened. Also, I guess you're just supposed to decide what lies are the most appealing to you.

During Jesus's crucifixion, this next paragraph speaks of what some soldiers decide to do with a piece of Jesus's clothing. In John 19:24, it says:

“They said therefore among themselves, Let us not rend it, but cast lots for it, whose it shall be: that the scripture might be fulfilled, which saith, They parted my raiment among them, and for my vesture they did cast lots. These things therefore the soldiers did.”

First of all, I am going to assume that these soldiers were Roman soldiers. So I would have to doubt they would have any knowledge of or interest in Jewish scripture. Neither would it be very likely that they would be interested in legitimizing one of their prophets even if they did have any knowledge of their

scriptures. Now it's possible that some knowledgeable soldiers may have wished to disrupt the Hebrew faith by fulfilling such scripture. But this is only speculation.

I told you how the apostles had differing versions of what happened after Jesus's betrayal. Well among other things, the same things happens with accounts of what happened after his burial. For John's version, lets go to John 20:12. It says:

"And seeth two angels in white sitting, one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain."

In Matthew's version of the story, an angel in white with a countenance like lightening came down from heaven after an earthquake and rolled back a stone that sealed Jesus's tomb. Then in Mark's version, an angel that looked like a young man clothed in white was sitting in the right hand side of the tomb. Though in Luke's version of the story, some people went into the tomb and found it empty. But as they stood there contemplating the situation, they noticed two angels in shining garments standing by them. So from the differences in their stories, I would have to assume that they were all lying. To what degree is for you to decide. Though at least they can be given some credit. Because it would have been easy for them to have gotten together and decide on one single lie to tell others. So at least they were honest in their dishonesty.

What this next paragraph had to say seems a little overblown. In Acts 2:5, it says:

"And there were dwelling in Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven."

It said here that there were Jews in Jerusalem from every nation under heaven. But I doubt if there were any Jews there from Mongolia, Japan, Norway, etc. Let

161

alone any of the nations of the western hemisphere. So I would have to doubt their claim.

This next paragraph was part of an unlikely and unwholesome story about a man and his wife who sold some land. They kept part of the money they got from the sale for themselves without telling a religious figure named Peter what they did. After Peter found out what happened, in Acts 5:4, it says:

"Whiles it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine power? why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God."

First of all, Peter suggests here that after these people sold their property that the property was still under their control. But usually when you sell something it

is no longer “in your power.” Even being made caretakers wouldn’t give them the authority of ownership. So Peter was wrong in his assumption. Then, in not telling Peter that they had kept part of the sale price for themselves, Peter basically said that they didn’t lie to him, but to god. To which I say bullshit! Though he and people like him may like to think so, lying to them isn’t the same as lying to god. It sickens me when people give themselves such authority.

Now after hearing the words Peter spoke here, the husband supposedly fell down dead. A similar fate awaited his wife a few hours later. Which seems a little harsh to me for simply not being as generous as they had promised to be. Also, after all this, what this next paragraph has to say seems rather hypocritical. In Acts 5:31, it says:

“Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.”

Well I’m sure that the man and wife who kept part of the profit from selling what they owned would have liked a little forgiveness. And seeing how they didn’t have to pledge to give Peter any money at all to begin with, a little forgiveness wouldn’t have been out of line. Though maybe forgiveness doesn’t extend to partial lies to “holy men.” So when they speak of forgiveness of sins, it would seem that you shouldn’t count on it.

Next is the third retelling of what supposedly happened when the spirit of Jesus supposedly appeared to a person named Paul. First they said that the people who were with Paul heard a voice but saw no man. Then later it said that they saw a light, but heard no voice. To me, the reason the story had changed was likely because the whole story was a bunch of crap. And then, strangely enough, it is only in this third retelling that he finally gets around to telling what the spirit of Jesus said. Part of which is in Acts 26:18. It says:

“To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.”

Being of highly questionable veracity isn’t all that is wrong with what Jesus supposedly said here. His ideas on forgiveness are something that I can’t agree  
162

with. Because to me, there is much more to obtaining forgiveness than asking some dusty old dead prophet for it. Another thing it says here that I don’t like is when it talks of the power of satan. Now as I said before, it’s possible that ghosts do exist. And belief in a creature like satan could also cause it to exist in some ghostly manner. But an even greater power in this world would be whatever power people imagine it to have. Which is one good reason not to do as Jesus taught and believe in such a creature. Also, for reasons I have already

mentioned and have yet to mention, it would also be a bad idea to believe in things like god or the spirit of Jesus. Then, as far as this good god-bad god situation goes, I can see why they would want to promote such a thing. Which would be to scare you into god's camp. It should be no surprise to you that people seeking followers would leave no stone unturned in looking for ways in which to obtain them.

Now the reason Paul finally got around to telling what Jesus supposedly said was because he was appealing to the Romans. To be tried by them instead of the Jews. Because the Jews would likely have found him guilty no matter what he said. These next two paragraphs speak of two Romans considering his appeal. In Acts 26:31-32, it says:

“And when they were gone aside, they talked between themselves, saying, This man doeth nothing worthy of death or bonds.

Then said Agrippa unto Festus, This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Caesar.”

Here they say that he didn't do anything worthy of death or bondage. Acknowledging that if he had been tried by the Jews, he would have received one of those two punishments. Then they suggest that he might have been set free if he had been tried by the Jews instead of them. Which doesn't make any sense. Because they just got through saying that he was looking at death or imprisonment at the Jew's hands. Though by saying that he might have been set at liberty if he had not appealed to Caesar, what they say could also be interpreted as meaning that since he did appeal to Caesar, he will not be set free. Which also makes no sense because his whole reason for appealing to Caesar was because they were unlikely to find him guilty of anything. As their saying that he did nothing worthy of death or bonds shows. So as far as I am concerned, this whole story is just a big joke. Just as religion in general is. Which is too bad. Because to rearrange an old saying, “the bigger the joke, the harder the fall.”

Even greater senselessness can be found in Rom. 1:17. It says:

“For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith.”

When they say from faith to faith here, what I would have to assume they mean is from religion to religion. So when they say here that the righteousness of god or the justness of the faithful is revealed through faith, what they are saying is

163

that it doesn't matter what you believe. That it is only your faith that matters. Which is a pretty strange thing to teach when you're trying to sell one particular form of religion. Also, the righteousness of god or the justness of the faithful



would have probably been disagreed to by, for instance, the people getting ready to have their hearts ripped out by the Aztecs demonstrating their faith in their gods. Especially if situations were reversed and they wouldn't have done the same thing. Now I on the other hand say that faith is the least important thing of all. What you have correctly reasoned to be true is much more important than what you may simply like to believe or are wrongly told to believe is true.

As you can imagine, what they said in this next paragraph is wrong. In Rom. 2:1, it says:

“THEREFORE thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things.”

Well I don't think that judges are usually guilty of the same things as the people they judge. So much for that theory. Another thing is that though I am judging the bible and those who wrote it, I myself am not guilty of the same things they are. For instance, I am not steering people toward god or religious servitude. All I am doing is showing you what I have reasoned to be the truth. One reason being that it is people, not gods, who are responsible for the things that happen on earth. Also, because it sickens me when some people divert their blame and call their mistakes god's will. Yet another dissimilarity between them and myself is that I have no desire at all to be worshiped as a prophet or holy man. Because I am just a man. Unlike these religious leaders, I also have said that I could be wrong in some of the things I have to say. Which is one reason why I would prefer you to make up your own minds as to how correct I am. Another difference between them and myself is that what most if not all of these kinds of people did and still do is a livelihood or good source of misused brain drugs. But why I am writing this book is because I see what they did and others are still doing as a problem that must be overcome.

Being overly confusing is just one of the things that are wrong with these next two paragraphs. In Rom. 4:4-5, it says:

“Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt.

But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.”

First of all, when it speaks of working here, what I think they were talking about was working at being a good worshiper. So it says here that if you work at such a thing, you don't earn grace, but debt. Though I would say that if you work at anything you should earn something besides debt. Then it says that if somebody doesn't work at being a good worshiper but believes in what I take to mean Jesus, they will basically have earned righteousness. But by their reasoning, shouldn't their inaction earn debt too. Also, it takes more than belief to make a

person righteous. Another thing is that I think they're basically saying that Jesus justifies the ungodly. But if Jesus did that, why would anybody bother to be religious.

For anybody who may actually like to be confused, this next paragraph is a good one to scramble a few brain cells. In Rom. 4:17, it says:

"(As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which are not as though they were."

Let's go to where it says god quickens the dead. Well god must not be very good at his job. Because I've never heard of a dead person doing anything very quickly. Except maybe decay. And with the supposed resurrection happening at the end of the world, I don't see them having that happen very quickly either. Unless god planned to hasten the end of the world. Which is a possibility believing their crap. Or maybe this means that god would hasten people to their deaths if such a thing came about. Whatever the case is, luckily I don't care. Then it says that god will call things that don't exist as though they did. Which seems like a rather silly thing to do.

There is nothing good to be gained from confusing people. But again, in Rom. 7:15-17, it says:

"For that which I do I allow not: for that what I would, that I do not; but what I hate, that do I.

If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good.

Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me."

First it says that he does what he doesn't allow. Which would seem to make him a hypocrite. Skipping a contrary statement, then he says that he does what he hates to do. But unless he did it for some constructive purpose, I would have advised him to stop doing it. He then says that if he did what he wouldn't do, he would consent to the law that it was good. So does this mean that the law was right or wrong. Confused yet? Then he says that whatever he did, it was no longer him who did it but the sin that was in him. Which is stupid because you and any sin in you are part of the same whole. It's like if your brain told you to kick somebody. Your brain didn't kick somebody, your foot did. But they would both be responsible for the action. Just as you and any sin in you would be.

As you can guess, I don't agree with this next paragraph's promotion of hope. In Rom. 8:24, it says:

"For we are saved by hope: But hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?"

Now in a way you can be saved by hope. Because you would be more impatient for something you knew was going to happen and be less likely to be impatient for something you only hoped would happen. So in only hoping for

something, the lack of the stress of impatience could help prolong life. Though despite this, I don't really like hope. Because if you want something to happen, 165

you should make it happen. All hoping does is soften reality and leave you open to disappointment. Take for example a woman hoping for a rich man to marry or somebody hoping that they will win the lottery. All the hoping in the world isn't going to make it any more likely to happen.

They ask a stupid question in this next "paragraph." In Rom. 8:31, it says: "What shall we then say to these things? If God be for us, who can be against us?"

Here they ask that if god is for them, who can be against them. Well who can be against them is somebody with the same or different god. Also, people having gods on their side doesn't seem to have lessened the amount of suffering they have been subjected to. Though this is hard to prove. Because things can usually be worse.

The crap is really getting deep in this next paragraph. In Rom. 8:34, it says: "Who is he that condemneth? It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us."

First of all, Jesus said that he didn't come to judge the world. He was also very big on the idea of forgiveness. So I can't see him doing much condemning. Especially if part of his function is to intercede on your behalf. Another strange thing is how lazy god seems to have become. First he apparently started having satan do the rotten things he used to do. Now apparently he has Jesus to do the condemnation function. Also, it says here that Jesus is risen. What he should have said was that he had risen from the dead. For a short time. Because here if he is at the right hand of god in some afterlife, that isn't what I would consider being risen. At least not as far as this physical existence is concerned.

Next, we have a paragraph that puts forward a stupid supposition. In Rom. 9:22, it says:

"What if God, willing to shew his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction:"

It talks here of god showing his wrath or making his power known by doing nothing. Or what they call enduring with longsuffering. In such a case, the "vessels of wrath fitted to destruction" would likely remain clueless as to god's anger or power.

As you can imagine, I had a little trouble deciphering this next paragraph. Which wasn't worth the effort. As is usually, if not always, the case. In Rom. 11:6, it says:

“And if by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be by works, then it is no more grace: otherwise work is no more work.”

What they are talking about is the difference between being saved by your works or by grace. The point I think they were trying to make is that being saved by grace will make any work void and being saved by work will make any grace void. Though even if there were a god to bestow grace, from their point of view, I  
166

don't think they should be impeding good works by suggesting that acting as though you were trying to be saved through them will cause any grace to be nullified.

You're next given some bad advice about prophesy. In Rom. 12:6, it says: “Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith;”

But I have an even better idea. Let them prophesy according to their ability to prophesy. Not according to the amount of their faith. Though I would rather people not prophesy at all. Not just because it is too unreliable. Or because of the slight possibility that malevolent spirits or beings with the power to precognosce future events could communicate such knowledge to people to fool them. But because you would likely run across jerks who would say things like “god is going to do that because you're not doing this.”

This next paragraph gives some advice on exhortation. But these kinds of people shouldn't be exhorting people about anything. A few more reasons why can be found in Rom. 12:8. It says:

“Or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.”

One reason why these people or the followers of any other religion shouldn't be exhorting people is that their ultimate purpose for doing so would likely be for their gain. Not yours. Such as being exhorted to surrender your souls to god for piece of mind. Then it exhorts people to give with simplicity. But as far as charity goes, there are those who would like to simplify it so much that it is in danger of being nonexistent. Now I agree that charity should be made as simple as possible. But I think that it is even more important that it be effective. Then, as far as their giving philosophy goes, I wish they would have taken their own advice and have given it with simplicity. Instead of using their proverbs, parables, repetitions and other aggravating and overblown forms of writing. Which could drive almost anybody stupid. It then says that the person who rules should do it with diligence. But I think a couple of other words would have been helpful. Because ruling with diligence didn't turn out too well with people like Stalin, Genghis Kahn, Henry the eighth or any of the other tyrants throughout history.

Also, it might have been burying people in words, but he could have added that any ruling is best done from the bottom up. Not from the top down. That is for a populace that, unlike this one, hasn't been driven insane. Though ruling from the bottom up isn't something that goes along well with god's style of ruling anyway. Then it says that you should show mercy with cheerfulness. But there is nothing cheerful about somebody having to obtain your mercy. I say that if mercy is to be given, it should be given with somberness and a promise for punishment should the need for your mercy arise again. In fact, it is evil to tell somebody that

167

they should be cheerful when they give mercy. Because they would in fact be being cheerful about the wrong the offender committed.

Another of many teachings against revenge is shown in Rom. 12:17. It says: "Recompense no man evil for evil. Provide things honest in the sight of all men."

Now I say that if somebody does something wrong to you and there is no possible way that you can imagine that what they did could somehow be justified, you're doing something equally bad to them can't be considered evil. Sure, as they suggest here, it would be better to take them to court. But the courts don't and can't cover every instance of injustice. In such cases, if there is no other way of seeking justice, visiting a little bad karma on them if possible would be helpful.

Stupidity abounds in these next three paragraphs. In Rom. 12:19-21, it says: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord.

Therefore if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head.

Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."

Well let me start out by saying that I don't buy this "vengeance being the lords" crap. One reason being that there is no lord. Which means there would be no justice. And that would be evil. You may also want to consider why the lord would punish those who do what he supposedly causes them to do. Another stupid thing about what they say is that I would imagine that this vengeance is supposed to take place in the afterlife. That not only doesn't do people on earth any good, but according to the new testament, the resurrection into the afterlife isn't supposed to happen until the end of the world. Which hopefully won't happen for a long time. Though any length of time is too long to wait for justice. Then you're told to give food and water to your enemies if they need it because in doing so you will heap coals of fire on their heads. But the idea should be to give them what they need, not heap coals of fire on their heads. Because if that

were the idea, you would be better off giving them nothing at all. Also, unless it's your fault that you are enemies, you shouldn't help them because they would be most likely to take it as a sign that what they did wasn't that bad. Or that your behavior is a sign of weakness or stupidity. And the weak and stupid practically just beg to be taken advantage of.

You're then told to overcome evil with good. But I say, as the old saying goes, "fight fire with fire." Their back door approach to fighting evil is stupid and evil. I say the wicked should be punished outright. Leave no doubt as to your position. For instance, some good advice I've heard about a girl breaking up with a guy is for the girl to leave no doubt as to her position. Otherwise the guy is likely to keep bothering the girl. Also, look at the Indians or mestizos invading the U.S. from Central America. Or all of the other rats, so to speak, abandoning the ships

168

that they themselves have put holes in. Those who exploit people for more money may like it, but I don't. And anybody else who doesn't like it and thinks that they can "nice" their way out of that situation is fooling themselves. Another reason for fighting evil outright is that the memory of bad things like punishment seems to be more vivid than the memory of good things. Now instead of overcoming evil, I say we would be better off by keeping it from happening to begin with. That is, to whatever extent is possible. Also, as I said before, we don't need the wicked to somehow strengthen our species. Because we have many other and better things on which to hone our beings. To that end, I would also support denying the wicked or overly aggressive the right to breed.

This next paragraph speaks of rulers. In Rom. 13:3, it says:

"For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same:"

They have to be kidding! Look at all of the millions of people who have been killed in the past because of rulers. Of various ranks. Religious or otherwise. Most if not all of the time those rulers weren't conquering evil works. So their statement that rulers aren't a terror to good works isn't very valid. Also, unlike a person with limited influence, the harm a ruler can do is tremendous. So as they say, I would be afraid of their power. Which isn't saying much. Because I also fear the power of a poisonous snake bite. Then it basically says that if you do what is good, you will receive praise from them for it. But that would have to depend on a ruler's ability to judge what is actually good. So basically, I would rather depend on the judgment of the majority.

For another stupid and deceitful teaching, let's see what it says in Rom. 14:23. It says:

“And he that doubteth is damned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith: for whatsoever is not of faith is sin.”

So basically what this is trying to say is that to not have faith is sin. But to the contrary of what they say, a lack of religious faith in any religion is not a sin. In fact, religious faith is a sin because religion in general is a sin. There are more than enough examples where religion has displayed its shortcomings to prove that. And if I am to sin, I would rather the sin be my own fault rather than the result of following some escapist religion that, for example, often justified the authority of rulers that were either aggressive; ignorant; ruling because of heredity and not accomplishment; malformed; delusionally elitist, or various combinations thereof. Another bad thing about faith is that it is uncomfortably synonymous with obedience. And when the faith is blind faith, the obedience becomes uncomfortably synonymous with blind obedience.

I remember the bible saying earlier that it is wrong to put a stumbling block in your brother's way. But in 1 Cor. 1:23, it says:

169

“But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness;”

And I thought they weren't supposed to put stumbling blocks in their brother's way. Maybe the Christians just don't consider the Jews their brothers. Which I could see why. Seeing how the Jews don't consider non-Jews their brothers.

Next, in 1 Cor. 2:15, you're told something that is really wrong. It says:

“But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man.”

First of all, what ever happened to the saying “judge not, and ye shall not be judged.” Along with all the other things they say against judging. So this should include the spiritual as well. And after the next chapter you will see even more clearly that being spiritual would be a disadvantage to anybody's ability to judge anyway. Then it says basically that the spiritual shouldn't be judged. What a bunch of bullshit! Well here is one man who does judge the spiritual. One reason being that we are more physical than spiritual. And as I said before, the physical world holds more sway over the physical world than any spirit world does. So the spiritual have practically no cause to tell you anything. Also, look at the whole reason why people invented religion. Then consider the many unfortunate exploits of various spiritual leaders both past and present. You can also consider the many wrong or evil things I've shown you in the bible so far. Not counting the things I've purposefully omitted. Or the things I may have missed from my one and only reading of something written so confusingly. Taking these and other things into consideration, to the contrary of what they

say, I would say that the spiritual are more in need of judgement than most of us.

These next two paragraphs gave a conflicting message. In 1 Cor. 3:21-22, it says:

“Therefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours;

Whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours;”

Here you’re told not to glory in man. But being told that all things are yours, with the exception if death, sounds like a hell of a good reason to glory to me.

The next paragraph I want to comment on is both stupid and contradictory. In 1 Cor. 4:3, it says:

“But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man’s judgment: yea, I judge not mine own self.”

Now I would have to guess that this person was spiritual. But earlier he said that the spiritual are judged of no man. But now he is saying that it is a small thing for him to be judged? That doesn’t make any sense. Unless earlier what he meant to say was that he himself can’t be judged by any man. Which in turn would show why it is a small thing for him to be judged by man’s judgment.

Because it would mean little to him. Though you can’t go by what he might have meant to say. You have to go by what he did say. Also, you will be seeing later that the bible is definitely against people judging each other. But in saying that it

170

is a very small thing for him to be judged by man’s judgment, it makes me wonder if he was trying to create a new religion. Then, continuing his stupidity, he says that he doesn’t judge himself. Though everybody has to judge themselves. Otherwise you would never know who you are; if you are what you should be; if you think it’s worth the price you might have to pay to become what you would like to be, or any of the other things people try to judge about themselves. Also, judging yourself may help keep others from having to judge you later. Another thing is that if it was a very small thing for others to judge him, it should have also been a very small thing for him to judge himself.

I suppose I should point out that the person who has been making these statements lately was a person named Paul. In these next two paragraphs, he had something to say that is both stupid and confusing. In 1 Cor. 7:37-38, it says:

“Nevertheless he that standeth stedfast in his heart, having no necessity, but hath power over his own will, and hath so decreed in his heart that he will keep his virgin, doeth well.

So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better.”



Let me see if I can decipher this garbage. First, what I take this to mean is whether or not a father should sell his daughter into marriage. So it says that if he decides to keep her, he does well. Then it says that if he decides to “give” her in marriage he does well also. So is this a stupid way of saying that he does well either way? Then it says that if he doesn’t give her in marriage, he does better. This could mean a number of things. One of which could possibly be that it is better to let the decision of who she will marry be hers. Which is something I would agree with. Though it could mean that if he decides to keep her, he can ask a better price for her. But whatever it was that he was trying to say, even an idiot could have found a more plain and straightforward way of saying it.

Contradicting the bible’s usual teachings of there being only one god, in 1 Cor. 8:5-6, it says:

“For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,)

But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we in him.”

Here it says that there are many gods. But to them there is only one god. They don’t say that there is only one god. But that to them there is only one god. This is an unusual thing for the bible to teach. Then you’re told that all things are of god. But then you’re told that all things are by Jesus. Well they both can’t supposedly be responsible for everything. Though maybe they use their ridiculous holy trinity theory to justify how all things can be “of” god and “by” Jesus.

171

There are a few bad things about what this next paragraph says. In 1 Cor. 8:8, it says:

“But meat commendeth us not to God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; neither, if we eat not, are we the worse.”

First of all, it says that meat doesn’t commend you to god. Big deal! Let god take care of himself. Your stomach should come first because you have to eat to survive. Though as you know, your survival doesn’t seem to be very high on god’s list of priorities. Then he says that if you eat, you aren’t better. Well when you eat you aren’t hungry any more. I would call that being better. He then says that if you don’t eat, you aren’t any worse from it. Which is pretty stupid. Even if he was referring to the short term effects of hunger, being hungry could cause people to beg or steal for food. I would call that being worse.

In this next paragraph, Paul demonstrates one of the stupid things that Jesus taught. In 1 Cor. 8:13, it says:

“Wherefore, if meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world

standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.”

What they were talking about here is a follower of Jesus eating meat offered to an idol. So what I think Paul was saying was that he will eat no meat or the person who offended will be responsible for his actions. Well just as Jesus couldn't take responsibility for your actions, Paul couldn't take responsibility for the actions of the person who ate meat offered to an idol. Because he had nothing to do with it. Nor should anybody take responsibility for another's actions unless they are responsible. One reason being that offenders don't learn much of a lesson if you relieve them of accountability for their actions.

This next paragraph had Paul asking some questions he shouldn't have. In 1 Cor. 9:1, it says:

“AM I not an apostle? am I not free? have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord? are ye not my work in the Lord?”

So one question he asks is if he isn't free. Expecting the answer to be that he is free. But I wonder if he remembered saying things like “we are the lord's; ye are not your own; ye are bought with a price;” etc. That doesn't sound very free to me. Then he asks if he hadn't seen Jesus. Well he supposedly saw a bright light. But he didn't mention seeing the person of Jesus. So the answer to that question should be no too.

When it comes to gaining converts, Paul should have come up with a better sales pitch than what he gave in this next paragraph. In 1 Cor. 9:24, it says:

“Know ye not that they which run in a race run all, but one receiveth the prize? So run, that ye may obtain.”

Now I would take this prize thing to mean the resurrection and entry into heaven after death that Jesus talked about. But he says that as in a race, only one will receive the prize. What a stupid thing to teach! Why should anybody

172

take his advice and become a Christian to run this race if only one will win the prize.

We're shown many levels of stupidity in this next paragraph. In 1 Cor. 10:13, it says:

“There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.”

First of all, it basically says that the people he was speaking to had succumbed to no temptation except to what temptations are common to man. But various believers at times have succumbed to every form of temptation there probably is. So he wasn't making much of a point here. Then it says that god wouldn't suffer

these people to be tempted more than they could bear. But as I said, believers have succumbed to all sorts of temptations. So I would say the temptation was more than they could bear. It then says that god will use temptation to give you an escape. Well I don't believe in god. But his followers still sickeningly do. Mainly because they had been tempted by having their egos boosted; having been promised eternal life; being told that they will be taken care of; telling them that god and not they are responsible for the things they do; etc. And not being held responsible for your actions by saying that they are god's will is one temptation in particular people can do without. Also, you know that I had remarked earlier about fighting fire with fire. Unfortunately, the only thing I have to tempt you with is the truth. Which isn't much of a temptation. Considering all those who so desperately avoid it.

Another thing is that the main reason these religious people exist is that people are even willing to pay to be lied to by these experts in lies. Then it says that god does these things so you can bear it. Well there are many things in life that you just have to bear. There is no other sensible way of getting around it. All their teachings do is help you escape from reality. And with the results of what this and other religions teach getting worse and worse, it's no wonder that people would want to escape from reality. Now life isn't easy, but running away from it is wrong. Another thing is that from what I have seen of the approaches Christian religious leaders take to gain converts to their "flock," it's very likely that you "sheep" can bear more than what they would like you to believe you can. Though in this respect, I don't see other religions being much, if any, better.

There are a few things wrong with these next two paragraphs. In 1 Cor. 11:31-32, it says:

"For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.

But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world."

The first thing they say is that if you judge yourselves, you should not be judged. Which is bullshit. Also, if you judge yourself and correctly find that you are guilty, does this mean that you shouldn't be punished? It would seem so.

173

Which is also B.S. Now there's a very slight possibility that what they meant to say is that if you judge yourself, you wouldn't find yourself in a position where you would need to be judged. But if that was what they meant, that is what they should have said. Though I doubt that would be the case often enough anyway. Another thing is that in the next chapter, you will be seeing some instances where they tell you that you shouldn't judge yourself. So it's pretty stupid for them to suggest here that you judge yourself.

Then what I think they are trying to say next is that when you are judged, you are punished by the lord. Yeah, just like the lord makes water flow down hill or how he makes you wet when you stand out in the rain. But somehow, I'm just not buying it. It then says that the lord does this so you won't be condemned with the world. Well first of all, there is much to be said about why a person may need to have been judged to begin with. Then, how did this judgement come about. Because it seems to me that a person would have had to have purposefully sought out judgment to make them deserving of any escape of the world's condemnation. Then, as far as the condemnation of the world goes, I don't see why it should be condemned anyway. And as far as man's role in any possible condemnation of the world goes, it won't be condemned if I can help it. Because I'm going to try to get people to judge themselves and others correctly. Which for a wide range of reasons won't be easy to do. Though if you can listen, the earth won't be condemned through our actions because we will judge that we will equitably share this planet with its ecosystem. I would also like people to judge that it would be better for our wasteful economic system to go to hell rather than the earth.

They must have been crazy to expect people to go for what this next paragraph had to say. In 1 Cor. 15:19, it says:

"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

Well being expected to have hope in Christ in this life is stupid enough. But to still be expected to have hope in him even after death is beyond stupid. And doing so would make you miserable examples of humanity. Now the reason they may have taught this is because the resurrection isn't supposed to happen until the end of the world. Which as I said before is hopefully a long ways off. Though how they could expect people to wait for whatever to happen even after they die is beyond me. Also, you have to be conscious to hope. So to be conscious in some afterlife waiting for the world to end could get quite boring. I myself would seek better things to do.

These next two paragraphs speak about making people sad. Or as they put it, sorry. In 2 Cor. 2:1-2, it says:

"BUT I have determined this with myself, that I would not come again to you in heaviness.

For if I make you sorry, who is he then that maketh me glad, but the same which is made sorry by me?"

Now the likely thing that made these people sad was hearing bad news. And here he says he wouldn't come to them again in heaviness. Which I take to mean that he wouldn't give them bad news to make them sad. But bad news

shouldn't be ignored. Especially for his selfish reason of not wanting to make those people sad who he depends on to make him happy. Also, there are many mistaken people out there who would like you to concentrate more on the good news rather than the bad news. But the worse thing that could happen by paying more attention to bad news is that you could become depressed or burnt out on hearing bad news. Which is just something you would have to put up with if you wanted to change the things that you find troubling. And actually doing something about changing the things that may trouble you could even help us adapt as a species to make it easier for us to do so. But the worse thing that could happen by ignoring bad news is the devastation of our planet. Though with all of the talk in the bible about destruction, or these people's promotion of destruction for the resurrection to take place, I doubt if they would have seen the devastation of the planet as being a bad thing.

For some rather strange teachings, let's move on to 2 Cor. 5:6-7. It says: "Therefore we are always confident, knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: (For we walk by faith, not by sight:)"

First of all, I wonder which lord they were talking about. God or Jesus. Because if the spirit of Jesus resides in them, as they seem to encourage people to let happen, how absent from him can they really be. Then, as they said before, if people still have to hope for Jesus in some way even after they're dead, for who knows how long, it seems that the reason for it would be because they were still absent from him. So there doesn't seem to be much to be confident about in that respect. Also, just because they tell you that faith is a reason for confidence doesn't make it so. Then somehow, the reason they give for this confidence is that they walk by faith, not by sight. Though you should let your ability to sense guide you. Not your ability to believe. Besides, you know what happens when you try to walk with your eyes closed. Which judging from the state of the world, too many people have been doing.

Another example of inept reasoning can be found in 2 Cor. 5:14. It says: "For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead:"

I don't agree with their reasoning that Christ dying for you should cause you to consider yourselves to be dead. Besides, the whole point of one person dying for another is to keep those other people alive.

This next paragraph doesn't make much sense. In 2 Cor. 8:9, it says: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich."

So here you're told that Jesus was rich. But as far as I know he was only a

carpenter. Who are not normally rich people. Though there's no doubt that you could go down hill from there. But you can go down hill from about anywhere. Then you're told that he made himself poor to make you rich. Well about the only thing that such a thing could make you "wealthy" in is faith. Though people can do without that kind of "wealth."

What Paul had to say in this next paragraph is pretty stupid. In 2 Cor. 11:6, it says:

"I say again, Let no man think me a fool; if otherwise, yet as a fool receive me, that I may boast myself a little."

The first thing he says here basically is that nobody should think he is a fool. Too late! I already do. Then he said that even as a fool the people he was talking about should have received him. Now I suppose there wouldn't be anything too terribly wrong with receiving a fool. Just don't allow them to make you foolish. Instead, you should try to separate them from their foolishness. Also, he said that the people he was speaking about should have received him so he could boast about himself a little. But though I don't care for boastfulness in anybody, I would have very little tolerance for listening to a fool boast. Another thing is that after all their talk against pride, it's quite stupid for him to promote boastfulness.

There are a few things to straighten out in this next paragraph. In Gal. 1:4, it says:

"Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father:"

So first it says that Jesus gave himself for your sins so that he might deliver you from this present evil world. But I wouldn't call supposedly taking your sins upon himself or even making a place for you in heaven the same thing as delivering you from this world. Besides, the world isn't the problem. Evil is. And seeing how god supposedly creates the wicked and causes bad things to happen, it would be much better if you were delivered from him and his supposed son instead. Then it goes on to mention god and the father. I wonder if this means that you are supposed to consider Jesus your father. It's hard to say, or care.

What this next paragraph had to say seems rather strange. In Gal. 4:11, it says:

"I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain."

Now what I take this to mean is that the labor he had expended on them caused him to fear them. Well about the only thing I could see that he might have had to fear is the competition. Which is not something I would expect him to have been afraid of. Though it's slightly possible that when he spoke of being afraid of them, he was only speaking facetiously.

Paul did a real good job at giving bad advice in this next paragraph. In Gal.

4:18, it says:

176

“But it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing, and not only when I am present with you.”

Well a bad thing about zeal is that it could lead to overzealousness. Which wouldn't be good. Especially when the “good thing” he was talking about having zeal for was religion. Also, if something was actually a good thing, it's unlikely that you would need to act zealously to promote it. Another thing is that if you consider lies; evil; superstition; stupidity; repression; subservience; false self justification; self deception; etc, to be good, you couldn't screw yourself up any worse by having zeal for those things. Just do the rest of us a favor and keep your zealously to yourself.

These next few paragraphs list things that should not be taken part in. Some I agree with and some I don't. In Gal. 5:19-21, it says:

“Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness,

Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies,

Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of which I tell you before, as I have told you in times past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.”

Now I will list the things that they mentioned that I have little or no trouble with. Or that there may be some place for. The first thing I have no trouble with is fornication. Whether it be premarital sex or pubescent experimentation. Because sex is mainly what men and women are made for. And if people were more accepting of the fact that sex is likely to occur and discussed it, things like unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted disease would probably be less likely to occur. Also, from what I have read, it doesn't surprise me that Paul didn't list homosexuality here. A little something against sex with sheep would have also been helpful. The next topic is hatred. I says that if somebody deserves to be hated, then they should be. Then there's variance. To which I say that it may not be a good thing to be overly argumentative. But usually when somebody says something you disagree with, it is a good idea to discuss your differing opinions.

The next topic I have something to say about is emulations. It is of course best to try and be your own person. But I don't see a lot wrong with wanting to emulate somebody who has good qualities. Just be careful you don't lose yourself in emulating them. The next subject is wrath. Which pretty much goes

along with what I said about hatred. If somebody is deserving of it, then they should receive it. Even if it could cause the next subject they mention. Strife. Next is sedition. From what I have heard of various governments in the past and seen of many current ones, I would say that people sometimes need to resort to sedition to protect themselves. They next speak of heresies. But there is no

177

such thing as heresy when the object is to reveal the truth. To which end heresy is our duty. Until proven otherwise.

Next is the topic of envyings. Which aside from being almost unavoidable, gives us a reason to strive for achievement. As long as the achievement is generally socially acceptable, it's unlikely that there would be anything wrong with it. Of course, it is best to be satisfied with yourself. But a little envy, as long as it isn't obsessive, isn't bad. Then, as far as murder goes, I've known people who were so slimy and evil that they deserved to be murdered. There would have been nothing wrong with removing them to improve the overall human condition. But let me caution you that somebody would have to be really screwed up for their death to be considered. For instance, much more screwed up than some religious person is likely to think I am. After all, the old testament is full of justifications of killing for god.

We next have the topic of drunkenness to consider. Now there are many serious problems with drinking. But anybody familiar with prohibition knows that wasn't the answer. Though I can think of one way to lessen one of the problems of drinking. Take for instance the meter maids that write tickets for people who have parked and let the parking meter expire. It would be a good idea to have such a person outside of any bar automatically write any intoxicated person a ticket who tries to drive away from that bar. Especially around closing time. Though as is often the case, where the lives of people come into conflict with the operation of some business, it is the lives of people that come in second. But despite the problems caused by drinking, I believe its benefits outweigh its problems. Because intoxication offers relaxation, recreation and relief from stress. Though I myself wish there were a more healthy drug to use. But until that happens, we will have to settle for alcohol. Then they speak of revellings. Though as with the drinking that often accompanies it, as long as it is kept somewhat under control, not done too often and at a proper time and in a proper place, I don't see a lot wrong with it. So I think life here would be pretty rotten if all their rules were strictly followed.

The next two paragraphs give a list of virtues. And surprisingly I only have a differing opinion about a few of them. In Gal. 5:22-23, it says:

“But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness,



faith,

Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.”

The first thing I don't agree with here is longsuffering. Because it is not a virtue to suffer. Even for a short time. Unless of course, despite being innocent, you need to endure an unavoidable situation to protect other innocent people.

Another reason I believe they mention longsuffering is as a ploy to keep the suckers in line. Also, when you are suffering, all of the other qualities they listed here suffer also. Now patience may be good. But it isn't if it is done for too long or for a bad reason. They next mention faith as a virtue. For about the zillionth

178

time. But one bad thing about faith is that apart from meaning unquestioning belief, it is often just wishful thinking. And in the case of religion and some governments, the result is likely a brainwashed fanatic. In which there is no virtue. The next supposed virtue they mention is meekness. Which is a good quality for domesticated animals, but not quite so much for people. Because a meek person is likely to be taken advantage of. Neither is it too difficult to imagine one meek person taking advantage of another meek person. Now having everybody running around and acting boldly wouldn't be good either. I think a middle ground like humility would be better.

This next paragraph gives a different version of the creation than what I remember reading about. In Eph. 3:9, it says:

“And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ:”

Well in genesis, they didn't even give a hint that anybody besides god was involved in the creation. And I see no reason why god would want to hide such a thing. So from the old testament's point of view, you can safely discount what he said here.

What this next paragraph had to say was wrong then and is still wrong. In Eph. 6:1, it says:

“CHILDREN, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right.”

He was right that children should obey their parents. But even that has limitations. And if they meant to suggest that children should obey their parents in accepting god, I of course say they should not. Not only for the sufficient reasons that I have already given, but for the many other different reasons you have yet to see. Also, they could be saying here that children should obey their parents because of what the lord says. But children should not obey their parents in, through or because of what the lord said. They should obey their parents, to put it simply, because they are their parents.

Let's see what we can find wrong with these next two paragraphs. In Phil. 2:3-4, it says:

“Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves.

Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others.”

First of all, it may happen that the only way to do something that must be done is through strife. And as far as vainglory goes, pride can be a very good motivator. Then it basically says that with lowliness of mind you should esteem others to be better than yourself. Which as it turns out, you would indeed have to be stupid to do. Now it would have been better if they had said that with lowliness of ego you should esteem yourself to be no better than others. What they suggest could also be harmful to somebody with even just a borderline

179

inferiority complex. This bolstering of other people's egos for them just doesn't make any sense. Then, as far as this “looking on other people's things” goes, one negative effect that could have is increased envy. Also, after telling people not to look on their own things, they say that they should “also” look at other people's things. Which I would take to mean that they should look at their things and the things of others. I would call that a good contradiction.

As is often the case, there is more wrong with these next two paragraphs than I will be commenting on. In Phil. 2:6-7, it says:

“Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:

But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:”

So it is saying here that while Jesus was in heaven, being in the form of god, he didn't think it was wrong to consider himself god's equal. But either you are god or you are not. Also, at one point in the old testament, it mentions there being sons of god in heaven. So I wonder if there were a lot of entities in heaven that considered themselves to be god's equal. I also wonder if satan considering himself to be god's equal had anything to do with what got him into trouble. It then says here that Jesus made himself of no reputation. Now this may just have been worded poorly. Because it seems to me that making himself of no reputation before he became a human would have been a little difficult for a god to do. Another thing is that if it wasn't the form of a man, I wonder what form this servant was. This would also seem to portray man as something lower than a servant. Because first he was made into the form of a servant, and then into the likeness of man. Which I don't like at all.

In speaking of Paul's brother, what this next paragraph had to say doesn't make

any sense. In Phil. 2:30, it says:

“Because for the work of Christ he was neigh unto death, not regarding his life, to supply your lack of service toward me.”

Now why would Paul’s brother do the lord’s work until it nearly killed him only so that others could supply Paul with a lack of service. As I said, it just makes no sense.

I don’t like what they were trying to teach in this next paragraph. In Phil. 4:12, it says:

“I know both how to be abased, and how to abound: every where and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need.”

Now what I think Paul was talking about here was a ploy to get suckers to believe in his religion. That in appearing to be abased and hungry, he would appeal to the poor suckers. Then in appearing to be full and abound, he would appeal to the rich suckers. Though I don’t like such insincerity. But I must say this approach to gaining converts is better than the “believe or die” system that other piece of shit lowlifes have used.

180

Next, it speaks of some very big lies that Paul told about Jesus. In Col. 1:15-16, it says:

“Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature:

For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him and for him.”

First of all, being in the image of something that is invisible isn’t very impressive. Then, if Jesus created all things and not god, I guess the old testament was just a bunch of crap. Which of course it was. But not for the reasons he gave here. Neither is the new testament any better. Also, it speaks here of various forms of governments being created by Jesus. I can see how kissing a little official ass could help the conversion process along. But the way most governments have acted and many still do act, I don’t think they should be receiving this kind of holy sanction.

Another absurd story about Jesus can be found in Col. 2:15. It says:

“And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.”

It says here that Jesus spoiled principalities and powers. But he did no such thing. In fact, every governmental power he came across had their way with him. Now the spoiling they spoke of could have come from his religious views. But judging from the number of his followers at the time, he didn’t even come close to

succeeding. Another thing is that in my dictionary it says that in theology, a principality is one of nine orders of angels. So could this mean that Jesus spoiled an order of angels? It's hard to say, or care. Then it says that Jesus made a show of them openly. But the only thing he made a show of openly was how cruelly he could be put to death. I'm sure they didn't mind being made a spectacle of in that way. It then says that Jesus triumphed over them in this. Well they may call being scourged and nailed to a cross triumphing, (as if they had a choice) but I wouldn't.

What this next paragraph had to say is pretty stupid. In Col. 2:20, it says: "Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances,"

Again you're told that if you follow Jesus you should consider yourself to be dead with him. Which I don't like at all. It's a good thing that Christianity doesn't support violence. Because if they consider themselves to already be dead, then going all the way by doing a suicide bomber thing wouldn't be that big of a leap. Also, to answer his question, it is because those people were still alive that they should have been subject to the law. Just as you should. Unless the law is unjust.

There is a confusing point that is brought up in 1 Thes. 1:1. In it they mention god the father and god your father being a separate thing from Jesus. But in 1 Thes. 1:3, it says:

181

"Remembering without ceasing your work in faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father;"

So after making it clear that god and the father were the same thing, they say here god "and" the father. As if they were two separate things. Now this may just be an example of poor writing. But I think it's more likely that it was just a stupid thing to say.

Pertaining to the resurrection, which is supposed to happen at the end of the world, in 1 Thes. 4:17, it says:

"Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord."

I guess you're supposed to believe that the living faithful during the resurrection will lift up and float among the clouds. But even if that were to happen, the clouds aren't your natural habitat. So I don't see that working out. Also, to sort of use an old saying, the clouds may be a nice place to visit, but I wouldn't want to live there. Another thing is that I thought these people were supposed to go to heaven. Not float around up in the atmosphere like some balloon.

I don't like the behavior that they try to excuse in this next paragraph. In 2

Thes. 2:2, it says:

“That ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.”

It first says here basically that those people shouldn't have been soon shaken in mind because of coming events. But if you know something bad is going to happen, a delay in it happening shouldn't make a lot of difference. Then it basically says that they shouldn't have been troubled by religious teachers saying that the end of the world was at hand. Because it wasn't. Which would make them liars. Well though this is a surprising admission, it still teaches an example of unacceptable behavior.

What this next paragraph had to say could use a lot of clarification. In 1 Tim. 1:20, it says:

“Of whom is Hymenaeus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme.”

I wonder what he meant by “delivered unto satan.” Was this some form of excommunication? Did he have them killed so they would go to hell? Or did he somehow produce satan so he could hand them over to him. Well if he had them killed, there wouldn't be any point to what they may have learned. And if he handed them over to satan, I doubt if they would have learned not to blaspheme from him. So I would guess that it was excommunication. Which if this were the case, it would have been helpful if he just said so. Also, I just thought you should know that this blasphemy apparently involved causing a shipwreck. Now causing a shipwreck would be a criminal act. But hopefully, how causing a shipwreck could be considered blasphemy will remain a mystery to me.

182

There are a few things to straighten out in these next two paragraphs. In 1 Tim. 2:11-12, it says:

“Let women learn in silence with all subjection.

But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence.”

Well the first thing I would like to say is that judging from some of the dumbass guys I have met, what they might have to teach to a woman is highly questionable. Neither should women be subjugated by men. Any subjugation to be done should mainly be done to each other equally. Women have their own lives to live and they should be lived under as much equality as possible. Men and women are just different and have their own roles to play in life. Which for the men should consist of more than just being a sperm donor. That is one reason why I agree that a woman shouldn't have authority over men. Because if left up to women, there is a possibility, however small, that is the only use there

would end up being for men. Which being a man, I would not want to expose future men to. No matter what. I don't want to go too deeply into this point. But for one last reason, a boss can push you too far. Imagine what a female boss might do if it were just because it was that time of month. Though if pushed too far by a male boss, you could always kick your boss's ass. Which would be much less likely to happen if your boss was a woman.

Then, as far as women teaching goes, I see nothing wrong with it. If somebody had a frog that could teach mathematics, I wouldn't have much objection to its doing so. Though the kind of teaching they were probably talking about concerned religious teaching. Which considering the kinds of overly sexist crap they usually taught, I can see why they would have wanted to avoid women "teachers." It goes on to say that a woman's place is to be in silence. But I know women have too much to contribute to treat them like that. And if they're wrong, big deal! Just tell them why they're wrong. Don't think that being an asshole can settle the difference between who is right and who is wrong. Following their stupid advice, people would probably start doing something really barbaric Such as treating women like cattle and having them go around completely covered in a sheet so you couldn't even see them. Etc.

We next have somewhat of a mystery. In 1 Tim. 3:2, it says:

"A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach;"

So given what this says, I wonder how the Catholic church was able to tell priests that they couldn't marry. Now I myself don't care what Paul had to say. But from a religious point of view, wouldn't he have been a much better judge of such things than those who came later?

As you will see, these next two paragraphs are pretty stupid. In 1 Tim. 4:8-9, it says:

183

"For bodily exercise profiteth little: but godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that is now, and of that which is to come.

This is worthy of all acceptance."

It first says that bodily exercise profits you little. But we now know much better why a fit body is better than an unfit body. Then it calls godliness profitable. Well if you could call being in a superstitious, brainwashed stupor profitable, I guess it would be to you. But I don't think it is profitable at all. It then says that godliness gives you promise of the life that is now. Though who would need a promise of something they already have. Then it says that godliness gives you a promise of the life that supposedly is to come. But a promise isn't as good as

knowing. Neither does his promise mean much when, for example, you consider why god would want his “kingdom” filled with the spirits of creatures that are so inferior to him. Creatures who in their living form you have been shown and told that he has no respect for. Paul goes on to say that what he said was worthy of all acception. But it takes a lot more than his saying so to make it so.

What this next paragraph had to say has little moral value. In 1 Tim. 5:1, it says:

“REBUKE not an elder, but intreat him as a father; and the younger men as brethren;”

It may be that a harsh gesture is likely to get you a harsh response. But if somebody deserves to be rebuked, they should be. Even if it is in fact your own father or brother.

From what this next paragraph says, it seems that Paul was just running out of things to say. In 1 Tim. 5:3, it says:

“Honour widows that are widows indeed.”

I don't think that you really needed to be told that you shouldn't honor widows who are only pretending to be widows.

Another of the many examples of what the bible taught being at odds with the actions of many of its believers can be found in 1 Tim. 5:23. It says:

“Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities.”

First of all, I don't think it's even possible to stop drinking water and use wine instead. At least if you care about living for very long. So why did he say it? Maybe it was to show that his ability to say really stupid things was as strong as ever. But the main point I wanted to make here is that I wonder what the bible thumpers who supported prohibition thought of this paragraph. My guess is that they were as stupid as other believers who use only what they want in the bible. Which considering all of the contradictions in it, can justify people doing about anything they want. This is one reason why I find people who keep the faith, but observe only what teachings they like or that serve them, to be so incredibly stupid.

As I've told you before, the bible often repeats something stupid about certain

184

topics that I have already talked about. But from time to time, I have to say something about them. Another one of these often repeated stupid teachings can be found in 2 Tim. 1:10. It says:

“But is now made manifest by the appearing of our Savior Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.”

Here you're told again that Jesus had abolished death. But if you have ever seen a graveyard, you know that is a lie. Now as I said before, it's possible that there is some form of existence after death. In fact, I think it would be difficult for any informed person to say with a clear conscience that there is not. But the fact remains that you have to die to get there. Which is not something that can just be glossed over.

Paul was fond of talking about things happening before the world began. This example is in Titus 1:2. It says:

"In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began;"

First of all, with all their talk of the certainty of eternal life for believers, it's strange for them to speak of it here as something you should need to "hope" for. It then says that god cannot lie. Which is unbelievable. Because according to other things in the bible, he had done not only that, but worse. Then it says that god promised eternal life before the world began. Well I would ask somebody knowledgeable in theology who it was that was supposed to be around before the world began that god was supposed to have promised this too. But I'm interested in the bullshit they would tell me. Also, one reason god could have promised something before it was necessary to do so would be because he knew what was going to happen. But if god knew everything that was going to happen before it did happen, I couldn't see even a god being able to handle the boredom.

There are a couple of matters to be cleared up in this next paragraph. In Titus 2:15, it says:

"These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee."

I would first like to point out that there are places in the bible where it tells you that you shouldn't rebuke each other. But here it says that the teachings of the bible (and no doubt those who teach them) rebuke with all authority. Though it's hypocritical for the bible to rebuke with all authority and tell you that you shouldn't do it at all. Especially since what the bible had to say was most likely the words of man to begin with. Then it says that you should let no man despise you. Now it's possible that they could have meant that you should not give people a reason to despise you. But if that is what they meant, that is what they should have said. Because a wicked person might do wicked things and keep them secret to keep people from despising them. Also, if you're going to have

185

teachings that rebuke with all authority, it's evil to have them be anything other than absolutely clear.

A couple of the things this next paragraph had to say seems rather strange. In



Titus 3:9, it says:

“But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain.”

It's strange for a Jew to say that genealogies should be avoided. Even a Christian Jew. I on the other hand don't see a lot wrong with genealogy. Because knowing your ancestry can be interesting. It then says to avoid contentions. Which may be a good idea if you think it will lead to a fight. But usually, not only is arguing some point with somebody a good exercise for getting at some truth, it also helps to promote a healthy interaction between people. Then it says that you should avoid strivings about the law. Which is strange because the law they spoke of was probably the only law that they thought was important. Being the law of god as taught by Jesus. And I would take striving about the law to mean working at understanding it. So what could there be for them to object to about that. Maybe it's because the bible was often purposefully written to be confusing and screwed up, they would prefer such teachings to remain that way. Which to me would be just another reason why I find the whole thing to be pointless at best.

These next few paragraphs are something Paul wrote about his son to a person named Philemon. In Phil. 1:18-20, it says:

“If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee ought, put that on mine account;

I Paul have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it: albeit I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides.

Yea, brother, let me have joy of thee in the Lord: refresh my bowls in the Lord.”

First of all, it was wrong for Paul to try and assume responsibility for his son's actions. Seeing how his son was an adult at the time. But with Jesus assuming responsibility for everybody's actions, such a teaching is no surprise. Paul next says that this was written by his own hand. But in a footnote at the end of this epistle, it says that this was written from Rome to Philemon by a servant named Onesimus. So it seems that somebody was wrong. Then Paul mentions that Philemon owes him his life. Using this to hold over his head. Well even if Paul had in fact actually saved this person's life and didn't simply indoctrinate him into his religion, nullifying a good deed by using it to make up for a bad deed isn't right. Paul then asked Philemon to let him have joy in him. Suggesting that if he did have Paul make reparations, Paul would no longer have joy in him. Which isn't a good thing to teach. Because you shouldn't have ill feelings toward those who only seek justice. Then Paul said that if he didn't make him make reparations, it would refresh his bowls in the lord. But such things are more likely to cause social constipation.

If believers put as much faith into the necessity for behaving correctly as they

put into belief in god, this world would be a much better place. Another example of how misplaced religious faith is can be found in Heb. 1:2. It says:

“Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds;”

Now I have heard that in the Catholic version of the bible, there were more examples to show that these people had sort of a doomsday cult thing going on. In which they prophesied that the end of the world was going to happen soon. Which is what I think they were referring to when they mentioned “last days” here. But their misguided faith that such a thing was going to happen back then is just as misguided as any religious faith people may have now. It then says that god made Jesus heir to all things. Well with god supposedly being immortal, Jesus would have a long time to wait for any inheritance from him. Then it says that god made the worlds through him. But as I said before, it doesn’t say so in the old testament. So Paul was saying that the account of the creation in the old testament was bullshit. And I wholeheartedly agree. Though what he had to say wasn’t true either.

I think that god was (supposedly) exalting Jesus too greatly in this next paragraph. In Heb. 1:8, it says:

“But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.”

Here god supposedly said to Jesus “O god.” This seems to be coming very close to, if not in fact, god calling his son god. But there can only be one top banana when it comes to god. Which I don’t see god’s son being.

Again on this creation subject, this next paragraph supposedly relates something else this supposed god supposedly said to Jesus. In Heb. 1:10, it says:

“And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands:”

So now god was supposedly saying that Jesus created the heavens and the earth. Which leads me to wonder who the bigger liar was. Moses or Paul. Though for more reasons than I would care to go into, I would have to say the biggest liar was Paul. Besides, any creature as powerful as Jesus was made out to be here would have been unlikely to put itself through the pains Jesus supposedly did because of this puny planet. Seeing how there are galaxies colliding and stars exploding. Wiping out who knows what.

Stupidity abounds in this next paragraph. In Heb. 2:9, it says:

“But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour; that by the grace of God should taste death for every man.”

First of all, if Jesus created everything, why would he have needed something

else to make him a little lower than the angels. Then, as I talked often enough

187

about before, it doesn't make any sense for Jesus to have "tasted death" for every man. Also, it would seem that women weren't worth bothering with.

For even more stupidity, we only need to go to the next paragraph. In Heb. 2:10, it says:

"For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings."

Earlier it said that everything was created by Jesus. But the point they were making here is that all things were created by and for god. Which is a nice contradiction. Then it says that god made the captain of their salvation, Jesus, perfect through suffering. Well in some cases it's possible to become better through suffering. But I doubt if perfection could be reached through it. Besides, how much more perfect should the supposed son of god need have been. Also, it would seem that god was supposedly trying to make you perfect through suffering too. By creating the wicked and causing evil to happen. But there is no good improvement that could come from those things. Besides, Jesus's way of handling evil was to forgive it. Though simply forgiving evil is far from what I would call perfection.

Surprisingly, these next two paragraphs seem to suggest that Christianity be abandoned. In Heb. 6:1-2, it says:

"THEREFORE leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the foundations of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God,

Of the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."

First of all, he wanted people to leave behind the principles and doctrine of Jesus. This again makes me wonder if he was trying to start his own religion. He then called the teachings of Jesus imperfect by saying that they should move on to perfection. Though I myself would say the teachings of Jesus were even farther from perfection than he would probably have said, I have to wonder who the hell he thought he was to say that the teachings of the supposed son of god were imperfect. It's also pretty strange for him to have worshiped and praised something he thought was imperfect. He then called the works of Jesus dead works and suggested that you cease to have faith in god. And though I agree, this isn't the type of thing he usually taught. Then he also rejects baptism, laying on of hands and resurrection of the dead. Which is also surprising. He then

rejects eternal judgment. Which is one idea that they taught that I liked. Because the idea of suffering forever for being wicked was more of a deterrent than forgiveness.

This next paragraph talked of the sacrifice of Jesus. In Heb. 10:14, it says: "For by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

So what they are saying here is that Jesus, by sacrificing himself, had made  
188

those who were sanctified perfect. Well seeing how Jesus supposedly died for the sins of mankind and not simply for those who believed in him, I would have to say that it was everybody that was sanctified. In which case he wasted his time. Because people are still far from perfect. Though despite the inconsistency I just pointed out, it's possible that he was referring to believers when he talked about the sanctified. To which I would say that, for reasons you have seen and have yet to see, in my opinion believers are more imperfect than others and degenerate from there.

These next two paragraphs of theirs are senseless, confusing and contradictory. In Heb. 10:26-27, it says:

"For if we sin willfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins,  
But a certain looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries."

First of all, it says here if you sin wilfully. But I think it would be very difficult to sin unwilfully. If it could be done at all. Though a convenient excuse believers can use is to say that the devil made them do it. Then it says that if you do manage to sin without wanting to do so after receiving their "truth," there will remain no more sacrifice for sins. Though I don't know if they meant that you couldn't perform a sacrifice for repentance for your sins, or if this meant that the sacrifice Jesus supposedly made for your sins would be null and void. Luckily, I don't care what the story is. Also, they speak of the certainty of judgment and fiery indignation. Which I would take to mean going to hell and suffering eternal judgment. But Jesus himself taught that just by asking, anything other than blasphemy against the holy ghost could be forgiven. So what they say here doesn't make any sense. Also, earlier it spoke of eternal judgment as being one of the imperfect teachings that should be left behind. So I would call that a bit of a contradiction.

I would like to point out a stupid statement Paul made in this next paragraph concerning the fable of Noah and his arc. In Heb. 11:7, it says:

"By faith Noah, being warned of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an arc to the saving of his house; by which he condemned the world,

and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith.”

Here it says that because noah built his boat he condemned the world. But if I remember the story correctly, it was god that commanded him to build the arc. So any condemnation would have been god’s doing. Also, how would this have condemned the world. By condemning the world to have people on it? Or that you, supposedly being his descendants, would someday destroy the world? It could also be argued that if noah had decided to disobey god and not build this arc, that god, not wanting to completely destroy humanity, would have stopped his destruction instead. Whatever the story is, I couldn’t care less.

189

Speaking of Moses, what this next paragraph had to say was wrong. In Heb. 11:26, it says:

“Esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than all the treasures in Egypt: for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward.”

Well if Moses knew anything of Christ, he sure kept it a good secret. Though maybe this was just another stupid attempt by Paul to make Jesus out to be god himself.

You may remember the story about esau and jacob. What Paul had to say about the story in this next paragraph was completely wrong. In Heb. 12:16, it says:

“Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright.”

First of all, esau didn’t sell his birthright. It was forced from him by jacob for some bread and pottage of lentils. The morsel of meat came into play later when jacob and his mother used it to help steal esau’s blessing from isaac. Also, as I said before, if there were any profane persons in this story, it was jacob and his mother.

There are a couple reasons why what this next paragraph had to say is untrue. In James 1:13, it says:

“Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted of with evil, neither tempteth he any man:”

Now since they brought up the topic of evil here, I am going to have to assume that it was evil temptation they were talking about. Which is good for them. Otherwise I would have had to again point out some of the ways in which the unfortunate idea of religion tempts people. Now maybe when people are tempted by their own stupidity, they figured that such temptation doesn’t count. But they would be wrong. Because the bible says, here and there, that god causes everything to happen. So when people are tempted by evil, he would

have to be to blame. So James was wrong there. Though fortunately for them, they can blame such things on satan. But god would still be ultimately responsible. Another thing is that sometimes god had supposedly even gone beyond temptation in causing people to do bad things. Which I would say is even worse. Also, as far as their assertion here that god can't be tempted with evil goes, in the past it mentioned god having at times done things he regretted. Apparently he was tempted to do those things. So he was wrong yet again.

I guess it's about time to mention one of those stupid teachings that, because of their frequency, I often let go by without any comment. In James 2:8, it says.

“If ye fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well:”

Now what they say would put your neighbor's wants and needs on the same level as yours. Which for the world we live in, is going a bit too far. Though as is often the case when people want something, maybe what they were doing was

190

asking for more than what they should have in order to help them get at least what they would settle for. Also, though what they said sounds nice, the bottom line is that you should matter more than your neighbor. Unless you're ugly or stupid and your neighbor is beautiful or intelligent. In that case, they should come first.

The kind of justice taught in this next paragraph is pretty lame. In James 2:10, it says:

“For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.”

Obviously, I don't agree with this. A person is only guilty of the crime he commits. Now it's possible that they could have been trying to say that if you commit a one sin, your punishment would be the same as if you committed all sins. (which would include some pretty bad ones) But if this is what they were trying to say, this is what they should have said. Though it was a pretty senseless thing to teach anyway. Because though it could have helped dissuade people from committing some offence, if they felt the need to commit some offence, what they said could also have made people figure that they may as well go all the way and make it a good one.

Not surprisingly, I don't agree with what this next paragraph had to say. In James 3:2, it says:

“For in many things we offend all. If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, and able to bridle the whole body.”

Well generally speaking, just as you can't please everybody, I doubt if you could offend everybody. Then it says that if you don't offend by word, you are a perfect

man. But there are other ways to be offensive besides through words. That wouldn't be very likely to make you perfect. Another thing is that if what you had to say didn't offend anybody in the kind of world we live in, then what you had to say probably wouldn't hold any significance. Also, a person could say something and not mean it or do just the opposite of what they said. I wouldn't call such a person perfect or being full of self control.

One of the biggest lies told in the new testament was this "the lord is coming" crap. Another example of such a teaching can be found in James 5:8. It says: "Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh."

I wonder what his idea of near was. Considering the many centuries that have gone by so far without his coming. So being asked to be that patient was pretty stupid. As are those who are still waiting patiently for his coming. Though if I believed in such crap, I would hope that he never comes. Because a lot of nasty things are supposed to happen first that any halfways normal person would actively be trying to prevent.

This next paragraph was speaking of Jesus. In 1 Peter 1:20, it says:

191

"Who was verily foreordained before the foundation of the world, but was manifest in these last times for you,"

Well Paul said that not only was Jesus around before the world began, but that Jesus created it. Though here Peter said that Jesus was only fore ordained before the world began. So who should you believe? I say neither. Because I know that they were both liars at best. Though as far as being able to tell lies goes, I think Paul had him beat.

What these next two paragraphs had to say doesn't seem very likely. In 1 Peter 3:1-2, it says:

"LIKEWISE, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they may also without the word be won by the conversation of the wives;

While they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear."

One of the unlikely things I find here is the idea that a husband would listen to a wife who is under his subjugation. It would almost be like an adult taking lessons from a child. It then talks about a husband beholding his wife's conversation coupled with fear. But about the only thing I could see a husband in such a position of authority being afraid of is his wife not shutting up. Which husbands back then had the authority to cure quickly enough in a number of ways.

Peter sure seemed to be fond of that "the end of the world is near" crap.

Another example can be found in 1 Peter 4:7. It says:

“But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober, and watch unto prayer.”

Seeing how this didn't happen, I would call this lying. And promoting lies was a terrible thing to do. Another of the many disgusting things about this is that there have been many prophets since that time who spouted the same sort of crap. Then, when things didn't turn out that way, some had even tried to bring such a thing about. But probably the most disgusting and evil thing about all this is that such teachings don't give believers much of an incentive to prevent such a thing from happening.

Next, they gave another example of something not to be believed. In 2 Peter 1:16-18, it says:

“For we have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eyewitnesses of his majesty.

For he received from God the Father honour and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.

And this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount.”

It first says that they hadn't followed cunningly devised fables. Well I can agree that they weren't cunningly devised. But for the most part, they were just fables.

192

Take for instance his saying that he and what I take to mean the other apostles heard a voice from heaven calling Jesus its son. From what I remember, god's voice saying this was supposedly heard after Jesus was baptized. But in Matt. 3 there is no mention of any of the other apostles being there. Then, in John 1, it mentions a couple of John's disciples at the time who may have been there named Andrew and Simon. But they didn't mention anybody hearing a voice from heaven. So as eyewitnesses, they left a lot to be desired.

Surprisingly, Peter seemed to show some concept of geological time. Which he tried to explain away in this next paragraph. In 2 Peter 3:5, it says:

“For this they are willingly ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water:”

So what he seemed to be saying here was that the earth wasn't old from age, but from god making it appear to be that way artificially. Though I am willingly ignorant of that too because I don't believe it. Also, the result of god making the earth appear to be old and telling you otherwise would probably be to condition you into taking his word over what you see. But can you imagine how loathsome



and worthless such conditioning would eventually cause humans to be? Now as far as being god's cattle or flock goes, you would become almost perfect. But for us, it would be disastrous.

What this next paragraph had to say was senseless. In 2 Peter 3:8, it says: "But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day."

It seems to me that if he wanted them to be sure of one thing, he could have chosen something better than this to make them sure of. Though not being a moron, maybe I am not a very good judge of such things. Also, if he didn't want people to be ignorant of this, why did he write it so ignorantly. Because telling people that one day with the lord is like a thousand years and then telling them the reverse of such a statement wasn't telling them anything but nonsense. Unfortunately, it has made me wonder if somebody on the earth saw god, if he would be moving in very fast motion or very slow motion.

They also have trouble making sense in this next paragraph. In 2 Peter 3:9, it says:

"The lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance."

So here you're told that the lord wasn't slack concerning his promise, but longsuffering. Though slackness and long suffering are two different things. The only connection between the two things that I can think of is that the lord's slackness caused him to be long suffering. Which would still make him slack. So it didn't make any sense for them to say what they did. But they could have meant that they were unfit to receive what was promised and the lord was long suffering until they were fit to receive it. Though as is often the case, if that is

193

what they meant, that is what they should have said. Also, with people being the way they are, it's likely that these people could see being promised something if they behaved a certain way as a ploy to get them to behave a certain way. Which in turn would make it more difficult to get them to act a certain way. That in turn would mean that the lord would have to prolong his long suffering. Especially when this promised thing is the destruction of the earth. Then it said that the lord wasn't willing to see anybody perish. But all people perish. Another thing is that the longer he waits to fulfill his promise, as he apparently has already waited, the more people there will be that will perish.

This next paragraph introduces a higher level of stupidity. In 2 Peter 3:13, it says:

"Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new

earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.”

It doesn't make any sense to destroy the old earth just to send them to a new one. Especially since the destruction of the old earth would likely be man's fault. Also, setting aside the old testament's differing views on the matter of life after death, earlier in the new testament you were told that if you were deserving you would go to heaven when you died. Jesus even told one person he was being crucified with that he would be in paradise (which I take to mean heaven) that day. Apparently there was no waiting around for the end of the world for the resurrection for him. He also spoke of there being mansions in his father's house that you would go to. Then, concerning this doomsday cult thing, they talked before about going to heaven after the destruction of the earth. You had also been told that there would be some who would live up amongst the clouds. But now you're supposed to go to a new earth? And people were supposed to put faith in this new promise of life after death? Well I guess they figured that if you're stupid enough to buy any of their bullshit, you would be stupid enough to believe anything.

There is something unfortunate and untrue in what this next paragraph says. In 1 John 1:5, it says:

“This then is the message which we have heard of him, and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all.”

Well the first thing I would like to mention here is his saying that he “heard of” the message that he was declaring to whoever. But to me, declaring hearsay isn't very appropriate. Then it says that there is no darkness in god. I wonder if this idiot had read some of the things in the bible that I had. Because from what I have read, god had said and done some pretty filthy things. Also, I wonder if this person would have admitted that “darkness” even exists. But if he did, I wonder if he would have admitted that god was ultimately responsible for it. Though most likely, he would put the blame for any “darkness” on satan.

As you can guess, I don't agree with what this next paragraph had to say. In 1 John 1:9, it says:

194

“If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleans us from all unrighteousness.”

Here it lays the bullshit on you that Jesus was faithful and just to forgive them their sins. Now it says sins here. Which means the people supposedly being forgiven were no strangers to sinning. So what could have made them think that being forgiven would have kept them from sinning again. And seeing how their track record would indicate that they would sin again, what would be the point of forgiving them. Or supposedly cleansing them from their past sins.

These next two paragraphs sound good on the surface. But they are misleading. In 1 John 2:9-10, it says:

“He that saith that he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now.

He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him.”

The first thing I don't agree with is here is their saying that he who hates his brother is in darkness. Because even though hating is an unpleasant business, I say that an even greater darkness would result from not hating those who deserve to be hated. Now you may say that everybody does wrong at times and my advice would have everybody hating everybody. But hatred is a strong emotion. It usually isn't, nor should be, caused or sustained by minor infractions. I would also say that there is often room for forgiveness. Also, you may worry about hating unjustly. Which is a danger in a world where people have been conditioned as sheep and are often content to let other people do their thinking for them. But all you have to do is get used to thinking for yourselves. You would then be more likely to judge such things adequately. Then it says that he who loves his “brother” abides in the light and will not stumble. Which is another faulty statement. Because too much light can blind as well as darkness. Another thing I would like to say here is that I don't care if people like or dislike each other. All that matters to me is that they show courtesy, respect and generally treat each other fairly. Obviously feelings could help or hinder these things. But hopefully understanding emotion will help you do what is right or avoid doing what is wrong, despite them.

Though a whole book could be and may have been written about the subject of emotions, there are a few other things I would like to say about them in the little space I allow myself here. First, it is hard to say how low of a lifeform experiences emotion. For instance, do some fish protect their young just because of instinct, or could there be some emotion involved. Or do animals run away from danger because of instinct or fear. Whatever the case is, from what I have seen, higher forms of animals have emotion. And it probably exists for a good reason. I have no doubt that it helped earlier communities of humans get along. But unfortunately, as I talked about earlier with my talk of asymmetrical warfare, it can also be used as a weapon.

195

For instance, through invader-scab friendly, “politically correct” civil liberties. Also, religions use it to gain followers. The rich and powerful also use it to help keep their “cattle” in line. As I said earlier, no doubt it helps some people do good or it could cause people to do bad things. Though the main reason for the

brain drugs of emotion is likely to bring people together to breed. But oh the misuses it has been put to! Now I am not saying that emotions should be avoided, but there is a point where the overall good must transcend something so selfish and personal. And that point has long since passed. You will later be seeing more examples of the unfortunate things emotion has gotten you. And it isn't pretty.

There is a good contradiction in this next paragraph. In 1 John 2:16, it says: "For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but of the world."

First of all, it says that the lusts of the flesh, eyes and the pride of life are not from god, but of the world. Which I take to mean that those things wouldn't be allowed or couldn't exist in heaven. But I wouldn't care much for a heaven like that. Though the main point I wanted to make here is that it says that those lusts and pride are not from god. Which contradicts other things in the bible where it says that everything is the result of god's will. For example, if somebody's sick lusts caused them to kill a child, it's considered god's will that it happened.

You're subjected to some excessive flattery in this next paragraph. In 1 John 3:2, it says:

"Beloved, now we are the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is."

Well I am no son of god. In fact, I've done pretty stupid things in the past that sometimes make me wonder if I'm retarded. Which I don't doubt most believers would say is the case. Neither, as I said before, do I think people needed this kind of ego trip thrust upon them. But what gets me is that, as you will see later, he was fond of calling people little children. Though there is a huge difference between being sons of god and being little children. This sort of thing could leave you not knowing whether you were coming or going. Which is the way I think they wanted you to be.

Maybe these next few paragraphs should have gone into the evil section. But what they had to say was at least stupid. In 1 John 3:19-21, it says:

"And hereby we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him.

For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things.

Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then we have confidence toward God."

So the first reason they gave to assure yourself that you are of god is that if you condemn yourself, god is greater than you. Which I take to mean that just

because you condemn yourself, it doesn't mean that god condemns you. That wouldn't inspire much confidence in me. It then says that god knows all things. Which I would take to mean that god would know you condemn yourself. Though that wouldn't provide any justice to those who may have been wronged. So what they said doesn't demonstrate to me that believers are of god. Also, we are the ones who have to live with each other and we usually know very well what is right and what is wrong. So it is we and not god who should be the ones to judge each other. Then you were told that if your heart doesn't condemn you, then you have confidence toward god. But being so stupid that you're not critical of yourself is a pretty slimy and evil way to demonstrate confidence toward god. Because what they said was another way of saying that if you don't condemn yourself for any wrong thing you may have done, but call it god's will, then you have confidence toward god. Though if religion hasn't driven you completely stupid, you should see that you should stay away from that kind of confidence.

This next paragraph gives another example of just how low the bar is set for people to consider themselves of "the truth." Which I take to mean of god. In 1 John 4:2, it says:

"Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God:"

How could anybody say something so wrong. For instance, I used to have some neighbors that lived in an apartment below me that I used to associate with. Until one of them bragged that he had ripped off such close friends that they wouldn't have even suspected that he could have done it. Which wasn't the only way in which they were mentally screwed up. And they were likely to stay screwed up. Though they would have confessed anything about Jesus all day long. But that was no surprise. Seeing how I know they used the bible to justify themselves. For instance, by saying that if god didn't want them to do messed up things, he wouldn't have created them to want to do messed up things. So if they and other scum like them are "of god," then it just gives me another reason to feel disdain for god and its followers.

When it comes to knowing god, what this next paragraph had to say was a little misleading. In 1 John 4:8, it says:

"He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love."

Here it said that he who doesn't love doesn't know god. But I came to the conclusion a very long time ago that love is only a drug. It is often a rationally blinding electrochemical process of the mind that causes a powerful controlling emotion which has little regard for reality. Love may be fun. But because of its nature, it is something I can do without. Now being as sick as wanting to know god is, it's no surprise that they would have used an emotional argument to try and make you do so. Then there are the other outright evil things that god had supposedly said and done. Like creating evil. So you could also say that he who

doesn't know evil doesn't know god. Also, as far as god being love goes,  
197

you know there are places in the bible that says everything that happens is the result of god's will. So if hate exists, from the point of view of those teachings, god must create that hate. So it would be safe to say that god is also hate. Neither would I call some of the things he had supposedly done acts of love. Like destroying the earth in the great flood. Though no doubt some would call it tough love. Then there was this supposed destruction that these people spoke about that was supposed to happen so they could go to heaven or whatever. I would gladly do without that kind of love.

What they were trying to say in this next paragraph was mostly wrong. In 1 John 4:18, it says:

"There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love."

Here it says that there is no fear in love and that love casts out fear. Well love could make you not care about danger, but it would do nothing about the danger itself. So despite love, it would be a good idea to fear if you need to. It also says that he who fears is not made perfect in love. But both love and fear have a reason for being. They just need to be kept in perspective. So people should keep away from the sort of "perfection" they promote.

Not surprisingly, what these next two paragraphs had to say is confusing. In 1 John 5:7-8, it says:

"For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water and the blood: and these three agree in one."

From what I have heard about the holy trinity, it was supposed to be the father, god; the son, Jesus and the holy ghost. But instead of saying the son here, it says "the word." So was Jesus the son of god or was he the word of god. Also, if these three things were the same, why did they separate them. Fortunately, I don't care to know the answer to any of this. Then it said that the spirit, water and blood bear witness in earth. Well a spirit may be able to bear witness. But in anything other than a forensic sense, I don't think water and blood could.

For an even better exercise in befuddlement, let's go to 1 John 5:16. It says: "If any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, he shall ask, and shall give him life for them that sin not unto death. There is a sin unto death: I do not say that he shall pray for it."

First it says that if somebody sees his "brother" sin a sin that is not unto death, whatever that means, he should ask. But ask what. Why he did it? If he

enjoyed it? Or maybe if they needed any help. Your guess is as good as mine. But people shouldn't need to guess things about their religious teachings. Then it says that you should give life for those who sin this sin. But the guilty deserve punishment, not life. I would have preferred they had said that the sinner have some life taken away from them. Though what they could have meant on this  
198

point was that a person give up some of his time, i.e. life, to straighten the sinner out. But if that was what they meant, that is what they should have said. It then says that there is a sin unto death, but the person being expected to give up some of his life for it shouldn't pray for it. Which is something you would think should go without saying. Now I am not exactly sure what they were getting at with all this. But judging from the other things in the bible that I am sure what they were getting at, I am sure that the answer to what they were trying to say here wouldn't be worth knowing.

What these next two paragraphs talk about, they hardly knew the meaning of. In 2 John :1-2, it says:

“THE elder unto the elect lady and her children, whom I love in the truth; and not I only, but also all they that have known the truth;

For the truth's sake, which dwelleth in us, and shall be with us for ever.”

There was a lot of talk about truth here. But as I have only partially shown you so far, it was only talk. Because most of what they had to say were only lies. And the self delusions they spoke of were only lies. In fact, if I had used this same approach to write a book about the things in the bible that were true, good, or made correct judgments, it would be lucky if it would be long enough to consider it a book.

Next, we have another out of the many paragraphs that speak about the truth. In 3 John :4 it says:

“I have no greater joy than to hear that my children walk in the truth.”

The truth he spoke of here was his truth. Not the real truth. Now being told so many times that what they had to say was the truth, it's no surprise that many bought it. But it takes more than brainwashing and superstitious, lazy, cowardly and wishful thinking to make something the truth. It takes the truth. Also, as far as his talk about his “children” goes, I will be going into more depth about such teachings later.

I guess it's about time to mention one of the confusing things I've been reading in the bible lately. In Jude :9-10, it says:

“Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him railing accusations, but said, The Lord rebuke thee.

But these speak evil of those things which they know not: but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves.”

These paragraphs bring up more questions than they answer. None of which is worth knowing the answer to. Like why those supposed entities were disputing over the body of Moses. Or why exactly didn't this archangel didn't dare accuse the devil. Then, instead of a railing accusation, the angel said “the lord rebuke thee.” Though that should be as bad as a railing accusation anyway. Also, what if the devil thought the same thing about this rebuke as I would think about a rebuke from either of these creatures. Which is that they can take their ghost

199

rebuke and stick it up their ghost ass! Even if it could somehow actually harm me. It then spoke of things that those creatures didn't know. But the unfortunate thing about that teaching is that if there are things that even an archangel doesn't know, what hope is there for you to know very much. Then it spoke of things they knew naturally as brute beasts. Well first of all, if you know something naturally, you still know it. Whether or not you can articulate it is a different matter. Also, how this person may have felt about the devil is one thing. But to compare an archangel in any way to a brute beast doesn't seem like something this person should have had the ability or right to do.

This next paragraph spoke of one of the ways in which people are “saved.” In Jude :23, it says:

“And others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire; hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.”

So here it says some people were saved (i.e. made subservient to god) through fear. Which would seem to suggest that god was desperate for souls. Because if you were a god, what kind of souls would you want hanging around. Those who were there because they truly wanted to be with you, or those who were only there because they feared you and hell fire.

Unfortunately, it would seem that people don't care what they believe in. As long as they believe in something. One of the zillions of reasons I have found this to be true can be found in Rev. 1:3. It says:

“THE Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John:”

Well as you probably know, there are many people still waiting for this revelation crap. But for believers to still be waiting for this to happen after all of these centuries shows to me that, as I just said, that they must not care what they believe. As long as they have something to believe in. Also, this was written for people's understanding back then. But as far as I am concerned, how



god may have viewed time is irrelevant.

Another example that the destruction foretold in the revelation couldn't have been meant for our time can be found in Rev. 1:3. It says:

“Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things that are written therein: for the time is at hand.”

Here it said that the time was at hand. Which I take to mean that the time was at hand many centuries ago. Well seeing how to my knowledge the things prophesied in the revelation didn't happen, I would have to say that John was a liar. Also, as I said before, if they were willing to lie in even one point, there's a good chance that they were willing to lie on many points. Which judging from all of the lies in the bible that I have pointed out so far, you should know by now that has indeed been the case. Yet sadly, many people still believe. Though even

200

more sad is that their reading this book, for various reasons, would be unlikely to end their belief.

What this next paragraph had to say had elements of both stupidity and evil. In Rev. 1:5, it says:

“And from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the prince of the kings of the earth. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood,”

First of all, it said that Jesus was the first begotten of the dead. But I thought he was supposed to be the son of god. Not the son of the dead. Unless they meant that god was dead. Or that there is no life after death. It then called Jesus the prince of the kings of the earth. But the first begotten of the dead has no business having anything to do with the living. And as far as the earth is concerned, the only thing the dead should have to do with it is basically as fertilizer. Then they said “unto him that loved us.” Using the past tense of love. But it seems to me that if he were alive in some form, he should still love you. So either he no longer exists or he no longer loves whoever. It then said that Jesus washed away all of their sins with his blood. Which he couldn't do. And judging from all of the sins there have been since then, he wasted his time. Now if he really wanted to do something godlike, he should have evaporated the really bad sinners and repaired the damage they did. Not simply try to make the criminals unaccountable and the victims overly forgiving.

Moving on to the next paragraph, it too had something senseless to say. In Rev. 1:6, it says:

“And had made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.”

Here it said that they were made kings and priests. But I don't know if this was just supposed to apply to the religious leaders or everybody. Also, if this were an ongoing thing through the centuries, I don't see how these titles had changed god's treatment of them.

For those who still believe in the second coming of Jesus and the destruction that is supposed to follow, what the next paragraph had to say must also be a let down. In Rev. 1:7, it says:

"Behold, he cometh with the clouds; and every eye shall see him; and they also which pierced him: and all the kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him. Even so, Amen."

Now it said here that when Jesus returned, those who pierced him would be among those who saw him. But the people who pierced him have been dead for a very long time. So this prophecy must also be long dead. Though people desperate to keep this prophesy alive may say that those who pierced Jesus would simply be resurrected first. Or that they would see him from the afterlife. There's no telling what additional insanity a believer may come up with.

201

Next is another example of the bible blaming people for something it promotes. In Rev. 2:14, it says:

"But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Ballam, who taught Balac to cast a stumblingblock before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed unto idols, and to commit fornication."

First of all, by now you should have some idea about the stumbling blocks that the bible put into people's way. So who were they to bitch. Then it complained about the followers of ballam eating things sacrificed to their idols. But the Jewish priests in the old testament ate things sacrificed at the altar of their god. So who was he to complain. Now the main point I wanted to make here is that they were the ones who taught that, for example, worship and blind faith was all important. So when those people worshiped other gods, it was partially their own fault. Because when you're conditioned to worship, you would tend to worship anything that moves.

This next paragraph is rather unclear. In Rev. 3:7, it says:

"And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write; These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, he that openeth, and no man shutteth; and shutteth, and no man openeth;"

The holy person who was supposed to be saying something here I think was supposed to have been Jesus. Or at least an angel relaying his words. But the first thing I would like to say is that it takes more than people like him calling

something holy or true to make it so. Then it said Jesus had the key of David. Though you already know what I think about him. And Jesus having his key would seem to make him just as bad. Then, what could this key be. It could have represented the uneducated masses base desire to have a king lead and watch over them. Somebody they could live vicariously through and worship like a human god. Which is nothing to brag about. Or it could represent their teaching that even if you are an adulterous, murdering scumbag like David, you can still be forgiven. Which is even worse. It then said that what the lord opened no man could shut and vice versa. So what could this mean? It could mean a brainwashed mind. Because when a mind has been damaged to "open" in such a way, it is nearly impossible to shut. And with such a mind being closed to conflicting ideas, it is nearly impossible to open. Which is tragic.

I must say that some of the things these people came up with are interesting. Though only in a way that a train wreck is interesting. Take for example what it said in Rev. 3:14. It says:

"And unto the angel of the church of the Laodiceans write; These things saith the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God;"

I thought Jesus was supposed to be the son of god. But now he was supposed to be the beginning of the creation of god? I think he was making Jesus out to be more than he was supposed to have been. Also, how could he have been created before his father. Another thing is that, as I said at the beginning of this 202

book, I've been told that god always was and always will be. But here is said that god was created. Which isn't the only place it makes that point. Well from the bible's point of view, I guess that puts an end to that idea.

There are a few things wrong with what these next paragraphs had to say. In Rev. 3:15-18, it says:

"I know thy works, that thou art neither cold or hot: I would thou wert cold or hot.

So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.

Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increaseth with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked:

I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eyesalve, that thou mayest see."

Now when it mentions cold or hot here, I think that is one of the things they meant. It would appear that they wouldn't have been satisfied with people being anything but miserable. Though just because miserable people are more likely to

seek god was a pretty stupid reason to try and make them so. Because god isn't worth it. Then it mentions being lukewarm as being bad. But being comfortable isn't bad. Unless you think that having evolved to a point where we no longer have a thick coat of fur is bad. Neither do I think people should be made to feel ashamed who are fortunate enough to fairly achieve comfort. It then said that if you are rich you don't know that you are wretched, miserable, poor, blind and naked. Well maybe the reason for that was because it mostly was n't true. Also, I would rather be comfortable and be those things rather than be uncomfortable and be those things.

Then it advised them to buy from the lord gold tried in fire. Which I take to mean faith. Though for those who, for instance, had been burned at the stake, it had literally been tried in fire. So if the lord wanted people cold or hot, I hope that was hot enough for him. And such faith was likely the reason they were in that kind of situation to begin with. Another thing is that with the lord wanting people to be either cold or hot, his riches would likely have been equally unpleasant. It then talked about making people see. Though I could imagine the unfortunate things such "shepherds" might want their "flock" to see.

Just in case you don't know, there were three people in the new testament named John. There was John the baptist, John the apostle and St. John the divine who wrote the revelation. Now the revelation is full of this John's hallucinations. So to mention just these next two from his latest one should be sufficient for now. In Rev. 4:7-8, it says:

"And the first beast was like a lion, and the second beast like a calf, and the third beast had a face as a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle.

And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of

203

eyes within: and they rest not day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come."

Well any supposed vision that is this strange is quite useless. It's not even worth wondering why god would have wanted such strange creatures hanging around his throne.

As time goes by, the damage done to our planet increases. Despite this, for any believer out there who thinks that the destruction foretold in the revelation was a prophecy meant for our time, there is little hope I can change your mind about anything. Though I still have to try. Now for those who think that at the end of the world they will ascend straight to heaven, they should consider what it said in Rev. 6:11. It says:

"And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also and their

brethren, that they should be killed as they were, should be fulfilled.”

The stupidity of this is incredible. Why would it be necessary to resurrect people, give them white robes, and then tell them to go back to “sleep” for however long. At least it makes no sense to me. Then it speaks of the faithful who had died so far in this foretold destruction. Before they were permanently resurrected, the remaining living faithful must first die as they did. So according to this, there isn’t any hope of the faithful who are still alive to escape death through faith. For instance, by hearing an angel’s trumpet sound and simply disappearing and being transported to heaven.

Unfortunately for John, he didn’t know much about astronomy. Because in Rev. 6:13, it says:

“And the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind.”

As you probably know, stars aren’t nearby little points of light that can fall to earth. In fact, for the ones that are stars, if just one of them was close enough, the earth could fall into it. I’m glad that he couldn’t have hallucinated something a little closer to reality. Because more people who are less stupid might have bought into this crap.

What this next paragraph had to say was also quite unlikely. In Rev. 7:1, it says:

“AND after these things I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind should not blow in the earth, nor on the sea, nor on any tree.”

If he could see the whole earth and these angels, those angels must have been pretty large. Also, the earth doesn’t have corners. I wonder what would have happened if somebody put this person into a round room and told him to go stand in the corner. Another thing is that there are more than four winds. There are many different winds blowing in many different directions.

There is a sub cult called Jehovah’s witnesses who are among those still waiting

204

for this end of the world thing. If I got the story straight, they are supposed to believe that only a hundred and forty four thousand people will be saved at the end of the world. But in Rev. 7:4, it says:

“And I heard the number of them which were sealed: and there were sealed an hundred and forty four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel.”

It’s surprising that such people are willing to take this person’s word about the destruction that he foretold. Seeing how they are apparently unwilling to take his word when he said things like the destruction he foretold being near or being at hand. But the main point I wanted to make here is that if these are the hundred

and forty four thousand the jehovah's witnesses were talking about, there isn't much chance that they would be among them. Unless they are Israeli. A particularly inept supposed exchange of words can be found in Rev. 7:13-14. It says:

"And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they?"

And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of the great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

If you ever read this story, you would know that nobody asked this elder anything. So how could he answer something he wasn't asked. Then this elder asked what were arrayed in white robes. Not who, but what. Which I find to be interesting. The elder goes on to explain what they were. Though John didn't say he didn't know what they were. Also, it was Jesus they were referring to when it spoke of the lamb here. But one of the strange things about this whole Jesus thing is the number of different ways he was referred to. He was said to be the son of man; the son of god; the lamb of god; the word; the beginning of the creation of god; etc. Which seems quite silly to me. Though a believer might conveniently say that Jesus was somehow all these things.

It would seem that John was making up things about heaven as he went along. Because in Rev. 8:3, it says:

"And another angel came and stood at the altar, having an golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer it with all the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne."

John went into quite a bit of detail earlier about the throne of god and its surroundings. But there was no mention of an altar then. So I don't know (or care) where the altar came from that he spoke of here.

What this next paragraph had to say isn't very impressive. In Rev. 8:5, it says: "And the angel took the censer, and filled it with fire of the altar, and cast it into the earth: and there were voices, and thunderings, and lightnings, and an earthquake."

Ooh, sounds scary. But the things they mentioned are happening all the time in one place or another. Though they could have been talking of this happening in  
205

heaven. Which would make the earthquake a heavenquake. Also, as far as throwing the incense burner unto the earth goes, I find such primitive aboriginal symbolism rather quaint.

I would have to say that what this next paragraph had to say is impossible. In Rev. 8:7, it says:

“The first angel sounded, and there followed hail and fire mingled with blood, and were cast upon the earth: and the third part of trees was burnt up, and all the green grass was burnt up.”

Ignoring the other crap, let's go to the part about the trees and grass. For one thing, green grass doesn't burn that well. Also, if it did get hot enough to burn all of the green grass, I doubt if it would have left two thirds of the trees unscathed.

More unlikely carnage was described in Rev. 8:10. It says:

“And the third angel sounded, and there fell a great star from heaven, burning as it were a lamp, and it fell upon the third part of rivers, and upon the fountains of waters;”

Another star falling to earth? How interesting. And I'm sure he meant a star and not a meteorite. Because he demonstrate some concept of the difference when, back in Rev. 8:8, he talked about a great mountain burning with fire being cast into the sea. But if this “star” was as large as this suggests, they could have stopped all the destruction here. Because that would have the end.

I hate to subject you to the relentless stupidity they described here. But in Rev. 8:12, it says:

“And the fourth angel sounded, and the third part of the sun was smitten, and third part of the moon, and the third part of the stars; so as the third part of them was darkened, and the day shone not for a third part of it, and the night likewise.”

As usual, I am not going to go into all of the stupid aspects of what they said here. Now earlier they said that all of the stars of heaven fell to earth. Apparently, not all of them did. Speaking facetiously, unless some hit the ground and bounced back up into space. Also, I could see how some sort of cloud could keep the sun from shining for a third part of a day. But I don't see how that could make the night shorter too.

Part of what this next paragraph had to say sounds like something you would see in a silly old cartoon. In Rev. 9:1, it says:

“AND the fifth angel sounded, and I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth: and to him was given the key of the bottomless pit.”

First of all, I wonder how many stars were supposed to fall to earth. One would have been more than enough. But the really stupid thing here is when he said this star was given a key. Because a star doesn't have hands or pockets to receive a key with.

There's quite a bit wrong with their next paragraph here. Which concerns some locusts god was supposed to make to plague the earth. In Rev. 9:4, it says:

“And it was commanded them that they should not hurt the grass of the earth,

206

neither any green thing, neither any tree; but only those men which have not the

seal of God in their foreheads.”

I should first mention that god gave those locusts stingers. Now one of the first things those locusts are told not to do is eat the grass. Which is stupid because all of the green grass was supposed to have been burnt up after the first angel sounded. I would have to assume that the ungreen grass didn't fare very well. So there shouldn't have been any grass for those locusts to eat anyway. It's also pretty rotten to make locusts and deny them food. He could have also saved those locusts some grief and have given their stingers to some other insect that doesn't eat plants. Then it said that those locusts were only to plague those who didn't have the brand of god in their foreheads. Which is stupid. Because in Rev 3:9, it speaks of people standing before the throne of god. From the way the story is told, I would assume that those who received the seals were among them. Which I take to mean they were already in heaven. Not on earth where these locusts could bother them.

Speaking more about these locusts, in Rev. 9:7-10, it says:

“And the shapes of locusts were like horses prepared unto battle; and on their heads were as it were crowns like gold, and their faces were as the faces of men.

And their hair was as the hair of women, and their teeth were as the teeth of lions.

And they had breastplates, as it were breastplates of iron; and the sound of their wings was as the sound of many chariots of many horses running to battle.

And they had tails like unto scorpions, and there were stings in their tails: and their power was to hurt men five months.”

He sure had a vivid imagination. Or some good drugs. Now there are still followers of this end of days death cult thing out there out there who might say that he was describing futuristic devices the best way he knew how. Which is an idea that is stupid for so many reasons that I'm not going to waste time by talking about it.

More bafflement can be found in Rev. 9:14-16. It says:

“Saying to the sixth angel which had the trumpet, Loose the four angels which are bound up in the great river Euphrates.

And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men.

And the number of the army of the horsemen were two hundred thousand thousand: And I heard the number of them.”

So what's going on here. First they talk about four angels being loosed, then they talk about an improbably large number of horsemen of two hundred million. Well I'm not going to lose any sleep pondering the correlation between the two. Also, why were those angels bound to begin with. It's hard to say, or care.

Their next paragraph here confuses an issue of guilt. In Rev. 11:18, it says:



“And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and to them that fear thy name, small and great; and shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth.”

Strangely enough, for some reason they actually made destroying the earth sound like a bad thing here. Which as you know, the last thing you could call the bible is environmentally friendly. You also know that according to what the bible usually says, everything that happens is the result of god's will. So if the reason for destroying those who destroyed the earth here was because they destroyed the earth, then it was god who should have been destroyed instead. Because he was the one who made them do it.

For another excerpt from this strange story, let's move on to Rev. 12:3-4. It says:

“And there appeared another wonder in heaven, and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads.

And his tail drew a third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for to devour her child as soon as it was born.”

He sure liked dreaming up strange creatures. Now this strange looking dragon was supposed to be satan. Though this is the first time I've ever heard of him looking like that. Then it said that this dragon drew a third part of the stars with its tail and cast them to earth. That dragon must have had some tail! But one of the things that I found stupid about his whole story was how fond he seemed to be of having stars cast down to earth. Also, as far as this pregnant woman thing goes, she was supposed to bear a child that ruled all the nations of the earth with a rod of iron. But it seems strange for them to teach that satan would want to eat such a child.

More about this mysterious woman can be found in Rev. 12:6. It says:

“And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days.”

Now this woman first appeared to John as a wonder in heaven. She was clothed in the Sun and had the Moon under her feet. So I would have to say that the rest of the teachings about her are equally hallucinatory. Also, I sort of wonder what kind of wilderness such a woman hid in. Or who it was that was supposed to feed her there. Though I don't really care.

If you think you're getting sick of hearing about this story, imagine how I felt. I had to read the whole thing! For another excerpt from it, let's move on to Rev. 12:12. It says:

“Therefore rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them. Woe unto the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea; for the devil is come down unto you, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time.”

208

So it said that woe should have been upon the inhabitants of the earth because the devil had come down to them. But why should they have been worried. Because the seven seals had supposedly been opened and the seven angels had supposedly blown their trumpets. After each of which a new disaster was supposedly unleashed. Though even that wasn't the end of god's wrath. So anything the devil could have done would have been pretty small in comparison. Also, god and the devil didn't get along with each other. They supposedly even fought a battle in heaven for some undisclosed reason. So any power that satan had (which they promoted as being quite substantial) would unlikely have been used in helping god hurt those people even further. It then said that the devil had a short time. But a short time to what. To live? Or to plague the earth before god completely destroyed it. In the first case, why would satan have wasted what time he had left to torture people. Or in the second case, what would the point have been for satan to torture people who were about to be destroyed anyway.

If you thought their last paragraph that I mentioned was stupid, take a look at these next two. In Rev. 12:14-15, it says:

“And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent.

And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the woman, that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood.”

First of all, I could have done without this times and half a time gibberish. Also, I wonder (but not too much) if they were writing poorly or if this woman was actually being nourished from the face of the serpent. Which as you know, doesn't seem like something this serpent would do. Then it says this serpent caused water to come out of its mouth in hopes of washing this woman away. But I would imagine this place where the woman went was the place god prepared for her. So if this serpent had any hopes of washing her away, then god must not have prepared the place very well. There is more I could say. But why bother.

There are a few things that are unusual about what their next paragraph said. In Rev. 13:16, it says:

“And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads.”

After all of the destruction they described, I don't see how there could still be the hierarchy they described here. Also, though they are just labels, referring to free and bonded people would again suggest something that didn't refer to our time. Though as far as marking people goes, that is something that could still happen. And hopefully will. In some way that is tamper proof. Because as the world population increases, protecting ourselves by keeping track of foreigners who are invading the U.S. mainly because their own stupidity has already proven

209

itself to be necessary. To such ends, I would be far more than ecstatic to be "marked" by being implanted with a tamper proof biometric chip. That is if employers and the government who obeys them more than the common people used such an ID to keep such modern day slaves from taking our jobs. Which isn't likely. At least not with our government.

There are some things in their next paragraph here that don't make much sense. In Rev. 14:13, it says:

"And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; and their works do follow them."

First of all, I think this is again saying that if you believe in Jesus you should consider yourself to be dead already. Otherwise, I would say that it would be pretty difficult for the dead to die. But as I said before, that was at least a stupid thing to teach. Also, those who died for the lord before this was written apparently didn't receive this blessing. Which sure made suckers out of them. Though being believers, being suckers would have been nothing unusual to them. Then it said that those people would rest from their labors. But the trouble with that is that it could just as easily mean that they would cease to exist. It then said that their works would follow them. Though I can't be too sure if their "works" was supposed to mean the guilt or innocence of their actions, or things they may have physically made. Neither does this make clear if these things would be going with them, or if they simply would be following them into destruction.

Not surprisingly, their next paragraph is rather silly. In Rev. 15:7, it says:

"And one of the four beasts gave unto the seven angels seven golden vials full of the wrath of God, who liveth for ever and ever."

Here you're told that seven angels were given seven golden vials full of the wrath of god. But back in the first paragraph of this chapter it said that those angels were already filled with the wrath of god. So being given vials full of the stuff seems rather superfluous.

Even more silliness can be found in Rev. 16:10. It says:

“And the fifth angel poured out his vile upon the seat of the beast; and his kingdom was full of darkness; and they gnawed their tongues for pain.”

I can imagine this scenario. To have somebody say, “Hey, it got dark all of a sudden. What are we going to do.” Then to have somebody else answer, “I have an idea. Let’s gnaw our tongues for pain.” It just doesn’t seem very likely to me.

These next paragraphs supposedly reveal the mystery of a woman and the beast that carried her. In Rev. 17:9-12, it says:

“And here is the mind which hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth.

210

And there are seven kings: five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come; and when he cometh, he must continue a short space.

And the beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is one of the seven, and goeth into perdition.

And the ten horns which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet; but receive power as kings one hour with the beast.”

All I am going to say here is that it would be amazing if anybody thought that an answer so incredibly unspecific could be thought of as being useful in any way.

One of the things that was supposed to be destroyed when the destruction foretold in the revelation occurred was Babylon. A description of the sorts of things that Babylon was supposed to be trading in at the time can be found in Rev. 18:12-13. It says:

“The merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and of fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble,

And cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men.”

Well the empire of Babylon doesn’t exist any more. Which I doubt if the revelation had anything to do with. So from that aspect, how could the revelation be meant for our time or a time soon to come. Also, modern cities don’t trade in some of these things any more. And some of the things they made out to be valuable aren’t that valuable any more. Neither did they describe any sort of technological merchandise. So anybody who thinks that the destruction foretold in the revelation could be meant for our time or a time soon to come, you have yet another reason to feel stupid.

From what this next paragraph said, it would seem that even god's throne held a few surprises. In Rev. 19:5, it says:

"And a voice came out of the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great."

Now to make a voice come out of a throne wouldn't be too difficult these days. Though it's difficult to understand why anybody would want a throne issuing orders. Also, the impression that this gives of the throne somehow being alive is pretty strange. But it isn't as bad as some of the other things you've been expected to swallow.

This next paragraph said that Jesus was to be married in heaven. In Rev. 19:7, it says:

"Let us be glad and rejoice, and give honour to him: for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his wife hath made herself ready."

It's rather strange to get married in heaven. For instance, what do they say during the ceremony. "Till life do you part?" Also, I suppose they would have to

tell their children not to play in the ionosphere, or some such thing. Another thing is that in describing what heaven was supposed to be like, Jesus, the lamb, was made out to be a pretty grotesque looking creature. So his bride must have had pretty low standards.

To set up this next story, the devil was supposed to have been kept in a bottomless pit for a thousand years. He then was supposed to have been let loose to do god's will by deceiving nations and causing them to make war. Then, in Rev. 20:10, it says:

"And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever."

Their stories seem to get even more unlikely as they go along. Because why after being confined in a bottomless pit for a thousand years would the devil come out to do god's will. Well the answer is that he likely wouldn't have. Though it's possible that god could have tricked the devil into doing so. Also, it seems pretty rotten for god to give the devil an even worse punishment for doing what he wanted to be done.

Being too stupid and strange to pass up, let's move on to their next paragraph. In Rev. 20:11, it says:

"And I saw a great white throne, and he that sat on it, from whose face the earth and heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them."

I have to say that I find it unlikely that the heaven and earth would flee from anybody's face. Also, seeing how they brought the subject up, it would have

been nice to know why they fled. Was it because they were afraid? Or was it because that whatever was on the throne was so ugly.

These next few paragraphs spoke of what was supposed to have happened after god destroyed the old heaven and earth and replaced them with new ones. In Rev. 21:2-4, it says:

“And I John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.

And I heard a great voice out of heaven saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God.

And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.”

First of all, it's too bad that making a physical city isn't as easy as making a ghost city is. Though as long as they were in pretend land here, why not create country estates for those who may not want to live in a city. Then it said that god himself would live with them. But if god was going to live in a new city on a new earth, why did he go through all of the trouble of creating a new heaven. Seeing how he apparently wasn't going to live there anyway. It then said that they were  
212

going to be his people. Yeah, just as they might be his cattle or slaves. Which is an idea you already know I don't like. Then it said that god would wipe away their tears. Though it's possible, I would have to say that these tears weren't tears of joy. So those of you who may think the next life would be better might do well to ponder why at least some of them were crying. It then said that there would be no more death or pain because all former things were passed away. Yeah, like their bodies and nervous systems. But being unable to feel pain doesn't give much hope that they would have been able to feel anything at all. Which doesn't sound like very much fun.

Earlier, I was wondering what the lamb's bride looked like. In Rev. 21:10, it tells you. It says:

“And he carried me away in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and shewed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God,”

So the new jerusalem was supposed to be the lamb's bride. But a city is no kind of wife to have.

Describing this new jerusalem, what this next paragraph had to say seems rather useless. In Rev. 21:12, it says:

“And had a wall great and high, and had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the twelve tribes of

the children of Israel:”

It said here that there were walls with gates around this city. But as with a story told earlier about a city that was supposed to be built called “the lord is there,” if god was to reside there, why would they need walls to keep out the undesirable.

I’ve never heard of the kind of gold this next paragraph speaks of. In Rev. 21:18, it says:

“And the building of the wall of it was of jasper: and the city was pure Gold, like unto clear glass.”

It seems that he didn’t know that you can’t see through gold. No matter how pure it is.

For another interesting description of the new jerusalem, let’s go to Rev. 21:21. It says:

“And the twelve gates were twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl: and the street of the city was pure gold, as it were transparent glass.”

What this seems to be saying is that every gate of this gaudy city was made from one pearl. Well either the gates were pretty small or there were some large oysters hanging around somewhere. Also, he again spoke of transparent pure gold. Oh well, it was his hallucination. I guess he could see what he wanted to see.

I guess it’s about time to mention another of the aggravating ways in which the bible is often written. In Rev. 21:25, it says:

213

“And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there.”

This brings up more questions than I would care to go into. But there are a couple things I would like to go into. The first being whether or not any angels can see in the dark. Because if they could, any angels that may be on guard duty during any nighttime hours wouldn’t be bothered by the dark. So there probably wouldn’t be any need to close the gates even if it were dark. Though if they had any concept of streetlights, the dark wouldn’t be any bother anyway. Another point is the angels guarding these gates. If they didn’t have different angels working in shifts, to me it would seem to be a hellish existence.

There is an aspect of this next description of the new jerusalem that I would like to talk about. In Rev. 22:2, it says:

“In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of nations.”

The point I wanted to delve into a little here is where it said that the leaves of the tree of life was for the healing of nations. But any nations were destroyed with the old earth. So what was there left to heal. Though they could have meant nations that would eventually come to be on the new earth. Or maybe it was supposed to heal any animosity between spirits that came from different nations. It's hard to say, or care. Also, there is an aspect of this story that I will be going into later. Which concerns some rabble that were supposed to be hanging around outside the walls of this city. Apparently those healing leaves didn't do them much good.

The bible had recently said again in a couple of different places that the time for this prophecy was at hand. Which as with many other things in the bible, I'm not going to bother writing about. But for those of you who think that the revelation was meant for our time or a time yet to come, I will leave you with this last excerpt from the bible for this chapter. In Rev. 22:10-11, it says:

“And he saith unto me, Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time is at hand.

He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still.”

Believers are just going to have to face the facts. When they said that the time was at hand, they meant just that. Or when they said later that he comes quickly, as I said before, you can't call the many centuries that have passed “quickly.” So you would have to be pretty stupid to think that the prophesy of the revelation was meant for our time or a time yet to come. Take for instance here where it said that the unjust and filthy should remain that way. Though I wouldn't put such an evil sentiment past god, I doubt if they meant that for these many centuries the unjust and filthy should remain that way until some future fulfillment

214

of the revelation. The last thing I would like to say here about the prophecy of the revelation. The longing some people still have for destruction because of what this garbage said is sickening and tragic.



## CHAPTER FOUR

EVIL  
of the  
NEW TESTAMENT

215

You had seen me point out many of the vile things that the bible said in “Evil of the Old Testament.” Which must have been especially difficult for any Jews to have read. No doubt any Christians who read this will find this next chapter even more difficult to read. One reason being that all of the crap that was written in the new testament is piled on top of all of the crap that was written in the old testament. To begin, let’s start off with what it said in Matt. 5:10. It says:

“Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.”

The trouble with what they said here is that people who are persecuted for righteousness’ sake can mean the same thing as people who are persecuted in the name of righteousness. And people persecuted in the name of righteousness shouldn’t be blessed. Now no doubt there are probably people out there who would say that what they meant to say was “blessed are the righteous who are persecuted.” But if that was what they meant, that is what they should have said. Also, as you will be seeing more of as you go along, you can’t assume that what they said had a good meaning. Another thing is that there may be people out there who might say that when they referred to “righteousness’ sake” here, they were speaking about Jesus. But to encourage people to suffer persecution for the sake of any cult leader is pretty rotten. And as far as Jesus’s righteousness goes, I’ve already dug a hole and thrown that idea in it. For the rest of this chapter, you will see me shoveling dirt into the hole to bury that idea.

In speaking of what I take to be Jesus’s commandments, in Matt. 5:19, it says: “Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach other men so, he shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven.”

I think it’s pretty rotten for them to teach that you can break one of the least important of what I take to mean Jesus’s commandments and still go to heaven. Because if any of their rules wasn’t worth enforcing, it wasn’t worth commanding people to follow. Now there may be some who think that altering a person’s rank in heaven is a form of enforcement. But to me it would seem that being in heaven would be the important thing. What your rank there may be would be largely unimportant. After all, what would a higher ranking person in heaven be able to do. Sit on a softer cloud?

Now I don’t know what you would call this next paragraph that I am going to mention. Was it a commandment or just a teaching. Whatever the case is, it’s pretty bad. In Matt. 5:25, it says:

“Agree with thy adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison.”

Well instead of telling people how they might avoid punishment, if they are in

216

fact in the wrong, I have a better idea. Don’t go around making people your adversaries. That is unless they deserve to be adversaries.

Another of the many teachings that make life easier for the wicked can be found

in Matt. 5:39. It says:

“But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.”

Between god creating evil and Jesus telling you not to resist evil, it would seem that you would all be better off if you became evil. But again I say that evil should always be fought. To teach people to do otherwise is evil! Besides, evil isn't so strong that it can't be fought and defeated. Though even if there were a flood of evil, the way to handle a flood isn't to let it have its way with you. The best way to handle a flood is to swim well. It would also be helpful to build better drainage. Also, Jesus probably understood that in turning the other cheek, you would be offering resistance. Lame as it would be. By trying to make the person who struck you feel guilty for doing so. So what he said sent a rather mixed signal.

An even better example of evil here can be found in Matt. 5:44-45. It says:  
“But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you;

That ye may be children of the Father which is in heaven: for he maketh the sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust.”

Assuming of course that those who may mistreat you are wrong in doing so, I can't imagine how much more evil anybody could get than to tell you to make things downright pleasant for such people. I say that anybody who does good to the evil or says that you should always do good to the wicked is a sleazy, slimy asshole! And those would be their good points! What they teach here also illustrates one of the major shortcomings of religious emotion. How it can make something seem beautiful when it is actually sick, demented and diseased. One of many reasons why what they said here is wrong is because too much of about anything, like forgiveness of your enemies, is not good. Now you may remember me saying before that what the bible does is put a little poison in with the sugar. But now, on top of that, the amount of sugar itself makes the poison. You may also remember my saying before that god, if it exists, was in fact a devil. Take all of the forgiveness and love that Jesus supposedly taught. Don't you think that a devil would know that it can, as the old saying goes, “trap more flies with honey than with vinegar.”

So it seems that I have to say again, and not for the last time, that evil should always be fought. Even if it couldn't be beaten, I wouldn't buy into this “if you can't beat them, bless them” crap. Then, what was the reason he gave here for being nice to the wicked? It was because god supposedly caused the sun to

shine and the rain to fall on them as well. Which wasn't much of a reason. Now there are undoubtedly those out there who would say that we are all guilty to some degree and therefore unworthy to point a finger of blame. But having done wrong doesn't disqualify you from trying to change and fight evil when and where you can. Unfortunately, people are so screwed up in what they have been taught, most people's understanding of good and evil is only rudimentary at best. There is another interesting aspect to all this overblown love and forgiveness crap that Jesus taught. Which is that despite it, Christians had in the past been guilty of some incredibly evil deeds. Though let's compare him to another piece of shit prophet of god. Namely Mohammed.

Unlike Christ, this guy actually led armies into battle to spread his religion. (Apparently, it couldn't succeed through philosophy alone) Though for his followers, believing their own lies, they would probably tell you that these wars were defensive actions. I saw an interesting documentary about Muslims once. Though my disdain for Islam preceded it by a very long time, it contained a lot of interesting information. Some of which I didn't even know about. Unless you prefer to wallow in ignorance, you should watch it too. It's called, "Islam: What The West Needs To Know." One of the things I saw on it was an old fresco that showed pictures of both Mohammed and the angel gabriel. Some deluded Muslim believer had apparently chipped away the face of Mohammed because it was too holy to look at. But left the picture of gabriel alone. How could anybody be so deluded as to think that the face of a human was more holy than the image of gabriel. After all, being an angel, gabriel should in theory be a far superior being compared to Mohammed. Not only that, but you would have to suppose that gabriel actually spent who knows how long in the actual presence of allah.

This is one of the problems of acting through faith. It can lead to some pretty stupid actions. Another thing I learned in the documentary I recommended is that the cocksucker (Personal opinion) Mohammed is that he is said to have personally cut off between six hundred and nine hundred heads. According to a painting I had seen of the act, he didn't do so neatly with an ax or sword. That bloodthirsty devil in disguise apparently preferred the hands on approach of doing so with a big knife. So given the filthy things that Christians had been guilty of, the demented and violent things that Muslims are guilty of should be no surprise. Such as doctors or other well educated Muslims being willing to kamikaze themselves to commit acts of terrorism. Or Muslim fighters specifically targeting school children. Though religion isn't completely to blame for such actions. Now you have yet to see to what degree my contempt for Jesus reaches. But at least he apparently wasn't as violent of a piece of shit as Mohammed was.

As for those who think the image of Mohammed is too holy to look at, I have an

image of him in my head right now. In which he is performing fellatio on a large dog and having a pig screw him in the ass. Ok. Now I have an image of him in  
218

my head of him doing the same thing the other way around. (I didn't know pigs could ejaculate so much!) Unfortunately, I'm not an artist. Or I would draw such images. That would really piss those brainwashed monkeys off. But followers of Mohammed shouldn't feel too picked on. Because I have an equal amount of disregard for any cult leader or religion that has to rely on things like faith, religious fanaticism, dogma, or most disgustingly, aggression to sustain what they would like you to think is right and true.

What they said in this next paragraph perverts an act of charity. In Matt. 6:1, it says:

“TAKE heed that ye do not your alms before men, to be seen of them: otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven.”

What they were getting at here was that people shouldn't have given alms openly. Just think of how terrible it supposedly would have been if a nasty habit like giving alms was to spread. Though from what they later said, apparently they didn't want people to do it just to bolster their image. But there are worse things that could happen than to give charity for selfish reasons. Like neglect of the poor, disinterest in their situation or putting a stigma on openly doing a good deed. Also, as I said before, giving alms isn't a very good way of dealing with poverty anyway.

Another thing I talked about before is that telling people to live recklessly is extraordinarily bad advice. Yet another example of such teachings can be found in Matt. 6:25. It says:

“Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not life more than meat, and the body more than raiment?”

I wouldn't give this advice to a worm. Now to the contrary if what he said, you should take care of yourself. Because life is pretty miserable without a steady supply of food and water. It can also be pretty bad if you don't have adequate clothing.

More of their bad teachings on this matter can be found in Matt. 6:34. It says: “Take therefore no thought for the morrow: for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof.”

Following teachings like this, you would have reason to pray. And pray hard! Which is probably why they said it. Now you shouldn't worry unduly about things before you need to. But many things must be thought of in advance to control or prevent. Like overpopulation, ecological damage, etc. And despite the things

they said, planning where your next meal is coming from is always a good idea. Then they spoke of the evil of the day. But if there was any evil involved in their lives, it was likely largely their own fault. Also, they might have said the trouble of the day, the struggle thereof or something like that. But no, they had to say evil. Which serves two purposes. First, it could cause people to become desensitized to the idea of evil. Well they can try all they want, (and they do) just  
219

don't be fooled by it. The second effect of bringing up evil here could be to cause people to be dissatisfied with this life. Which they also did all the time by making people think that it is the afterlife that counts. But people shouldn't neglect this life in hopes of a better one in heaven.

This next paragraph is another one of those that sound beautiful. Which doesn't incline people to look past the beauty to see the evil. What I am referring to is in Matt. 7:1. It says:

“JUDGE not, that ye be not judged,”

How predictable is for the bible to make you all out to be guilty and therefore (in their eyes) unworthy to judge other people. But I am willing to live with any judgement that I deserve. Just as I am willing to live with any judgements I place on others. Now for the sake of argument, let's say that we were all guilty of something like being backstabbing thieves. I would rather we tried to repress such actions by punishing those we catch doing it rather than not caring or doing nothing about the crimes being committed. Even if somebody guilty of a worse crime judged somebody guilty of a less severe crime, at least some sort of justice would have been served. So Jesus can stick this teaching too. It would have been better if he said something like “judge fairly, that you may be judged fairly.”

The most likely excuse Jesus may have possibly had for saying what he supposedly said in this next paragraph would have been if he believed his own lies. Which wasn't much of an excuse. In Matt. 10:37, it says:

“He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me.”

I've heard of some big egos, but this is ridiculous! Now I say that those who love Jesus more than their own family aren't worthy of life. What they said here was probably the kind of crap that allowed things to happen like the reverend Jim Jones handing out the faster acting poison. Though there should be a limit to love for a family member. Which concerns justice. Because your love for a family member who commits a serious crime shouldn't keep you from turning them in. Because though they may be fond of and protective of a family member, a victim is a victim. And their families are probably equally as fond of and protective of them.

The last paragraph of theirs that I mentioned was bad enough. But they manage to say something even worse in this next one. In Matt. 10:39, it says: "He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."

First of all, I'm not too sure what he was trying to say when he said that those who find their life will lose it. But I don't like any of the possibilities of what he could have meant by it. Then it basically said that if these people threw away their lives for his sake, they would find it. Yeah, find it's no longer there. "Holy" people who teach things like this really make me sick. They may promise you an

220  
honored place in heaven, or some such dogshit. But you don't need to die for some religious leader or their varying barbaric beliefs to earn a place in heaven. (if such a place even exists) Living with justice and consideration should be all that is required for that.

One of Jesus's many warped ideas on forgiveness can be found in Matt. 12:31. It says:

"Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men: but blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men."

As far as sin goes, there is less incentive for avoiding any sin if you can be forgiven for it. Now from what I have reasoned on this matter, I say that the only sin that should be forgiven is one in which reparations can be made. Then there is the matter of blasphemy toward the holy ghost to consider. To which I say that if it is responsible for the lies and evil I've read in the bible so far, it can find somebody with diarrhea and suck on their anus with a straw thick enough to let all of the chunks through.

From what I have read around here in the bible, Jesus meant what he said in this next paragraph. In Matt. 12:43, it says:

"When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest, and findeth none."

There are a few reasons why Jesus could have said something so filthy and disgusting. One I mentioned earlier. Which is that in a world where evil happens, to prove the greatness of god, it is necessary to say that he creates evil for some purpose. Another reason for what he said here could have been because there are opposites in the world. Like hot and cold, light and dark, male and female, etc. So since these are a part of life, then along with good, evil must also be necessary. But just because there is an opposite to good doesn't make it necessary. Evil is called evil because it is wrong. And it is never right to be wrong. Though I don't mean what is merely subjective. I mean what is really wrong. He may also have said this because anybody without their unclean spirit



would have no need for him or god. Though I myself think it would be wonderful to do without an unclean spirit, Jesus and god. So to the contrary of what Jesus tried to teach here, in my opinion, is it those with an unclean spirit in them who walk through dry places and find no rest.

When the bible wasn't saying things that are unimportant, telling lies or teaching evil, it also liked to use parables. A reason why can be found in Matt. 13:10-11. It says:

"And the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables?"

He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given."

Well I can tell you what I think the main mystery was that he didn't want people  
221

to know. Which is that if you are a believer, you are one of the suckers said to be born every minute. Now let me give you an example of why I think theological parables and the people who use them suck. Say somebody gave you a parable to figure out. And after who knows how long, you came to the conclusion that it meant that the strong or unscrupulous have the right to subdue others. Which is an idea god apparently lived by. Though instead of being given a parable, suppose you were told this outright. Then the time it took deciphering the meaning of the parable could instead have been put to use in deciding for yourself if having the ability to dominate others gives you the right to do so. Which I don't believe it does. Also, there are those who might say that unraveling a theological parable is meant to exercise the mind. But it isn't a very good form of mental exercise. Besides, from what they said, making people smarter wasn't what they were trying to do anyway. Their most likely purpose was to keep people stupid. Or make them think that Jesus was smarter than they were. Both of which would have made potential believers easier to convert and current believers easier to control.

Moving on to the next paragraph, Jesus spoke of what he meant to achieve through the use of parables. In Matt. 13:12, it says:

"For whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken even that he hath."

When they speak of abundance here, it isn't a very sensible way to refer to knowledge. It most accurately describes wealth, food, possessions, etc. So what this most likely is saying is that those who have this "knowledge" will be able to fleece people and gain things. While those who don't have this "knowledge" will have things taken from them. This is a pretty dishonorable way of gaining things. Even if it is from those stupid enough to believe any of their

crap. Also, if this is what Jesus had in mind with his use of parables, it is a safe bet to assume that this is what he was up to with everything he said. Of all the questionable things religion has to offer, on its own, being made out to be such suckers would make it not worth the price. Let alone all of the other unfortunate teachings.

In the following two paragraphs, Jesus gave a less believable reason for keeping people in the dark. In Matt. 13:13-14, it says:

“Therefore I speak unto them in parables: because they seeing see not; and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.

And in them is fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing they shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive:”

Well to deceive people to fulfill some old prophecy is a better reason than the one I pointed out earlier. Though it's still pretty bad. But I'm not buying the reason he gave here. Another reason he would have had to deceive people he doesn't mention here. Which is that when people seek out the ability to justify  
222

their stupidity, they probably wouldn't have wanted any real truth he may have had to reveal anyway.

In the paragraph before this next one, Peter rebukes Jesus for saying he was going to die. Then in Matt. 16:23, it gave Jesus's response. It says:

“But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things of God, but those that be of men.”

First of all, I think it was going a bit far calling Peter satan just because he didn't want to hear Jesus say that he was going to die. Because caring about what happens to another person is not an action I would attribute to satan. Then, the reason for Jesus's anger was basically because Peter chose life over god's will that Jesus die. But despite what god may have commanded, I would choose life every time! Now there may be things worth dying for, but doing so just so god can gather more suckers into his corral isn't one of them. If Jesus's way of thinking prevailed, there would be many misguided people savoring the idea of death at god's command. But it would in fact be unscrupulous or stupid people telling them that they should die for some cause because it is god's will. So to tell people that such a death is something to be savored is despicable; evil; vile; contemptible; sickening; grotesque; perverted; demented; etc. etc. etc. etc.

For the most part, I would say there is nothing wrong with teaching people to be humble. But what this next paragraph had to say was going too far. In Matt. 18:4, it says:

“Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.”

Now telling people they should be as humble as a little child is pretty stupid. Because children are apt to be too humble. Which makes them too trusting, easily persuaded and therefore easily victimized by anybody wishing to do them harm. What they said may make it easier to lead people. But if anybody is unable to lead an adult, they shouldn't be leading anybody.

These next two paragraphs take the idea of forgiveness to the extreme. In Matt. 18:21-22, it says:

“Then came Peter unto him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times?”

Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven.”

Again, this sounds beautiful, but it is actually sick. Let's see how many reasons I can come up with for now that I may not have used already. First of all, in my opinion, too much forgiveness would be worse than not enough. For example, anything easily obtained, like forgiveness is here, is easily taken for granted. Which it shouldn't be. Though if his teaching were followed, it would be. Now most people deserve some forgiveness. But this is too much. In my opinion, forgiveness without limitations is evil. Another thing is that if you do decide to

223

forgive somebody, it is up to you as to what degree they should be forgiven. Because forgiveness is not an “all or nothing” proposition.

I won't go into specifics on this next matter, but Jesus went on with a story that was meant to teach that you should forgive somebody in hopes that they would in turn forgive somebody else. But who would care about being forgiven by somebody who was in need of being forgiven themselves. Though the main point I wanted to make here is that it would be a morally and judiciously unbalanced world if we all ran around letting those who damage society be held unaccountable. So instead of what Jesus taught in this instance, I say you should forgive only as much as you feel is justifiable. Hopefully, you will set a good example for others.

In not having anything bad to say about this next institution, Jesus must have supported it. In Matt. 19:12, it says:

“For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it.”

Well seeing how the main point of what Jesus taught mentally cuts off your

balls, it's no wonder that he didn't object to it happening physically. Which is terrible. Now because eunuchs didn't have a lot to live for besides the service of their masters, they were sought after. I also told you before that I seem to remember hearing something somewhere about parents who would castrate their children to get a better price for them. But even if I was imagining this, knowing what lengths some people will go to in getting what they feel they need, I don't doubt that it happened. It's also highly likely that some parents sold their children into slavery knowing that castration was in store for them.

As you may know, some people also did it so their male children would have a more feminine adult singing voice. But I have only disgust for anybody who would support such an institution or allow such things to happen. Also, to be fair, there is something I should say about his saying, "those who are able to receive it, let them receive it," From what was written in the preceding paragraphs, I would have to say that he wasn't saying that those able to receive castration should receive it. Another thing about Jesus's support of making some people eunuchs is that you have to be pretty screwed up to be against population control, but be accepting of castration for the reasons I've mentioned.

Jesus told a story in Matt. 20 that had a couple of possible interpretations. One of which I don't care for. But being a little too lengthy to copy, I'll just tell you what the story was about. There he tells a parable about a man who hired some people to pick grapes for a penny a day. Over the work day he hires more people. One hour before the workday was over he hired more people. Then at the end of the workday he paid the people who only worked only one hour the same amount as those who worked all day. Which the people who worked all

224

day didn't like. One possible moral this puts forward is that people should only receive what they agreed to. Which though not being very fair is at least acceptable.

The second moral of this story could be that if you convert or are only good for the last part of your life, you will get the same reward as those who may have converted earlier in their lives or were good all of their lives. Now as far as the conversion aspect goes, the idea of converting to any religion is disgusting. But as far as being good all your life goes, apart from being unfair, it doesn't give people much incentive to be good earlier in their lives. Also, though I can't make any sense out of the idea of there being different social ranks in heaven, it seems to me that if being like a child can make you greatest in the kingdom of heaven, then there should be some benefit there for having been good for longer than someone who hasn't.

The next story I want to mention had Jesus being just plain mean. In Matt.

21:19, it says:

“And when he saw a fig tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and he said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforth for ever. And presently the fig tree withered away!”

Killing a tree just because there was no fruit on it? What a rotten thing to do! Also, being in Jerusalem, the fruit could have been gone because it was already picked. Which the tree had no control over. This rotten story is retold in Mark 11:13-14. There the reason given for there being no figs on the tree there was because it was the wrong season for them. Though Mark didn't mention the tree withering. He only mentioned Jesus telling the tree that nobody would ever eat from it. Which may or may not have meant death to the tree. But it was still a rotten thing to teach.

We next have Jesus symbolically promoting the act of cannibalism. In Matt. 26:26, it says:

“And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body.”

Well there are a couple obvious reasons why Jesus may have taught this. One is that just as cannibals believe they gain power from their victims, Jesus was trying to bestow such power on his disciples. The other reason could have been that from the overpopulation that resulted from what this and other religions teach, he was trying to soften the blow from the cannibalism such overpopulation could very easily cause to come about.

This next paragraph had Jesus asking some Pharisees some questions. One of which would be pretty stupid to anybody who wasn't Jewish. In Mark 3:4, it says:

“And he saith unto them, Is it lawful to do good on sabbath days, or do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace.”

The main part of the question that I wanted to comment on was where Jesus  
225

asked if it was lawful to do evil on the sabbath. As if it were actually an option. But evil is never an option. So the answer to that part of the question would be no. It is not lawful to do evil on the sabbath. Or any other day for that matter.

What Jesus had to say to the Pharisees in these next few paragraphs was wrong. In Mark 7:11-13, it says:

“But ye say, If a man shall say to his father and mother, It is Corban, that is to say, a gift, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me; he shall be free.

And ye suffer him no more to do ought for his father and mother;

Making the word of God of none effect through your tradition, which ye have delivered: and many such like things do ye.”

Now I would doubt if those people would have been adverse to putting their children to work. But I think they were referring to adult children here. And what I think Jesus was saying was that they should have been slaves to their parents. Which is disgusting because nobody should be slaves to anybody. It also talked here of parents profiting from their children. But the purpose of children is not for the enrichment of the parents. Their purpose is for the perpetuation of the species. Also, don't take what I have to say next to include something like schoolwork. But if your children have to work just to survive, you should take it as a sign from "GOD" that you shouldn't be having any more children. Another thing is that the more you gain from the labor of your children, the more other people will just have to take away from you. Through taxes, rent, food prices, etc. So from generation to generation, it would be better for parents to suffer an unbroken line of poverty than it would be for children to suffer an unbroken line of toil and slavery to their parents.

This next paragraph again said that people should be like little children. Which wasn't a good thing to teach. In Mark 10:15, it says:

"Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom as a little child, he shall not enter therein."

As I said before, people should never be told to be like children. Especially little children. Besides, people too often act like children as it is. Neither are children likely to learn how to act maturely from such people. Now it's easy to see why they would have liked people to be like little children. But oh what a sucker anybody would be to let these kinds of teachings sway them into being that way. So I say that it is best to be an adult; to be able to stand on your own two feet; to quit ignoring the harsh truth in favor of the pleasant lie; to have the courage to face the things you don't want to face; to take responsibility for your own actions; to not leave problems for somebody else or some big bogeyman in the sky to fix. These things will better prepare our species to live in a universe that isn't easy to live in. I would also like to say that if you can't be an adult and still go to heaven, then you are better off without it.

What these next two paragraphs had to say weren't directly evil. But the idea behind what supposedly happened was. In Luke 2:13-14, it says:

226

"And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying,

Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

What supposedly happened here was that some shepherds out in a field witnessed this spectacle when Jesus was born. But this miracle would have been better spent over some city. So it seems that keeping Jesus's supposed

holiness somewhat under wraps was the goal. This could have been the type of thing that Jesus was up to when he would supposedly heal somebody and tell them not to tell anybody else what happened. Now you may ask yourself why these miracles weren't displayed openly. For a couple of reasons I can think of right now, an excuse that doesn't work very well is that things were done this way so that faith would only effect those stupid enough to believe.

Though I think a more likely reason was to condition people to accept such things on flimsy evidence. Which is quite evil. Because people shouldn't be gullible. Neither should they let what they do with their life or how they believe depend on hearsay. Though as for me, having god himself perform some miracle in front of me wouldn't convince me that I should follow him anyway. Because miracles don't plow fields; clean and grind wheat; bake bread; weave clothes; make drywall; do simple arithmetic or any of the other things that really matter in our physical existence. So even if such a creature used a miracle to kill me, at least I would die like a man.

I can't stress too strongly that while we are here, this is the life that counts. But in these next paragraphs they tried to say again that heaven is the most important thing. In Luke 6:20-23, it says:

"And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said, Blessed be ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God.

Blessed are ye that hunger now: for ye shall be filled. Blessed are ye that weep now: for ye shall laugh.

Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they will separate you from their company, and shall reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake.

Rejoice ye in that day, and leap for joy: for, behold, your reward is great in heaven: for in the like manner did their fathers unto the prophets."

Here you're told that in heaven everything will be fine. Big deal! This is where people are born, live and die. Besides, I have more faith in our atoms and molecules here than I do in any ghost atoms or molecules. Oh sure, it would be nice if there was an afterlife that was better than this one. But even if there was, I still wouldn't neglect this one to get there. Because if there were some grand purpose to this life, I doubt if paving the way to some possible heaven would be it. Neither should anybody rejoice in a bad life just because they believed a better one was to come. Now if Jesus wanted to do something really godlike, he

would have told people how to overcome the problems he talked about. Not simply tell them to be happy because heaven will be better.

Though as you know, Jesus wasn't the only one to spread such diseased teachings. For example, I remember seeing a film of a Japanese women jumping off a cliff rather than be captured by the "fiendish" Americans. Some apparently even took their children with them. Despite how nice they were probably told it would be to be with their ancestors, somehow I don't think their sacrifice was necessary. I also remember seeing a short interview of a Muslim soldier saying that if he died for allah, he would go straight to heaven and have there all that was denied him here. Such as young boys and girls to have sex with. (and likely a few sheep too) I can imagine why he was told that he could do such rotten things in heaven. Which is another reason why such things make me sick. Then there were the hashish eating assassins who did dirty deeds for kali. You can probably imagine why they were encouraged to be willing to sacrifice this life in its service. Etc. etc. etc. So to sum all of this up, I say that anybody who would throw away this life in hopes of a better one is more than foolish. And anybody who would encourage them to do so is in my highly considered opinion, evil.

As I have told you before, there are some ideas that the bible mentions many times. Though I may have already discussed some of them, it would be wrong to skip them all. So from time to time I feel that I should make some comment about them. Another one of these often repeated teachings is in Luke 6:27-28. It says:

"But I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you,

Bless them that curse you, and pray for them which despitefully use you."

So let me say again that to do good to the wicked only rewards wickedness. Which is wrong. The only reason you should do anything good to your enemies is if you did something wrong to make them your enemies. Now if an enemy apologized for something wrong they had done, I might forgive them to some degree. And if they made reparations, that forgiveness would increase. This is the only way any enemy should receive anything good from you.

There was something particularly vile in this next paragraph that I wanted to comment on. In Luke 6:35, it says:

"But love your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be children of the Highest: for he is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil."

First they said that people should love, do good to and lend to their enemies. Hoping for nothing in return. But assuming that it is their fault that they are your enemies, you should at least hope that they turn from their wickedness. Though the main thing I wanted to comment on here is its saying that god is kind to the evil. To which I say that only vile scum would be kind to the evil. Now when they



teach things like this and tell you that evil is somehow necessary, it would likely help turn people to evil who might not normally do such things. So yet again I say their teachings like this are sick.

Another often repeated unfortunate teaching can be found in Luke 6:37. It says: "Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven:"

To the contrary of what they said, I say it would be better if we were all judged to whatever degree we deserved rather than not to be judged at all. And the same thing goes for condemnation. Neither would I abstain from judging just so I myself wouldn't be judged. Also, though a thief for instance would find it difficult to be justified in judging others, if he in fact didn't judge others, he would still be deserving of judgement. I would also like to say again that we should all try to judge to whatever degree we can. Otherwise determining right from wrong could eventually become difficult. So I say you judge me and I'll judge you. Not only because we're not always the best judge of ourselves, but because the practice will keep us on our toes. Then, as for what they said about forgiveness, it would be better if nobody received forgiveness rather than having those who don't deserve forgiveness receive it.

This next paragraph had Jesus talking about the devil. In Luke 8:12, it says: "Those by the way side are they that hear; then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved."

So this is basically calling me a devil. Because I want to take their words out of your hearts. Which I want to do because I want you to be free for all of our sakes. To be able to stand on your own two feet as you can and should do. And not to commit the disgusting act of calling the problems you create god's will. Etc. Also, I'm not the one trying to make myself out to be more than just a man or trying to bring you into the servitude of some supposed supernatural being, through myself. Neither am I the one claiming to speak the supposedly undeniable wisdom of god. So from what you have read so far, I'll leave it for you to decide who the real devil is here. The reason they gave for calling what I am trying to do an evil thing is because you may cease to believe and not be saved. But what is it that you would cease to believe. That you are the rightful property of some supernatural being? Under its control and therefore not responsible for your own actions? Etc. Then, from what would they be saving you. From sharing heaven with spirits that have free minds; from responsibility or feelings of guilt for your crimes; from freedom too? I would say so. Which makes the cost of what they promoted far in excess of any possible benefit. To say the least.

Next, we go back to a story that Matthew talked about concerning devils and a

herd of pigs. Though in Matthew's version of this story, there were two people possessed by devils. Not one as Luke said. In Luke 8:33, it says:

229

"Then went the devils out of the man, and entered into the swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the lake, and were choked."

It's a good thing Jesus was big on forgiveness. Otherwise he might have felt responsible enough to pay the person who owned the pigs for putting devils into them and causing their deaths. Though to be fair, the story tells of the people who owned the pigs running away when they saw what happened. So maybe Jesus planned to pay them, but couldn't. Also, I can see that Jesus didn't belong to animal rights groups. Because he had supposedly cast out other devils without having to put them into anything. Though the reason he supposedly put those devils into the pigs was because they asked to be put there. But apart from teaching the poor moral of fulfilling the wishes of devils, it again teaches a callous disregard for the lives of animals.

Another example of Jesus's callousness can be found in Luke 9:59-62. It says: "And he said to another, Follow me. But he said, Lord, suffer me first to go bury my father.

Jesus said unto him, Let the dead bury their dead: but go thou and preach the kingdom of God.

And another also said, Lord, I will follow thee; but let me first go and bid them farewell, which are at my house.

And Jesus said unto him, No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God."

Now I don't see these requests as being unreasonable. In fact, it would be terrible for the one man to neglect his father's burial or for the other man to leave without telling his family good by. But Jesus didn't seem to think so. Though the point I think he was trying to make was that people should put god before themselves. Which I don't agree with at all! Let god take care of himself. He's supposedly immortal and invulnerable. But you're not. So why should you sacrifice your life for him. To prove you're worthy? Well if you have to sacrifice what little you have to be worthy of something that has everything, then you're better off being unworthy. Also, why should the one sap neglect his father's funeral or the second poor sap leave without telling his family goodbye.

Sure, one reason would be to follow a holy man. But the reason Jesus wanted them tagging along was apparently for them to preach the word of god. And no doubt help convince others of his holiness. This wouldn't have been less necessary to begin with if, as I mentioned earlier, the big display god put on when Jesus was born was done for more than just a few shepherds. Though

some miracles in the bible were performed in front of many people, often times they were not. Then there were the times when Jesus would do some miracle for somebody and tell them not to tell anybody about it. So why should either of these idiots have neglected their families to convince people of things that god or Jesus often didn't seem too eager to display more openly themselves. As for the

230

second poor sap, I say that anybody who puts their hand to the plough and doesn't take a look back if they feel they need to isn't fit for plowing.

This next paragraph had Jesus teaching something spectacularly bad. In Luke 12:4, it says:

“And I say unto you my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do.”

Well he was wrong there. There is more they can do. Such as abuse your body to intimidate those still alive. Maybe there would be nothing more they could do to your soul, but something he didn't mention is that there isn't anything more you could do either. Because you're dead! Though maybe if you're lucky you could haunt those who killed you. Now I could see this type of teaching that Jesus and likely other religious leaders gave coming in handy. Considering their apparent willingness to tell people that they should be willing to die for one reason or another. Which being done for religious reasons, makes those reasons unfortunate at best. But I say forget such disgusting teachings and be afraid of those who can kill you. It will help you stay alive.

Though it isn't as bad as the last example, another bad teaching can be found in Luke 12:19-20. It says:

“And I say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry.

But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required if thee: then whose things shall those things be, which thou hast provided?”

I can see what they said here making some sense to a certain degree. Because say for example everybody was declared a lottery winner and no longer had to work. As you could imagine, the economy would go to hell pretty quickly. But for the most part, I don't see anything wrong with people accumulating enough to retire on. As long as it was acquired fairly. And not just legally, but honestly. There's also nothing wrong with eating, drinking and being merry. As long as it is in moderation. Then, after threatening to take such a person's soul, they theoretically had god asking whose would those things be which such a person stored up. To which I would answer, “thou fool, they shall go to those who haven't earned them.”

Being one of their particularly bad teachings, I feel it necessary to comment on another example that I had already commented on. In Luke 12:22-23, it says: "And he said unto his disciples, Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat; neither for the body, what ye shall put on.

The life is more than meat, and the body more than raiment."

Even though I don't think that what Jesus taught here is possible, I still find such teachings to be disgusting. Another reason being that if life has worth, which I believe it does, then it is worth looking out for. It then basically said that your lives are more valuable than food or clothing. But without food or clothing, your lives would be pretty miserable. And of course, if you went too long without

231

food you would die. Then what would your life be worth. So despite what Jesus said, I say you should take care of yourselves.

This next paragraph is one of the many that tried to get people to think of themselves as cattle. Though as in the past, I won't be mentioning all of such examples yet to come. In Luke 12:32, it says:

"Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom."

It was bad enough that they tried to get people to think of themselves as being somebody's flock. But they had to make it a little more demeaning by calling them a "little" flock. Well despite their mind games, as I said before, you shouldn't consider yourselves as being a part of somebody's flock. Though for those who do, despite what they said, you should fear. Because instead of your lives and destiny being under your control, it would be under the control of the "shepherds." Whose priorities would surely be quite different from yours. Also, people too often are brought under the control of others as it is. Actually allowing for such a thing would be bad because there is practically no limit as to how deeply others would likely be willing to control you. Though don't get me wrong. The overflowing petri dish of humanity has shown itself to be in need of being controlled in other ways rather than just for ecological reasons. But doing so on obviously filthy religious grounds isn't the way to go.

Now many people believe, at least at this time, that Jesus wanted to help mankind. But judging from the evidence so far, I would say this next paragraph gave a more accurate description of his intent. In Luke 12:49 it says:

"I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I, if it already be kindled?"

That sure wasn't being very helpful! Also, the question I think he was basically asking here was what could he do if the flame was already kindled. Well he might have thought about putting the fire out. But no. Apparently he wanted to throw some logs on the fire.

In the next paragraph I want to comment on, Jesus taught an astonishingly bad moral. To help let you know what was going on, they told a story of Jesus hearing that a person named Pilate mixed the blood of some Galileans in with his sacrifice. Jesus then asked if those Galileans were sinners above all sinners because of what happened to them. Then, answering his own question, in Luke 13:3, he said:

“I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.”

Well despite not being great sinners, this still happened to them. So what's the moral of this story? It seems to be that if you sin, you may as well go all out. Because the punishment will be the same.

They told a story in Luke 15 that is a little too lengthy to copy. So I'll just tell you what it was about. It told of a man's son who wanted to take his share of things and go off by himself. Which the father probably wasn't too happy about.

Though he agreed to it anyway. So after leaving, the man's son wasted his  
232

share in having a good time. Then, falling on hard times, the man's son returned to his father. The father apparently heard what had happened. But when he saw his son coming, he first forgave him, then ran out to meet him and started kissing him. Now from the forgiveness aspect of this story, it may sound nice. But it seems to me that the father should have waited to see if his son even wanted forgiveness. Let alone deserve it. And his returning didn't imply regret. So teaching forgiveness out of hand like this is pretty bad.

Also being a little lengthy, I will just tell you what some of this next story was about. This story was about a dishonest steward who was about to be fired by his master. So the steward decided to make friends with his masters debtors so he could stay with them. How they said he does this can be found in Luke 16:5-7. It says:

“So he called every one of his lord's debtors unto him, and said unto the first, How much owest thou unto my lord?

And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty.

Then he said to another, and how much owest thou? And he said, an hundred measures of wheat. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and write fourscore.”

First of all, what these debtors did may have been the most likely reaction for them to have. Especially apparently for a Jew. But they weren't setting much of an example with this story by making the debtors out to be so willing to be dishonest. Though what I especially don't like here is they're basically saying that if you do something dishonest, it's ok to do something else dishonest to try and cover the crime. There is an unlikely aspect to this story though. It isn't up

to a debtor to say how much is owed. It is up to the person to whom the debt is owed. Unless what they meant here is the debtors forging documents.

In the next two paragraphs of this filthy exemplification of so called morality, Jesus told of the master's response when he found out what happened. In Luke 16:8-9, it says:

“And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely: for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light.

And I say unto you, Make to yourself friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations.”

How much more evil can they get! First of all, what Jesus was saying with his story was that this steward did good. Which is sick. It is wiser to be honest to begin with. Or at least seek forgiveness. Also, though it would be evil to commit another crime to cover up the first, it is doubly evil to teach that to do so is good. Then it said that the children of this world are wiser than the children of light. Which I don't like the sound of at all. Especially after the example he gave of the children of this world. Another thing is that “children of light” brings up images of friendly angels, wise and kind spirits or advanced beings. So to teach that such

233

demented people as the steward or his master were wiser than they is sickening. Something else that is interesting to note here about the children of light thing is that the name that is sometimes given for the devil is lucifer. Which is Latin for light bringing. To me, that would seem to suggest somebody who lights your way, makes you able to see or is a giver of wisdom. Though I am not trying to promote the supposed deity lucifer, I don't see anything wrong with such things. I would also like to say that with the lies, evil and other unfortunate things the bible taught, lucifer could only have been an improvement. And while we're on the subject of the devil, it seems to me that with all of the abilities attributed to satan, he could easily cause people to believe that what is evil is actually good. Which if I believed in such things, I would say that this is what happened with this religion. Right from the beginning.

Getting back to their story, they went on to say that you should make friends with the mammon of unrighteousness. In case you don't know, mammon was the false god of riches and greed. Though after this story, amongst others, I would say this god was the true god of such things. Also, only filthy scum would tell you to make friends with such people. I should also point out that you shouldn't make friends because of what you may get out of it monetarily. You should make friends for friendship's sake. Then the reason Jesus gave for making friends with such slime was that when you fail, they would receive you

into everlasting habitations. Well first of all, he didn't say if you fail, but when you fail. Though not only do I find his confidence in people underwhelming, but you don't need this kind of negative self fulfilling prophecy imposed on you. Another disgusting thing to teach is that the mammon of unrighteousness have everlasting habitations to receive the wicked into. Because it wrongly teaches that it pays to be like that. Though it may for some at times.

But as you can probably guess, there is a price to be paid by everybody for such things. Sometimes a terrible one. There is one last thing about what Jesus said here that I should point out. Which concerns the master commending his steward for stealing from him. Though I am not a good judge of how a Jew might think, it seems unlikely to me that somebody's boss would commend an employee for stealing from them. So to be fair, this does leave the door open a crack for the slight possibility that Jesus may have come up with such an unlikely scenario to cast doubt on the validity of the moral he tried to teach here. Which brings up the question, if he didn't agree with this moral, why did he teach it. To screw up those stupid enough to overlook the unlikeliness of the story? Well all I am going to say is that if that was his intent, it would have been ineffective at best.

What Jesus had to say in Luke 16:11, was also sick. It says:

"If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches."

For whatever reason, it was pretty rotten for Jesus to have taught that anybody

234

should be faithful to anything that is unrighteous. Also, he asked who would trust you with true riches if you have not been faithful to the unrighteous mammon. Well I would. Because anybody smart or moral enough to be unfaithful to unrighteous mammon would be a better person to entrust true riches to.

Jesus also gets low marks for what he said in this next paragraph. In Luke 16:13, it says:

"No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon. "

Though I do agree that people must choose sides, by his lame reasoning you could not love both parents, your parents and your country, or yourself and anybody else. So to some degree people can, as he said, serve more than one master. Also, after all of their talk supporting mammon, it's pretty stupid for them to discourage it here. Though what I really don't like here was their back door approach to get people to think of themselves as servants. Which in the bible, usually meant slave. And you know how I feel about slavery.

These next two paragraphs retold some of Jesus's diseased ideas on forgiveness. In Luke 17:3-4, it says:

"Take heed to yourselves: If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him.

And if he trespass against thee seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him."

First of all, in the first paragraph I'm glad to see Jesus say for once that you should "take heed of yourselves." Also to rebuke an offender. Not that it mattered much. Because he went on to say basically that no matter how often somebody abuses you, as long as they ask for forgiveness, you should forgive them. How can anybody say something so sick! Now if these rotten ideas were followed, the tendency would be for the offender to stop bothering to ask for the forgiveness he knew he would receive anyway. Such a person would likely eventually stop even feeling guilty for their offences. Likewise, the person being offended would likely eventually stop the pretense of bothering to rebuke. Or offer forgiveness he knew he would give anyway. He may even stop being bothered by the offences. This would be a terrible way of life. Only what I consider to be a devil could find such a thing to be good. Where offences took on the air of being no big deal.

So take some advice from me instead. Don't forgive the same person too often. Just do it as often as you think is right. Then, if you have gone beyond that point, stop giving them the opportunity to screw you over and either separate yourself from them or them from you. Another thing is that I wonder why Jesus would have said something so blatantly evil. Maybe he thought people are the way they are and you can't punish somebody for being the way they are. But if this was what he thought, then he was wrong. Because recognizing evil and

235

knowing that it is wrong is the way we are. It is also part of our nature to avoid or punish what we know to be bad. Neither is there any question that we are right in this.

As you know, when the bible spoke of servants, they usually meant slaves. Or possibly even eunuchs. Some more of Jesus's ideas on slavery can be found in Luke 17:7-10. It says:

"But which of you, having a servant plowing or feeding cattle, will not say unto him by and by, when he is come in from the field, Go sit down to meat?

And will not rather say unto him, Make ready wherewith I may sup, and gird thyself, and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken; and afterward thou shalt eat and drink?

Doth he thank the servant because he did the things that were commanded



him? I trow not.

So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do.”

What an asshole! Not that I would own a slave. But if I did, I wouldn't treat him like that. Even animals are usually given a break after a day's work. Then he basically said that you shouldn't thank a slave. But unless the master would rather do the work, I think the slave deserves some thanks. Then after all of this he had the nerve to say that slaves should consider themselves to be unprofitable. But if they were unprofitable, chances are they wouldn't have been doing the things they were doing for this master to begin with. Though even if they were unprofitable, it is still no excuse to treat them like that. Also, a master is the last person I would look to for a fair judgment as to what amount of work a slave should consider it to be his duty to do.

From personal experience I know that for some employers, no matter what you do, it is never good enough. You can also imagine that for many of them, if the choice was between you busting your ass and them losing money hiring another worker, your ass doesn't stand a very good chance. Now I know that employees suffer from the same problem as employers. Which is to get as much as they can for as little as they can. But I think greed is a much more potent motivation for employers. With such greed coming into play on their part, exploitation of employees becomes almost as unavoidable as breathing. Where as for the truly lazy employee, they dig their own grave. Another thing is that I think this whole story was a parable about the apostles service to god. And likely yours too. So who decides how much such an unfortunate person's duty to god should be. Those who lie about speaking in his name? What a joke!

I don't agree with the point Jesus made in these next paragraphs. In Luke 18:11-14, it says:

“The Pharisee stood and prayed by himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican.

236

I fast twice a week, I give tithes of all that I possess.

And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner.

I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other: for every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.”

The thing I don't like here is that the publican prayed arrogantly and showed no inclination to change his sinning ways. But you're supposed to believe that he

was better than the Pharisee? I don't think so! Also, the Pharisee may not have been exalting himself here. He may just have just wanted to make sure god knew what he did and possibly get some reassurance or recognition for his pious lifestyle. There's no terrible sin there. Now as far as the moral of this story goes, if I had a choice between arrogance and humility, I would choose humility. Because if you're masterful, you shouldn't need to go around convincing others of it. Neither is there much sense in making the small feel smaller. Though between arrogance and humility, I think a middle ground would be best.

This next paragraph doesn't show Jesus to be the nice guy everybody thinks he was. In Luke 19:27, it says:

"But those my enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me."

This teaching doesn't fit very well with his usual "love thy enemy" crap. So what if Jesus were alive and you didn't want to be reigned over by him. For instance, because you wouldn't want the harshness of life to be replaced by the lies of religion. He would like you slain in front of him. Well that's ok. Because from what I have read so far, I would very much like to slowly lower him into a tank of hungry Piranha.

From what these next paragraphs said, it would seem that Jesus meant for people to actually eat him. In John 6:51-57, it says:

"I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?

Then said Jesus unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me."

Well that's explicit enough. Though the only sure way to know if he was

237

speaking figuratively would have been to see his reaction to people heading toward him with knives and other implements of food consumption saying "we want to live for ever." But whatever the case was, I don't think Jesus should have been endorsing cannibalism. Especially for the reasons he gave.

This next paragraph spoke of Jesus's reaction to a stoning. Which was a form of justice that the bible had spoken of these people using before. In John 8:7, it says:

"So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him cast the first stone at her."

The reason for this stoning was because of some woman's adultery. To which I can agree with Jesus's opposition. Especially since the man involved wasn't being stoned too. But I don't like the main point they were trying to make with this story. Which is that one sinner shouldn't punish other sinners. Now in my considered opinion, even if everybody were guilty of committing major offences, it still shouldn't make any difference when it comes to handing out justice. Because as terrible as being a hypocrite to some varying degree is, there is something worse that can happen. Such as letting wrongdoers who get caught go unpunished.

One of the things Jesus said in this next paragraph is something I would expect from a devil. In John 9:39, it says:

"And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see; and that they which see might be made blind."

First of all, I believe the blindness that Jesus spoke of was of the mind. Not of the eyes. Now it said here that Jesus would make the blind "see." But I already know that I don't like what he would have had people seeing. Though the thing I especially don't like here is his saying that he would like to have made those who "see" blind. Which he would have to do to keep from eventually being put out of a job. Or lose the worship that I would bet he thought would help him in the afterlife. Having people see would also push evolutionary tendencies in the wrong direction for the cause of religion. Which among many unfortunate things is repression. Also, it's hard to believe that people would accept Jesus's last filthy, evil statement here. I guess the pleasure of being led and the allure of living even better after you die can often trump rational thought. But despite these types of things, as you can see, I am doing my best to make people see the truth. Or at least get them headed in the right direction. Neither do I intend to make anybody "blind." Unlike some people we know.

Still on the same subject, Jesus gave a reason why he wanted to make people blind in this next paragraph. In John 9:41, it says:

"Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, We see; therefore your sin remaineth."

Now if you do something wrong but don't know it is wrong, it isn't as bad as doing something wrong that you know is wrong. But unknowingly doing a wrong

act is still wrong. Therefore you are still responsible for it. Also, purposefully making yourself or others ignorant to try and avoid responsibility for such actions is incredibly evil. Another thing is that even if Jesus wanted to keep people from sinning, making people “blind” wasn’t the way to go about it. Yet another reason being that what Jesus said shows more concern about the responsibility of a perpetrator for some crime than concern for whatever sin some victim might have to suffer. Though he tried to cover the victim end with his evil teachings about forgiveness.

These next two paragraphs deal in part with an often repeated subject that I only mention intermittently. In John 10:8-9, it says:

“All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not hear them.

I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and go in and out, and find pasture.”

First of all, what Jesus was saying here was that the past prophets were thieves and liars. But I consider them to be worse than that. Though what gets me is that he was the biggest thief and liar of them all! Because the others wanted you to have faith in god only. Jesus on the other hand wanted people to have faith in him like a god and through him have faith in his father-god. So he was the one actually stealing a piece of the worship pie. Then, Jesus again called people sheep and told them that like sheep, they would find pasture. Helping them and anybody who would think that these writings refer to them to confer upon themselves the care, rights and privileges of domesticated cattle. One of the bad things about which is that the devolutionary process through breeding that man has imposed on various domesticated animals has clearly been shown. So anybody who would help promote this process on man because of religious considerations is worse than scum. Jesus also said here that he was the door and people would be able to go in and out. Which I would assume meant that they could act in a way that would cause them to be “saved” and not. And yet still be saved. What a disgusting thing to teach!

Moving on to the next paragraph, Jesus had something really depraved to say. In John 10:10, it says:

“The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.”

As I have said before, the bible is written to be confusing. So I can’t say it is impossible that the “they” he spoke of here could have been the victims of the thieves. But judging from the preceding paragraphs, it is the thieves he is speaking of giving abundant life to. Neither when you consider all of the other promotions for evil that the bible gives is it hard to believe that Jesus could have meant to say something so disgusting. So as far as giving thieves, killers and destroyers more abundant life goes, I say that no devil could do worse! What

this said also again promotes the idea that the wicked are somehow necessary.  
239

Which I don't think they are. One of the many reasons being that it can sometimes take more strength to do what is right rather than what is wrong. So a loss of the wicked would not impede our ability to survive or evolve. Though as I said before, the real reason Jesus probably said something so disgusting was to help make people screwed up. Because having such people around would help suckers turn to religion for comfort.

Though there was a lot of talk about sheep around here, I only needed to move on to the next paragraph to find a blatant human-cattle exemplification. In John 10:11, it says:

"I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep."

But I say from a sheep's point of view, there is no such thing as a good shepherd. Because as I said before, a wild sheep can handle itself better in the harsh wilderness better than a domesticated one. And a free mind can handle the harshness of reality better than a domesticated one. So these religious shepherds weren't doing people any good. It then said that a good shepherd lays down his life for his sheep. Well if he did, it would only be because he had to. Because they are his livelihood. But apart from the harm he does to them as a species, they also drink their milk; harvest their skins; eat their flesh; sacrifice some; sell some; breed them to the shepherd's requirements; often treat them like objects; etc. In various ways, shepherds are worse than many kinds of parasites. I on the other hand envision a better destiny for mankind than to be somebody's sheep. Though I do believe that we need one form of shepherd. Which is in the form of a just, secular legal system.

Jesus retold something from the old testament that I didn't like then and I don't like here. In John 10:34, it says:

"Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?"

Doesn't it seem strange that if people are gods, they don't act like gods. But then neither did their god. Which is no surprise. Seeing how they created it. Also, though this teaching was supposed to help justify Jesus's claim that he was the son of god, it also helps promote the idea that people are gods. One reason that I don't like such teachings is that a god can justify anything it does. But we can't justify everything we do.

Next is a retelling of one of Jesus's more unfortunate teachings. In John 12:25, it says:

"He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal."

Despite his diseased teaching, there is nothing wrong with loving life. Now from

his way of “thinking,” if you like the smell of flowers, you will lose your sense of smell. Though if you hate smelling pleasant things like flowers, your sense of smell would lose a very pleasant aspect for its being. Flowers themselves would also lose a significant portion of what makes them pleasant. Another thing is that why would anybody want to keep anything eternally that they hate. Yet  
240

another thing is that you shouldn't hate this life in hopes of an eternal one because, to rearrange an old saying, “a life in the hand is worth two in the bush.” There is another pertinent old saying. “Waste not, want not.” I should also point out that it seems to me that if anything could make an afterlife more possible, it would be a desire for life in general. Not a hatred of this life.

This next paragraph told how people could glorify god and become Jesus's disciples. Though such teachings apparently aren't limited to this religion. In John 15:8, it says:

“Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples.”

What I believe this was saying was that people should have many children. But a bigger concern than glorifying god or being a disciple of Jesus should be what will happen to your children. Because following advice like this has led to overpopulation, environmental destruction and war. The eventual result of which will be the destruction of the earth. Though I guess you're supposed to believe that's ok. As long as you yourselves get by. So as far as their teaching goes, screw your children. Besides, not only will the resulting strife make people pray harder, but this way the end of the world that they predicted would be sure to come. What also made this a bad thing to teach is that people are inclined to have many children anyway. Especially it seems the stupid and ugly. But I say instead of glorifying god in this way, screw him. Also, with the world being the way it is, people should basically only be allowed to have as many children as is needed for a sustainable population. Another thing is that if I were god, I could think of better ways of having people glorify me or make me proud to be their god. Like by maintaining a well balanced ecological system with just laws and consideration toward the deserving.

One of the bad things about this next paragraph is that it too taught a disregard for this planet. In John 17:9, it says:

“I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine.”

Well I have no regard for anybody who would show this kind of disregard for the planet. Also, this kind of teaching was like praying for somebody, but despising their feet. Because we are part of the world. So their teaching doesn't make any

sense. Another thing is that you shouldn't swallow this crap about people in general being somebody else's to give or for someone else to possess.

Jesus talked about faith in this next paragraph. In John 20:29, it says: "Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet believed."

Considering the various unsavory things Jesus said and the reason behind religion in general, I say that even those who had seen are stupid at best. Let alone those who have not seen and still believe. And as far as being blessed goes, they may have the supposed blessing of contentment. Like cows. But I  
241

wouldn't call that being blessed. One of the things I would call that is being more easily controlled by those who wish to control you. Which itself alone would make any sort of blessing far from worthwhile.

Next is a good philosophy taken too far. Concerning charity, in Acts 2:45, it says:

"And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need."

Teaching people to give charity to this extent is pretty bad. All giving so much would likely do is make the giver poor too. Also, instead of giving to whoever, they should have taught that these people start out with the poorest and work their way up from there.

This next paragraph told another part of a story that you may remember from the last chapter. It concerned a man and wife selling some land to give the money to Peter. Though they kept some of the money instead. In Acts 5:3, it says:

"But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land?"

One of the really rotten things about this story was their teaching of charity by coercion. Sure, these people may have promised to give Peter all of the money. But sometimes people have a right to change their minds. And I believe this was one of those times. Especially when they probably made this promise while under a state of euphoria induced by Peter. Also, Peter asked why satan made him do it. Now I wonder what made him think it was satan. Because it could just as easily have been god. Though it was in reality just common sense. Another thing is that as you may remember, the man and wife were killed for using a lie to cover the change in the amount of charity they decided to give. Which as I said before, was a pretty severe punishment for the crime. Especially when Peter just admitted that it was satan's fault that they did what they did. Neither did this fit very well with Jesus's ideas on forgiveness. Though to be fair, the man at least

wasn't given time to even ask for forgiveness. Maybe for a Jew, where money is concerned, forgiveness is a different matter.

If god existed, one of the things it said in these next two paragraphs would be true. But it was a terrible thing to try and get people to accept. In Acts 10:34-35, it says:

"Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons:

But in every nation that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him."

Well for argument's sake, let's say the stories about god in the bible were true. From the examples of fiendishly diabolical slaughter I read in the bible, among other things, I found out real quick that god indeed was no respecter of people. Or of anything else for that matter. It amazes me that anybody could worship  
242

anything so filthy. Take for example the Jews who worship at a place called the wailing wall. Which is a remaining piece of king Solomon's temple. If I were a regular person and anybody told me that there are people who actually pray at the rubble that demonstrates their god's displeasure of them, I would have found it hard to believe. It's like a woman having been raped and through worshiping in front of the remnants of her torn clothing, worship the rapist. It is just so far from rational thought that it is incredible. Then it said that if you fear god and also work righteousness, (as if they had the ability to judge righteousness) you will be accepted by god. But I also find it hard to believe that anybody would want to be accepted by something that requires you fear it and has no respect for you. I know I wouldn't. And neither should you.

This next paragraph mentioned what was required to go to heaven. In Acts 14:22, it says:

"Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God."

First of all, if being a just and considerate person wasn't enough to get them and by inference you, into heaven, then it isn't worth going there. Also, I would have to assume from the types of things that the bible usually talked about that this tribulation would be on god's behalf. But let's take into consideration man's frequent social blindness when it comes to wealth and power. The kind of tribulation the wealthy and powerful put people through. Who along with the religious try to teach people to be subservient. For which reason the wealthy and powerful often use religion to prey on peoples desire for whatever comfort they can get out of religion. To help them control them. On top of that they constantly try to tell people that what religion does is somehow necessary. Which it isn't.



Such people will be more likely to take advantage of you in any way possible. Therefore they will also be more likely to have you going through as much tribulation as they can for their own sakes, not gods. While telling you that it is for your own sake. So telling people that they must go through much tribulation to get to heaven for this reason alone is pretty bad.

The story I would like to relate next shows that it apparently isn't always bad to be possessed by spirits. This story concerned a girl who was possessed by a spirit of divination. She and the possessing spirit followed Paul and a person named Silas around proclaiming them to be servants of god and that through them was salvation. Then in Acts 16:18, it says:

“And this she did many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour.”

Now it seems to me that if Paul had thought that it was bad for this girl to be possessed by a spirit, he would have ordered it out of her days before he did it here. So it seems that at least at first he didn't think that there was anything wrong with it. But I myself don't think that people should be possessed by

243

spirits. I could live with having the ability to communicate with them. But not with having them occupy my body or interfere with my free will.

Sometimes the bible says things that are so bad that I sometimes wonder if they were put there purposefully to act as a self destruct mechanism. To keep it from someday getting in the way of a better way of doing things. Take for example what it says in Acts 24:15. It says:

“And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust.”

Well there's no incentive to be good when they say that even if you're bad, you will still be resurrected. Though they don't say so around here at least, even if the bad were resurrected and sent to hell, they would probably find it preferable to nonexistence. One reason being that the devil would have no reason to help god by making hell unpleasant for souls sent there. Also, to the contrary of what they taught, I say the life force of the wicked should be neutralized or left to rot. Another thing is that teaching good treatment for the wicked reminds me of people who say that without religion, people would be much worse. But with the bible promoting evil as it does, I say it most likely makes people much worse than they would normally be.

They also seem to fail to realize that as with voodoo; witchcraft; devil worship or most if not all other religious practices, it is self serving; self indulgent; escapist; repressive and promotes ignorance. All of which you would be better off without.

Then we have those who say that you take what you want from religion. Which is pretty bad seeing how in the case of the bible for instance, you can use it to justify any wickedness that may tempt you. Now religious people may sometimes do good, but for a multitude of reasons, in my opinion having religion is more destructive than having none at all. What the world needs is a secular philosophical system that is unencumbered by religious dogma. One that supports good works and those willing to perform them. To some extent, I would even extend those good works to those who may be undeserving. People who would do what is right should do so for its own sake. Instead of doing so because they are having the carrot of heaven dangled in front of them.

This next paragraph spoke of some worshipers. In Rom. 1:21, it says:

“Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.”

First of all, if they knew god, what was there to glorify. That it was slimy enough to desire and demand worship and fear; that he had no respect for people or life in general; or that he created the wicked to plague them? Etc. Or should they have been thankful that he created people to be his slaves. Whoever wrote this should have given reality a try. Then it said that these people became vain in their imaginations. Well that’s no surprise. Look at all of the imperialist kings and nobles who demanded glorification and tribute from those under them.

244

Where could they have found an exemplification or outright instruction in such behavior? You need look no further than this glory and worship demanding god who “commands” from his “kingdom.” Though such things are not unique to this religion. Because every deity or holy man who has ever lived has probably desired glorification or worship to at least some degree. Which the slightly more honest promoters would probably say is a necessary evil. But the last thing religion needs is more reasons for evil. It’s no wonder that people might become vain in their imaginations and seek glory for themselves. With religion setting these kinds of examples.

For more of the bible’s warped philosophy, let’s go to Rom. 4:6-8. It says:  
“Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works,

Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.

Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin.”

The first thing I would like to say here is that it’s wrong to call anybody righteous unless they deserve to be. What they promoted would be worse than

undeserved flattery. So such a thing would actually be a curse. It also cheapens the righteousness of those who have earned it. Then it said that a person is blessed whose sins are covered. But as when a child does something wrong, to let a man's sins go unpunished would be doing him and whoever he sinned against a disservice. It then said that the person upon whom god would not impute sin is blessed. But those he sinned against would be cursed. And it would be better for a victim to be blessed rather than the perpetrator of some crime. Also, it's not up to god to impute sin anyway. Just as if it were a sin to be wet and somebody jumped into a lake, it wouldn't be up to god to impute wetness.

There were a couple unfortunate points made in this next paragraph. In Rom. 4:15, it says:

"Because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression."

Well first of all, the law is meant to work justice and balance. Not wrath. It's only meant to work wrath on criminals. Which is good. Now we all know that the law isn't perfect. Especially where money is concerned. But it is better than no law at all. Then they said that where there is no law, there is no transgression. But if for instance somebody tortured a child to death just for the fun of it, whether or not there was some law around to call it wrong, it would still be wrong.

This next paragraph taught the wrong attitude to have toward trouble. In Rom. 5:3, it says:

"And not only so, but we glory in tribulation also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience;"

Now to the contrary of what they said, I say it's sick to teach that trouble should be enjoyed. In my opinion it is something to be avoided or overcome. Though  
245

it's unlikely that either of these things would be done if anybody enjoyed it. Another thing is that to welcome trouble to experience patience is a pretty weak reason for doing so. Because what is patience compared to things such as war; murder; disease; famine; assault; theft; oppression; misery; etc. So take my advice instead and don't glory in trouble.

Now I have my ideas about what should be done to those who do bad things. But teaching the opposite of justice, in Rom. 5:8-9, it says:

"But God commendeth his love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him."

What a grotesque and sickening thing to teach! To the contrary of what they taught, having Jesus die for their sins couldn't alleviate them from responsibility

for past, present or future sins. As I said before, the only way to gain forgiveness is to earn it. Though what they were basically saying here was that “we are sinners, we shouldn’t be held responsible for being the way we are.” Which is wrong in so many different ways that I don’t know how the person saying it could have done so with a straight face. For example, as I also said before, people experience unpleasantness for a reason. This is the way we are. To know right from wrong. To appreciate the good and punish the bad. Also, there is a clear distinction to be made, for instance, between building and destroying. Though as far as building goes, most people probably would and should accept responsibility for such a thing. But as far as the responsibility for destroying goes, nobody can save you from that. And only a devil would try to.

Repeating their criminally stupid teaching about sin and the absence of law, in Rom. 5:13, it says:

“(For until the law there was sin in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law.)”

As I said before, it isn’t the law that makes somebody accountable for some sin. It is the sin. Whether or not there is somebody else around to call it wrong is largely unimportant. Another thing is that I would have to assume the law that they spoke of here was the law of god as related by Jesus. So does this mean that all of the sinners who came before him weren’t responsible for their actions? And most likely deserving of whatever heavenly reward Christians taught the good or righteous would receive in the afterlife? It would seem so. Which was also a sick thing to teach. Another thing is all of the destruction by god described in the bible before the law according to Jesus came about. If no sin was imputed, for some strange reason a lot of punishment was.

This next paragraph talked about a free gift. Which I take to mean Jesus dying so your sins could be forgiven. In Rom. 5:16, it says:

“And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.”

246

Now forgiving people’s sins is one thing. But to justify them is truly sick! Sure, people are imperfect and likely to screw up to some degree because of it. Though that doesn’t mean their offences are justified. Because offences can’t be justified. If they could, they wouldn’t be offences. For instance, look at a tiger or whale. They can be said to be justified in their killing because they do it to survive. But people don’t have to commit most if the unseemly offences they have been guilty of to survive. And just because these things can sometimes make survival easier doesn’t mean it’s justified. You don’t have to be a genius to see how harmful justifying offences would be to society in general.

For more depraved “thinking” on the part of the bible, we only need to move on to their next paragraph and see what it says. In Rom. 5:20, it says:

“Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.”

As I said before, the law they spoke of was probably the law of god as revealed by Jesus. And from some of the things I’ve read, I have no doubt that it was taught to cause offence to abound. But people look elsewhere for a devil? Ha! I’m just glad our civil laws weren’t made with those ends in mind. Another thing is that I don’t see any possible difference between any sin caused by the teachings of Jesus or any other kind of sin. Also, when sin happened in Sodom and Gomorrah, according to what they said, grace should have abounded more. But it didn’t seem to help them much. Yet another thing is that I believe that people have a better memory of the bad things that happen to them than they do of the good things that happen. So if somebody is victimized by someone else, the memory of it would be longer lasting. Such a memory is also bound to taint in a negative way their feelings toward others. That alone would make it unlikely for goodness, or “grace,” to abound. Though the grace they spoke of could have meant the level of holiness some people may achieve in an atmosphere where sin abounds. But my considered opinion on that would be that the cost of all those offences would far outweigh any possible benefit from such grace.

In reading the bible, I often ran across things that made me think that they couldn’t possibly say anything any worse. In which I was far too often proven wrong. Another such example can be found in Rom. 7:25. It says:

“I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.”

Incredible! What he was saying with this astonishingly hypocritical statement was that he, and by example you, can serve god with your mind and sin with your flesh. But you can’t honorably or logically think “good” and do bad. You have to choose sides. Also, as I said earlier in the book, even when people know that sinning is wrong, it can still happen from time to time. So by allowing for sin, he was inviting all hell to break loose. It amazes me that even with crap like what they said here in the bible, some people actually go through the trouble of memorizing it.

247

Unfortunately, there are some people on earth who are basically worthless. Such as those who worsen the condition of man through overpopulation or lead others into destroying the environment for money. Though generally speaking, people do have worth. But another attempt to get people to believe the opposite can be found in Rom. 8:36. It says:

“As it is written, For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter.”

I don't know where, as they said, it was written. But it was as diseased of a thing to say there as it was here. Because god was supposedly a big boy. So he could take care of himself. Also, if he was so small that he needed people to sacrifice themselves to serve him, then he wasn't worth dying for anyway. It would also be foolish to die for a situation that god supposedly created to begin with. The only things really worth dying for are for what is right, your justifiable honor or your species. And as I said before and will probably have to say again, religion is not something worth dying for. Another thing is that a few paragraphs back it said that if god is for you, who can be against you. To which the answer would be those who might kill them all day long. It went on to say that people should consider themselves to be sheep for the slaughter. But he and whoever else thinks that way can eat shit and die! We for the most part at least are more valuable than that. Despite their constant attempts to make people, through these teachings, worthy of such treatment.

These next two paragraphs had Paul trying to justify god's supposed right to create people as he wished. In Rom. 9:20-21, it says:

“Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?

Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor, and another unto dishonour?”

First of all, he asked who people are to reply against god. Well that was an easy question. We are creatures with the ability to question god. Which gives us more than sufficient right to do so. Especially if what he does concerns us. Then in an analogy, Paul asked if the potter, god, had power over the clay, you. But even if there were a creator like god, there is a big difference between clay and people. It then spoke of this potter-god making a vessel of dishonor. Though I myself think it would be wrong to make anything to be dishonorable. Neither does having the power to do something necessarily make it right to do so.

We next have a retelling of something terrible that the bible taught earlier. In Rom. 11:8, it says:

“(According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day.”

You already know that god's messengers and servants were supposed to be blind and deaf. Which was bad enough. But from what I have read around here,  
248

god apparently was doing this to everybody he could. What a terrible thing to do! I am going to assume you don't need me to explain again why such a thing would

be terrible.

What this next paragraph said could have meant two different things. In Rom. 12:1, it says:

“I BESEECH you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.”

It's possible that they meant that these people should have presented their bodies, and likely yours, to Jesus. Who could have been considered a living sacrifice. Which would be about as good of an idea as presenting your bodies to a tic or mosquito. Though the more likely explanation would be that they meant that people should present themselves as a living sacrifice to god. To which I say they can go to hell! They also called this their reasonable service. But I say people are in debt to nobody for being alive. Except maybe their parents. Or possibly to a welfare system that allowed parents to be able to afford to make babies. A welfare system that, though it disgusts me to say it, could be due in part to some of the teachings of Christianity. Though such charity was hard to come by for many hundreds of years.

Now without this charity, I may or may not have been born. But I am fairly certain that I wouldn't be alive right now without it. Despite this, for reasons which are probably painfully obvious by now, religion is a price that I refuse to pay. For good or bad, the only sacrifice (if you want to call it that) or repayment I am willing to make as far as what Christianity might have possibly done for me is to do what I think to be right. And not for myself only. I don't think anybody could reasonably ask for more.

Moving on to the next paragraph, they again led people to believe that this life wasn't the one that counts. In Rom. 12:2, it says:

“And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.”

So here they said that people shouldn't be conformed to this world. Which is astonishingly bad advice. Despite living around anybody who would believe their garbage. But generally speaking, I say you should be conformed to this world. For one reason, there obviously have been people who have talked others into giving up this life on religious grounds or for their own sakes. I on the other hand would prefer to prevent such things from happening in the future. Obviously, while you're here, this is where your concerns should lie. Also, I don't think that the transformation of your mind, due to their brainwashing, can prove the will of god to be good, acceptable or perfect. Such a thing may have been proof to them, but not to me.

As far as I'm concerned, a bad teaching becomes worse with each retelling.

But you know that didn't stop them. Another example of which can be found in Rom. 12:14. It says:

“Bless them which persecute you: bless and curse not.”

I didn't like this kind of saying before, and I like it even less here. Now if for instance you were guilty of being barbaric and received what you dished out, then you should hold no ill will against those who do the same thing to you. But actually blessing them would be going too far. Then as far as cursing them goes, if you are fairly innocent, then to not curse those who persecute you would be terrible. For one reason, it would make the offenders think that what they were doing wasn't so bad. Which worse yet could encourage them to do the same thing to somebody else in the future. So you can imagine how bad it would be to actually bless them?

For more bad advice, let's see what it said in Rom. 12:16. It says:

“Be of the same mind one toward another. Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits.”

First of all, in the last paragraph I mentioned they said that you should bless them that persecute you. But following the advice they gave here, you should be willing to persecute those who have it in mind to persecute you. Because you would then be of the same mind one toward another. I would call that a bit of a contradiction. Though generally speaking, I myself don't think that people should need to be of the same mind toward each other in anything other than in doing what is fair and considerate. It then said that people shouldn't mind high things. Which is a subject that I talked about before. Though I will just say again here that minding high things is a hell of a lot better than minding low things. For instance, if you want to be anything other than cattle. Then it said that people should condescend to others of low estate. But to do so would be insincere. Which is not something to be encouraged. I would also say that it would be better to set a good example for people of low estate. They went on to say that people shouldn't be wise in their own conceits. As if being stupid in their own conceits would be better. Also, it's hard to say what they meant by conceits. Because conceit could refer to egotism or to imagination. So it's hard to nail them down as to having said this or that in this instance.

Any slimy, scum sucking imperialist devil would find sheer delight in what this next paragraph had to say. In Rom. 13:1, it says:

“LET every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God.”

There is so much wrong with this concept alone that I could probably devote a whole chapter to it. But there are only a few choice things that I have to say about it here. First, soap bubbles float without the help of god. And crap falls



without the help of god. Which means that any higher powers than ourselves would likely be there without the help of god too. So people shouldn't be subservient to higher powers because god supposedly put them there. Also, just  
250

because there are higher powers to the average person is no reason to be subservient to them. For example, I am a higher power than a worm. But I would have no sympathy or respect for a worm that went on a hook willingly. So the person you should be more concerned with being subject to is yourselves.

Another attack on your right to judge can be found in Rom. 14:10. It says: "But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why does thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ."

So here they asked why we judge our brothers. Well that's just the way we are. We usually judge what the best course of action is to take in any given situation. Just as we judge what food tastes good, how good the things we buy are, what card to play when playing cards, etc. So despite what they said, there is no reason why we shouldn't judge each other. Also, instead of telling people not to judge each other, they should have told people not to judge others fit to be abused. Unless of course they really deserve to be abused. Judgement also combats abuse. Deferring judgment doesn't. Then they basically asked why people think nothing of their brothers. Well I don't think nothing of others. I just think more of myself.

They then went on to say that people would all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. Though even if that were true, (which I don't believe it is) it would still be no reason to not judge people here. Now if they sin in heaven, then that is where they can be judged. Though as for here, I say wrongdoers should be judged as justly as possible. Another thing is that Jesus seemed to be more interested in forgiving people than in judging them. And I don't see why it would be any different in heaven. So if you don't get your justice here, you may never get it. Yet another thing is that I don't see why the job of judging should have went from god to Jesus anyway.

More talk about judgment can be found in Rom. 14:13. It says:

"Let us not therefore judge one another any more: but judge this rather, that no man put a stumblingblock or any occasion to fall in his brother's way."

First of all, I don't care how often they said it. But people have the right to judge what is right or wrong about anybody or anything. Because to think is to judge. And we have the right to think and to act upon what we think. Then after telling people not to judge each other, he told them to judge something else. But if they have the right to judge one thing, then they have the right to judge anything else. Another thing is that earlier I said that he would have been better off telling

people not to judge others fit to be abused. Which he did here in a way by basically saying that people should judge that it wouldn't be good to put a stumbling block or occasion to fall in their brother's way. Well at least he somewhat straightened that out. Though it was hypocritical for him to say. Because religion in general is a stumbling block and an occasion to fall. Take for instance the evil, lies and other misleading things about this religion in particular. Their use of parables; telling people that only those who are meant to know

251

should know; suggesting that it's good to mentally be blind and deaf; etc. etc. etc. Though as I said before, just from observing various cultures, this religion isn't the only one with severe problems.

This next paragraph taught a course of behavior that I find disgusting. In Rom. 14:22, it says:

"Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before god. Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth."

The part I wanted to comment on here is where it basically says that if for instance, you rape and murder children, but don't condemn yourself for it, (or get caught) you will be happy. Though as you can guess, there are many other lesser unfortunate things that somebody could do and not condemn themselves for that would be harmful to society in general. Which made what they said here sickening at best. Now for whatever I say may be worth to you, I say that if you do something bad, then you should condemn yourself for it to whatever degree is justifiable.

Part of what this next paragraph said was pretty bad. In Rom. 16:19, it says: "For your obedience is come abroad unto all men. I am glad therefore on your behalf: but yet I would that you were wise unto that which is good, and simple concerning evil."

First of all, I don't see how it would be possible to be wise concerning what is good without also being wise concerning evil. Also, let's say it was possible and somebody was ignorant about subjects like rape, murder, assault, etc. Not knowing much about these things wouldn't make them less likely to happen. Another thing is that, as they say, "to be fore warned is to be fore armed." So why would he have taught something so obviously wrong? Maybe he wanted people to be ignorant concerning evil so that they wouldn't realize the evil of obedience to god or of religion in general. Whatever the case was, I say that you should be wise concerning evil. Lest you inadvertently commit it or leave yourselves vulnerable to it.

Now from many of the things I have read in the bible, I would have to say that these people didn't believe that it would be very good to have a wise "flock."

Because a wise flock would have little use for these “shepherds.” So it’s no surprise that they again attacked wisdom in this next paragraph. In 1 Cor. 1:19, it says:

“For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent.”

I dislike this kind of saying more every time I read it. Despite what they said, I say there is nothing wrong with either wisdom, being wise, having understanding or being prudent. Now though I could think of some excessively vulgar and insulting curses, I can’t come up with an adjective vile enough to describe anybody who would repress the wisdom, understanding or prudence. The philosophy they spouted here could only have come from a devil of devils!

252

Still speaking about wisdom, in 1 Cor. 1:21-22, it says:

“For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.

For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom:”

First, it basically said here that it was because of god’s wisdom that he made the wise blind to him. But any rejection of god through wisdom comes from wisdom, not god. Then it said that it pleased god through the foolishness of preaching to save those who believe. Though I see nothing pleasing about saving only those stupid enough to be fooled by the foolishness of preaching. But with god benefiting from such stupidity, I can see how such a thing might please him. It then said that the Jews require a sign. Though as I said before, it would take more than a bag of tricks to convince me. One reason being that who is to say that evil beings weren’t capable of the same tricks. So some “sign” wouldn’t prove that the thing creating it wasn’t evil.

Also, how could people know that the tricks that Jesus supposedly performed weren’t done with the help of evil spirits. Or how could Mohammed, another mortal man, know that it wasn’t an evil spirit that supposedly revealed “the word of god” to him. How could people KNOW. Because faith or these kinds of “miracles” don’t make things true or right. The only way to know is through what I advocate and the bible discourages. Which is through figuring things out for yourself. Though that would leave religion high and dry. They then went on to say that the Greeks sought after wisdom. As if that were a bad thing. But they shouldn’t have knocked it until they tried it.

These next few paragraphs again had them trying to get people to accept the harm that god apparently does to them. In 1 Cor. 1:27-29, it says:

“But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are

mighty;

And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are:

That no flesh should glory in his presence.”

Like I asked you to do with another teaching, go back and reread these three paragraphs with a word substitution. Substitute the word god with the word satan. I'll wait. With what satan is supposed to represent, it makes much more sense that way, doesn't it. Now I say that only the most depraved of entities would choose bad things over good things. Then the reason they gave for god doing these things was so that no flesh should glory in his presence. Though after being abused so foully, people would have no glory any place else either. Also, if god had to degrade people to be more glorious than they, it just shows again how low of a lifeform it is.

This next paragraph told people not to worry about suffering loss. In 1 Cor. 3:13, it says:

253

“If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.”

So they said here that if any man's work is burned, he will suffer loss. Though he himself will be saved. Well given such a choice, I think I would rather not be “saved.” Then they said that such a person would be saved as by fire. But that's one kind of saving I could do without. They may have considered incineration a beneficial experience, but I would recommend against it.

Going back to attacking the wise, in 1 Cor. 3:18-19, it says:

“Let no man deceive himself. If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise.

For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He taketh the wise in their own craftiness.”

Here they said that anybody who seems to be wise should become a fool. As if that would be better. But I say they can suck it! Such a state of mind might be great for them, but it would be really lousy for the rest of us. So despite their teaching, wisdom is not foolish. Then by some depraved reasoning they basically said that a wise person becoming a fool would make him truly wise. But a fool isn't wise. He is a fool. It then went on to say that the wisdom of this world is foolishness with god. But if that were the case, why would he care what a person's level of intelligence was. Also, if a wise person is a fool to god, then how much less do you think a fool would be to him. As if people apparently don't mean little enough to him as it is. Another thing is that it's no surprise that god would think that it is wise to have faith and worship. Which is like a slave holder

telling his slaves that it is wise to be slaves. They went on to say again that god takes the wise in their own craftiness. Which is an unfortunate teaching I commented on before. Though to the contrary of what they say, if anybody deserves to be “taken” by god, it is the foolish.

Continuing their assault against wisdom, we only need to advance to the next paragraph. In 1 Cor. 3:20, it says:

“And again, The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.”

Well let’s see how my dictionary describes “vain.” It says empty, worthless, hollow and having no genuine substance, value or importance. But this describes religion far more accurately than wisdom or intelligence. The only way I could see intelligence being vain is if people used it to weaken our species, destroy and pollute our ecology, promote overpopulation, etc. Which is indeed the case. But at least with intelligence, there is cause for hope. There isn’t much hope with ignorance.

This next paragraph again promotes the ideals of slavery. In 1 Cor. 3:23, it says:

“And ye are Christ’s; and Christ is God’s.”

It’s bad enough to be a slave. But as I said regarding being the sheep of a sheep, to be the slave of a slave is even worse. Also, Jesus may have liked the  
254

idea of being owned by god. But that didn’t give him the right to own others. Another thing is that I find it strange that one part of the “holy trinity” can own another part.

Unfortunately, one of the ways the bible teaches is by example. Which is one of the things that disturbs me about this next paragraph. In 1 Cor. 4:10, it says:

“We are fools for Christ’s sake, but ye are wise in Christ; we are weak, but ye are strong; ye are honorable, but we are despised.”

First of all, if what they were saying was true or good, then they wouldn’t have been fools in promoting it. So he was correct in his assertion that they were fools. Also, if they were fools for Christ, then the people they converted would be fools too. Another thing is that to be a fool is bad enough. And to be a fool for someone else’s sake is even worse. But as with sheep or slaves, being the fool of a fool is worse yet. Despite they’re trying to say otherwise here. Then, they repeat this same stupidity by calling themselves weak and despised. This brings us to the main thing that I don’t like about what they said here. Which is if it was ok for them to be fools, weak and despised, then it should be ok for their converts to be that way too. But there is so much wrong with being those things that it is too much to go into in any great detail. So all I am going to say is that you are unlikely to be either wise, strong or honorable by following the foolish, weak or

despised.

Though there are worse things in the world, having sex with your mother is still pretty bad. This next paragraph talks of what is supposed to happen to the soul of somebody guilty of such a thing. In 1 Cor. 5:5, it says:

“To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.”

Along with those who may fornicate with their mothers, I would have to assume that this includes other sinners as well. So what this seemed to be saying was that though wrongdoers may be punished physically, every backstabbing; thieving; lowlife; murderous scumbucket that ever lived will have their souls saved in the day of the lord. Incredible! Just when I've thought that I read the worst that the bible had to offer, they still managed to top it! It's bad enough that they taught things like there only being a judgement in the afterlife and virtually limitless forgiveness. But now it would seem that the result of any such judgement in the afterlife will be that they will be saved. Another thing is that if being saved and going to heaven meant that I would have to be around the types of sinners that I mentioned, amongst others, it only gives me another reason to want no part of it. One last thing here is that I only have what they said to go by as to who or what they meant by satan. But at least you could apparently count on it for some kind of justice.

You may remember me pointing out earlier that nobody, not even god, is above accountability for their actions. But in 1 Cor. 6:12, it says:

255

“All things are lawful unto me, but not all things are expedient: all things are lawful for me, but I will not be brought under the power of any.”

Here he starts out by basically saying that all things were lawful for him to do. How disgusting! Who in the hell did he think he was! Now I say that everything is not lawful to anybody. Least of all guys like this. For instance, if he raped and killed old men and women, he may have thought that it was lawful for him to do so. But I don't. Also, rather than being concerned if his actions were right or not, he seemed only to be concerned if they were expedient. But there is a lot more to it than that. Another thing is that he apparently found it expedient to teach some really filthy things. Then after saying again that all things were lawful for him, he said that he wouldn't be brought under the power of any. Well it apparently was good enough for Jesus, so why not him. Now he and assholes like him may like to think that they are above the law. But I say that they are as accountable as the rest of us. Take a couple of people that I had mentioned before. The reverend Jim Jones or David Koresh. Just to name two. They

probably felt the same way as Paul here. I can only wonder what other kinds of suffering such teachings have caused. Or may yet cause.

These next two paragraphs again tried to get people to accept the idea of slavery to god. In 1 Cor. 6:19-20, it says:

“What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?

For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God’s.”

Well even if god put any spirit into people, it becomes theirs by right of possession. So as far as I am concerned, god giving people a spirit wouldn’t give god claim to people. They went on to say that the people he was speaking to were bought with a price. Well I don’t know about them, but I am not for sale. Which means that I can’t be bought. Also, I wonder with what currency these people were supposedly bought. If I had to guess, I would say the currency was his “leadership.” And obviously, he would have thought it was worth more than I do. As far as who received payment, I guess it could be argued that these worshiper’s payment was their religious faith. But considering all of the disgusting things that goes along with that, its like they had been paid with shit.. Now I don’t care how often they tried to sell this slavery crap. I for one know how filthy such teachings are.

You probably remember Paul saying that all things were lawful for him to do. But let’s add that to what he said in 1 Cor. 7:40. It says:

“But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment: and I think also that I have the Spirit of God.”

So even though he only “thought” he had the spirit of god, everything was still lawful for him. But it seems to me that for anybody to set themselves up above recrimination like that, they should more than just “think” that they have the spirit  
256

of god. Though people shouldn’t try to give themselves such authority anyway. This also again brings up that holy trinity crap. Before he said that people had the spirit of the holy ghost in them. But here he basically said that he only thought that he had the spirit of god in him. But with the holy trinity being all in one, if he had the holy spirit in him, wouldn’t that mean that he had the spirit of god in him too?

For more misguided advice, lets see what they had to say in 1 Cor. 10:24. It says:

“Let no man seek his own, but every man another’s wealth.”

Here they said not to seek what is your own. But I would call seeking after what you have being satisfied with what you have. Which there is nothing wrong with.

Then they said that people should seek other people's wealth. But he didn't mention any restrictions on how you should seek it. This also left open the possibility of taking all of what others have. Which made it a pretty bad thing to teach. Another thing is that telling somebody to seek another person's wealth is about the same thing as telling them to envy another person's wealth. Which isn't a very good idea.

This also brings up something I was going to talk a little more about later. Which concerns economics. But seeing how they sort of brought the subject up, I guess I could talk about it some here. Though this subject could take up a whole book by itself, seeing how this isn't what this book is about, I will do what I can in what little space I allow myself here. First of all, though there are many different ways in which groups of creatures exist in nature, I am going to judge that the communal, goal oriented system is best for us. Though in such an interdependent society, to have everybody going after everybody's else's wealth like hungry dogs and exploiting whoever they can however they can to gain as much as they can isn't what I would call having everybody looking out for the interests of society in general. Such a thing is more conducive to the individualistic social structure of cockroaches. Now there's no doubt that capitalism has driven innovation. But seeing what it has and is doing to the planet, I know there is a better way. So one of the social goals would be living a pleasurable existence that is sustainable and takes up as small of a footprint on the land as possible.

One of mankind's unsuccessful social structures was communism in the old Soviet republic. The failure of which I could only partially blame on the fact that people are more apt to work harder for their own greed than they are to work for somebody else. Most of the problems they had with their society I would have to blame on bad management. Then there were other economic systems that relied on things like war or pyramid building to sustain their society. What we need to do is think about sustainability, efficiency, localized production, pleasurable pursuits, a fair standard of comfort based on ability, but most importantly, WORK!!! People need JOBS!!! Which as I pointed out earlier,

257

obviously isn't accomplished very well by shipping jobs to other countries to see how much foreign debt the U.S. government will eventually start taking out of our asses. While importing as much union busting cheap labor as possible and seeing how much druglike food we can shove into each other's mouths for employment.

Now I know what it was like to go to different states to look for work. Where I only found tenuous jobs that I couldn't live on or was driven like an easily



replaceable dog. Only to end up in the military to experience in many ways an even higher level of exploitation. It was like the old saying, "out of the frying pan and into the fire." I am trying to do what I can to save other people from my fate. Which isn't easy. Because for one reason among many, I know the power of the brainwashing I had to overcome and you are subjected to. There are also too many people who, because the change happens so slowly, are willing to take crap until the bitter end. Especially the wealthy or those in a position of power who can escape the negative effects better than others. Who unfortunately have the power to make most people think whatever they want them to think. For instance, if the kings of France had the same power of the media that we have today before the French revolution, I doubt if it would have ever happened. The same can be said for the American revolution.

For an example of how stupid such things can get, take president Bush getting reelected even though he got us involved in a ruinously expensive war that at best was clearly unnecessary. Etc. etc. etc. Even though things have been and could be worse, Democracy is a farce. It might work in a small village. But in larger communities, all you end up with is a plutocracy. Which is rule by the rich. Who's main concerns are varying levels of how to stay rich or get richer. These people have also been shown to be less honest than others. In thinking about it, I have come to the conclusion that just dishonesty itself would make the concept of "freedom" mean much more to them. As an alternative to the way things now work, I would prefer people were elected by lottery. I won't go into detail on how to make that work. But that would at least make it more difficult for the rich to band together and buy the elected officials who are willing to "play ball." It would also help protect us from those who are simply power mad. Also, you don't need to be highly educated or a genius to be a good leader. All you need is intelligent and moral advisors. For those of you who claim to like Democracy, I challenge you to get any more democratic than that!

The largely cult like system called Capitalism has also failed miserably. But as I said before, it would take a dictator to straighten things out. Not that I would expect or really want to be given such a headache. Though I do have a plan to save at least some of us. Which is something you are mainly going to have to do for yourselves. Because to personally direct everything that would be needed to be done would take more time than there is in any single lifespan. Neither am

258

I interested in becoming a cheerleader. All I will likely be able to do is show you the way. You will have to wait till later to find out what this plan is.

Getting back to the topic at hand, we again had Paul teaching something

disgusting. In 1 Cor. 11:1, it says:

“BE ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ.”

Again I have to wonder who in the hell he thought he was! He was no deity or prophet. He was only somebody who was supposedly appointed by the spirit of Jesus to preach. That didn't make him important enough to have people basically worship him as he supposedly worshiped Jesus. The type of thing that he taught here could also have people following the priest; who follows the bishop; who follows the cardinal; who follows the pope; who follows an imaginary or at least uninterested, evil god. With the saints, angels, Mary and Jesus thrown in for good measure. All of which people can do without to begin with.

Paul didn't set a very good example in these next few paragraphs. In 1 Cor. 13:1-3, it says:

“THOUGH I speak with the tongues of men and angels, and have not charity, I am become a sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal.

And though I have the gift of prophesy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing.

And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.”

Well let's begin with looking at the definition my dictionary gives for charity. It says love; benevolence; affection; good will; that disposition of heart which inclines men to think favorably of their fellow men and do them good. Now it's good that Paul said that because he didn't have charity that he was nothing and all of his achievements didn't profit him. But I think that a greater example was set by his being somebody chosen by the spirit of Jesus to preach, with all of his supposed abilities, and still having no charity. Which I don't like. Because if even he didn't have charity, why should you. Neither did being without charity seem to hurt him much.

There's something else here that doesn't make sense. Which is that if he didn't have charity, why did he give all that he had to feed the poor. (though you should only give part of what you have, not all) I suppose he could have done it because he thought it was the right thing to do. Or maybe he thought it would be expedient. Whatever the case was, it does show a certain amount of hypocrisy. Which is something that people should stay away from. Even if it is for a good cause. Another bad example was set by him in his saying that he was willing to have his body burned. That would likely mean that other Christians should be willing to do the same. But it should take a much better reason than religion for somebody to be willing to go through such a painful self sacrifice.

These next two paragraphs spoke of their death cult resurrection at the end of the world. In 1 Cor. 15:42-43, it says:

“So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption:

It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power:”

He must have been really confident in people’s stupidity to say something so blatantly evil. Here he admits that their religion is corrupt, dishonorable and weak. But people should never accept such things. No matter what the supposed rewards may be. Neither do I like his teaching that incorruption, glory and power can come from corruption, dishonor and weakness. Also, though it doesn’t say so here, he taught that the destruction of the world must happen before the resurrection does. Which is disgusting in itself. But as far as the destruction of the world goes, what they were basically saying here that the destruction of the world would be caused by corruption, dishonor and weakness. So with religion promoting these things, where do you think the blame for the destruction of the world should lie. Another thing is that to the contrary of what they taught, I say that if you are corrupt, dishonorable and weak, you should be flushed down the damn toilet! Not have incorruption, glory and power attributed to you.

For another of their slimy teachings, let’s go to 1 Cor. 15:56. It says:

“The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law.”

First of all, we all have to die sometime. So unless you cause it to happen prematurely, there is no sin there. Then they said the strength of sin is the law. Though incredible as it may seem, as far as I can tell, the law they spoke of was the law of god as revealed by Jesus. Well as usual, you can believe what I next have to say or not. Which is that in my considered opinion, real sin is bad. Now I can’t say that it was impossible that they were talking about mankind’s civil laws. But even if that were the case, then just the opposite of what they taught would be true. Because the goal of civil law is in theory supposed to stop sin. Not strengthen it.

Next, they gave a stupid reason to forgive somebody who caused grief. In 2 Cor. 2:7, it says:

“So that contrariwise ye ought rather to forgive him, and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow.”

What a bunch of crap! For a person who causes grief, being overly sorry is the least thing they can suffer. If such a person is overly sorry about anything, it would likely only be that they were caught. Neither is being overly sorry very likely to be the case anyway. Because their feelings didn’t stop them from causing the grief to begin with. Also, with their lack of feeling toward others in

this regard, I'm supposed to have regard for their feelings? Get real! Now it is possible that some offenders could have cause for at least some forgiveness.  
260

Especially given the often unfortunate examples set for them by those in a position of power. But actually comforting them would be going a little too far.

They next gave another reason for the level of forgiveness that they taught in the last paragraph I mentioned. In 2 Cor. 2:11, it says:

“Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices.”

Well for the most part, there is no way that being more frugal with your forgiveness could give satan an advantage over people. Because satan is supposed to be evil and supposedly wishes bad things to happen to you. So what do you think would be more likely to cause bad things to happen to you. Forgiving and comforting those who do bad things, or judging and punishing wrongdoers according to their crimes. Then, what they basically said was that it's bad to not be ignorant of satan's devices. But the first step in keeping a bad thing from happening is being aware of what bad thing could happen. So being ignorant of satan's devices would be bad.

I guess it's about time to mention another of the bible's many disgusting teachings that it's better to be dead. Which of course makes it easier to convince the suckers to be willing to die for whatever these religious parasites say they should be willing to die for. In 2 Cor. 5:8, it says:

“We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.”

I only wish he was absent from the body before he had a chance to write crap like this. Now I on the other hand say that you should take my advice instead. Which is to do your best to stay alive. Because this physical existence is worth the effort. It's also best to do what you honorably can do to stay alive in case there is no afterlife. Or if there is an afterlife, in case it isn't as great as it was made out to be.

This next paragraph talked about some of the attributes somebody must have to be a minister of god. In 2 Cor. 6:8, it says:

“By honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report: as deceivers, and yet true;”

First of all, there is no reason for dishonor when trying to teach people a better way. Though I can see how dishonor comes into play with what they taught. Because to promote a pandering, escapist religion is highly dishonorable. They went on to promote deception. But it is sick for them to promote deception as a device to get people to believe. Though such a sick attitude didn't begin with

what they said here. Neither unfortunately has it yet ended.

It seems that if there wasn't enough trouble around, it was ok for them to stir some up. In 2 Cor. 7:9, it says:

“Now I rejoice, not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance: for ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing.”

261

Apparently the whole point of this was that they received damage for nothing. But no matter what they were trying to do, it was wrong for them to cause trouble for no reason. Also, if causing trouble for nothing can be “godly,” it is just another reason to have nothing to do with it.

Now I'm one of those people who believe in humility. But another example of the bible teaching just the opposite can be found in 2 Cor. 9:3. It says:

“Yet I have sent the brethren, lest our boasting of you should be vain in this behalf; that, ye may be ready:”

Well I don't believe that being boastful is very nice. Also, in teaching that it's ok to be boastful in this instance, they make it easier for people to be boastful in other ways too. Though religion is nothing to be boastful about anyway.

There is quite a bit that is wrong in what these next paragraphs said. In 2 Cor. 10:3-6, it says:

“For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh:

(For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds;)

Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ;

And having in readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience is fulfilled.”

First of all, they said that they didn't war after the flesh. But they didn't and couldn't have warred over people's souls without it also having an effect on the flesh that contained it. So they did indeed war after the flesh. Such a war is also fought for the same reasons as most other wars are. Which is to take what other people have. Then they said that the weapons of their warfare weren't carnal. But anything that happens in this world, such as preaching; writing; thinking; faith or miracles is carnal. So they were wrong again. They went on to say that their weapons pull down strongholds. Which isn't a very nice thing to do. It then said that they cast down imaginations. But there is nothing wrong with imagination. And only the filthy shit eating scum who wanted to keep people under their control through ignorance would say such a thing.

Along with imagination, they also mentioned casting down every high thing that exalted itself against the knowledge of god. Though just from the limited instances of what I have shown to be in the bible so far, you should see that if everything was cast down that challenged the “knowledge” of god, there would be very little left standing. Then it said that people’s thoughts were to be brought into captivity for their obedience to Christ. But mental slavery is even worse than physical slavery. Which again is something that only one of the evil Judas goats like Paul would promote. They went on to say basically that when these followers obedience is fulfilled they should be ready to take revenge against the disobedient. For which there is a lot I could say. But for now I will just say that  
262

those seeking revenge against those who just want to be free can eat shit and die! They are the ones promoting using warfare to get people to be ignorant and obedient. If anybody has cause for revenge, it’s those who such people were trying to oppress.

Paul gave another reason in this next paragraph as to why he and his religion tried to hinder people. In 2 Cor. 11:12, it says:

“But what I do, that will I do, that I may cut off occasion from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory, they may be found even as we.”

So here he said that he cut off occasion from them that sought occasion. But if people seek occasion to better themselves, be free, give charity or do other good things, they should be free to do so. Even if it may cause them to be worthy of glory. Then the reason he gave for doing what he said was so others would be found to be the same as they were. But you already know what kind of people they were. The kind who tried to get other people to do what they were supposedly willing to do themselves. Such as being willing to give their bodies as a living sacrifice, (by fire if necessary) consider themselves sheep for the slaughter, etc. etc. etc. All of which makes the promoter of such garbage the filthiest of scum. And those suckered into accepting such filth aren’t much better.

These next paragraphs tried to justify a homosexual relationship between Paul and some other man. In 2 Cor. 12:2-5, it says:

“I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven.

And I knew such a man, (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;)

How that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter.

Of such an one I will glory: yet I myself will not glory, but in mine infirmities.”

When he said that he knew this man, he probably meant “knew” as in the biblical term for sex. Though he supposedly couldn’t remember if he sinned physically or spiritually. But I would say that it was likely physically. Then after speaking of their ecstasy, he talked of how he spoke unspeakable and unlawful words to him. But that didn’t stop him from trying to justify the gay “sweet nothings” he spoke. He then said that he would glory in his loverboy. Which I already assumed to be the case. Then he said that he wouldn’t glory in himself, but in his infirmities instead. But only the most vile of scum would have taught that personal faults or moral deficiencies are something that people can glory in.

Now on this whole homosexual thing, I must say again that it isn’t right. Because the function of sex is for procreation. Which two people of the same sex aren’t capable of. Being gay also interferes with masculine and feminine personality traits. And though I am no expert, it is my feeling that such diversity  
263

is healthy for children. But homosexuality confuses the whole issue. Also, for many of these people, being gay is simply the easy rout to take. Though the easy path isn’t always the best path to take. Another thing is that, as I said before, people can and have made all sorts of unfortunate social deviations a functional part of their cultures to some degree. Though in a culture where homosexuality is considered normal, I would hate to see people suffer strife for being what I would consider to be normal.

But despite all of this, I don’t think homosexuals should be mistreated. (unless they mistreat you) Because being gay may have simply have stemmed from a poor choice. And making a poor choice is something that everybody is likely capable of. Or maybe it was somehow beyond their control. So they should be treated like any other handicapped person. Though since this handicap is somewhat normal to them, unlike other handicaps, it is promoted by most of its victims. Which is another reason why homosexuality should never be promoted. Lest even more people fall victim to this handicap.

The bible next expounded more deviant ideas on how people should view their faults. In 2 Cor. 12:9-10, it says:

“And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.

Therefore will I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ’s sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong.”

So after making the unfortunate statement that whoever’s strength was made perfect in weakness, they again talked about glorying in their infirmities. But I am

telling you that it would be about the pinnacle of evil to glory in your shortcomings. Now though I pity those who may have been fooled into accepting this diseased concept of theirs, I pity more those who may have suffered at the hands of those who bought this filthy garbage of theirs. And then the reason they gave for glorying in their infirmities was because it would cause the power of Christ to rest upon them. But if the “power” of Christ relied on these people glorying in their infirmities, it is just another reason why nobody should have anything to do with them. Then, after saying again that he took pleasure in his infirmities, he also said that he took pleasure in reproaches, necessities, persecutions and distresses. Which sounds like a promotion for masochism to me. So I say it was sick for him to have taught by example that people should take pleasure in those things. He then said that when he was weak, he was strong. Though I find that hard to believe. Because when I’m weak, I’m weak. Just as when I’m cold, I’m cold; when I’m in pain, I hurt; when I’m hungry, I hunger; if I am hated, I’m sad; etc. Which is the way it should be.

This next paragraph spoke of a curse. In Gal. 3:10, it says:

“For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse: for it is written,  
264

Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.”

First of all, the law they were speaking of here was likely the law of god. Now when it said that those who were of the works of the law were under a curse, what I take this to mean is that those who didn’t follow the law would be cursed. Well I’m not surprised that they would use the threat of a curse to keep people in line. Then it said that those who didn’t follow their law were cursed. But religion in general is a curse. Also, incomplete as it is, you can see from what I have written so far that if believers in the bible in particular followed most of its laws, they would indeed be cursed. This then brings up just how badly believers would be cursed. Well as you know, there are many different varieties of bad things that the bible taught. Each and every different one of them is a different curse. So the question isn’t how anybody would be cursed. (and those they drag down with them) But in how many different ways they would be cursed. Which as you can imagine, would likely have a cumulative effect.

Moving on to the next paragraph, they have a couple more unfortunate things to say. In Gal. 3:11, it says:

“But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith.”

So first it said that nobody is justified by god for following his law. But I think that those who do what they’re supposed to do should at least have some



justification. Then they said that the just live by faith. Which is pretty stupid. Apparently, having faith is more important than following the law of god. Well considering some of god's teachings, I could see where faith is better. But if the law of god is no good, the faith you put into what created it would also be no good. Also, as far as this whole faith creating justification thing goes, I have unfortunately known believers who were so slimy that your spit would be too good for them. There is no way that just because they had faith in god and I don't that they were more justified than me.

Speaking more about the curse of the law of god, in Gal. 3:13, it says:  
"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:"

Here it said that Christ redeemed them from the curse of the law. Which I take to mean that he made people free from having to obey the law of god. Though its hard to say, or care, if this pertained to everybody or just those who believed in him. But generally speaking, the main thing I don't like here again is Christ apparently enabling people to relieve themselves of accountability for their actions. Which of course is something nobody can do for you.

The type of thing I am going to comment on in this next paragraph is said quite a few times in what is left of the bible. Though as with other things, I won't be commenting on every instance. In Gal. 4:19, it says:

"My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you."

265

As you have probably guessed, what I don't like here is his calling people little children. One reason being that it didn't convey very high expectations for people's behavior. Another reason is that if you treat people like little children, they will likely tend to act like little children. Just as if you treat people like subjugated cattle, they will likely tend to act like subjugated cattle. Though they did more than treat people like subjugated cattle. They tried to convince people that is what they are and should be. Which is sickening.

As you can guess, I don't like what this next paragraph had to say. In Gal. 5:15, it says:

"But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another."

I hate to put words in the bible's mouth, so to speak. But what it appeared to be saying here basically was that if people fight, steal or even kill amongst themselves, they shouldn't be consumed with animosity. Well first of all, it would have been better if he came straight out and said that people not do such things to each other. Not suggest how they should feel if they did such things. Another thing is that if you're stupid enough to mistreat each other, it would be better if

people thought badly of each other for doing it. Because I would hate to see such things take on the air of being no big deal.

Over and over and over again, the bible tried to make what is bad sound good. Another example of which can be found in Eph. 3:1. It says:

“FOR this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles,”

So if it was good for Paul to be Jesus’s prisoner, it stands to reason that it should be ok for you to be too. But don’t you believe it! Because it is never good to be a prisoner. Even pleasant confinement would be bad. Because our salvation is in our freedom, progress and ability to stand on our own two feet as much as possible. But through these various forms of subjugation that the bible keeps trying to get people to accept for themselves, you can only mentally become human versions of the domesticated silk moth. Which in case you didn’t know, through domestication has lost its ability to fly. The thought of the kind of physical and mental devolution the bible has exposed people to sickens me. As does the fact that there seems to be no limit as to what depths of devolution god would find acceptable.

This next paragraph again said something bad. Though it was followed by something that wasn’t bad. In Eph. 4:1, it says:

“I THEREFORE, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called,”

I don’t care how often they said it. But you should never accept the idea of being a prisoner of any kind. Then what it basically said was that you should be worthy of whatever vocation you choose. Which is something I basically agree with. Though being the way the bible is, even though they go on to talk about things like meekness and longsuffering, a dishonorable vocation can still be

266

practiced even under those conditions. Such as a thief, pimp, slavemaster, etc. So it would have been better if he added the word “honorable” before the word vocation.

Next, I don’t like one of the things this next paragraph said people should have done with their children. In Eph. 6:4, it says:

“And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.”

As you can probably guess, the part I don’t like here was their telling people to bring their children up in a religious nature. Because as you have seen, there is a huge number of ways that doing so would be harmful to them. Also, to me at least, brainwashing children is particularly disgusting.

You have recently seen some instances where the bible exemplified things like imprisonment; immaturity; obedience; irresponsibility; masochism; stupidity; etc.

etc. etc. Moving on to the next paragraph, let's look at the filth they had to dump on people here. In Eph.6:5, it says:

“Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart, as unto Christ.”

So slaves were supposed to serve their masters with the same resolve as there were to have served Jesus? Well Paul, Jesus and any slaveholders can all eat shit and die! Though I have to admit that the main reason the bible said any of this sort of crap was probably because they realized that if they wanted their religion to succeed, it would be really helpful to kiss the ass's of the wealthy and powerful. Who were also likely to be slaveholders.

Still promoting slavery, in Eph. 6:9 it says:

“And, ye masters, do the same unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there any respect of persons with him.”

Well at least they taught some restraint on the part of the masters. Not that it would have done much good. One reason being that it would likely be too difficult to expect people to only be wicked to a certain degree. Another reason being is that they basically said, “neither” is there respect for people with the lord. Which was another way of saying that “neither” should masters have respect for their slaves. And it's likely too difficult to forbear threatening those you have no respect for.

Another exemplification for oppression can be found in Eph. 6:20. It says:

“For which I am an ambassador in bonds: that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.”

Now despite what they said, it is never good to be in bondage. Though the sick people who are into that sort of thing might disagree. They also spoke of such a person speaking boldly. But nobody in bondage can speak very boldly. Considering the miserable situation they are in. Neither should you expect to find any truth in what a person in bondage might have to say. Also, any animal that would lock itself in a cage is doubly condemned.

267

In these next paragraphs, they had something filthy to say about the already filthy act of preaching about the lord. In Phil. 1:15-18, it says:

“Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will:

The one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds:

But the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel.

What then? notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretense, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice.”

So what all of this led to was that even if Christ was preached for bad reasons,

it still made Paul happy. Well it doesn't make me happy at all. In fact, the idea of evildoers and charlatans preaching about Christ for their own purposes is even more disgusting than those who supposedly do it for god. One reason being that, generally speaking, it is wrong to do something bad for a supposedly good reason. Especially if, as I said, that "good" reason is preaching about the lord. Now if in fact there were a reason to do something bad to do something good, that good thing should be better than the bad thing that was done. Which can be subjective in nature. So anybody choosing such a course of action should weigh things from more than what may benefit them personally.

Moving on to the next paragraph, it brought up some unfortunate possibilities. Improbable though they may be. In Phil. 1:19, it says:

"For I know that this shall turn to my salvation through your prayer, and the supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ,"

First of all, it said one reason Paul did what he did was for his salvation through other people's prayer. So it appears that his reason for doing what he did wasn't completely for unselfish reasons. Which doesn't surprise me. Also, I think he should have said something here about the salvation of those he was preaching to. Though with their being cattle, he probably wouldn't have thought that it mattered. Then it said that these people's prayer supplied the spirit of Jesus. Unfortunately, as I said before, I can't say it is completely impossible that people's prayer couldn't also supply "god" with some form of energy if they prayed to it. Such as through some form of collective extrasensory power. Though since any reason for creating or sustaining such a creature in this way is evil, then the creature itself would be evil. As I have shown to be the case, if it exists. Another thing is that such a creature would likely want to survive. Even if doing so was harmful to mankind. Such as making them accepting the idea of them being "calves of the stall." Or making them think of themselves as "sheep for the slaughter." It would likely use any power it had to cause people to continue to sustain it through their belief and prayer. Such as by causing miracles, possessions or other paranormal experiences to give people cause to pray and believe. It might also conserve its power by promoting blind faith and preaching to bring it more prayer. So I would again suggest that people discontinue their faith in all gods, prophets, saints, etc. Just in case.

268

Another attempt to cheapen life can be found in Phil. 1:21. It says:  
"For me to live is Christ, and to die is gain."

So for somebody in his exalted position to supposedly think of death as gain, the natural conclusion would be that other people should feel the same way about themselves. Well I don't care how often the bible said this kind of shit! I

say that this life matters! And to lose it is not gain, it's loss! But later he did say that it was more needful for people to abide in the flesh. Though it doesn't mean a lot when compared to all of the other promotions they gave for people's willingness to sacrifice themselves for god. Which is a diseased concept that unfortunately other religions are apparently also guilty of.

Next, you should have a good idea by now how I feel about the salvation they promoted. Neither do I care for the way they taught that people should seek it in this next paragraph. In Phil. 2:12, it says:

"Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling."

Now the kind of salvation they promoted was bad enough. On top of that, I say that any salvation that has to be gained through fear and trembling was even worse. Also, any truly righteous salvation, like the kind I promote, is best sought with boldness. Not searched for like a cowering dog under a table looking for scraps. As they promoted for their salvation.

In these next two paragraphs, Paul was again trying to diminish the importance of life. In Phil. 3:3-4, it says:

"For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.

Though I might also have confidence in the flesh. If any other man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the flesh, I more."

Here he said basically that he and those like him should have no confidence in the flesh. Which gave the impression that this physical life had no value. But I know that life has value. Then after saying that he had no confidence in the flesh, he said that he might have. Well there's decisive thinking for you. He then basically said that if anybody had reason to trust in the flesh, he could come up with more reasons than them to do so. Which was another way of saying that no matter what reason could be given to have confidence in the flesh, they still shouldn't have confidence in it. Which was a sick thing to teach.

What their next paragraph had to say challenged the last one that I mentioned in vileness. In Phil. 4:6, it says:

"Be careful in nothing; but in every thing by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known unto God."

Here he again taught that people shouldn't be careful. But only an asshole would teach people to be reckless. I already told you the best reason why. Which is because sometimes things can go wrong even if you're trying to be

269

careful. So being reckless would only increase the chances of things going

wrong. He then said that instead of being careful, people should put their lives in god's hands. Which would screw people up and make it necessary for people to pray more and make even more requests of god. It could also make people more dependent on him. All of which would be terrible.

So I would rather people be careful and not make requests of god. Which would come in handy in one of those well quoted circumstances where god says no. Besides, I doubt if god would have created people just so he could sit around fulfilling their requests. Also, evangelists. reverends; ministers; priests; nuns, bishops; cardinals; popes; ayatollahs; caliphs and other cultists exercise much more control over people than god does. Which means that it is in the hands of those demented people who you would actually be putting your life in. So for anybody to throw away caution, they had better start looking for a paddle. Or else they, as the old saying goes, will be "up shit creek" without one. Not that having a paddle in such a circumstance would be a lot of help.

Moving on to the next paragraph, it said a couple things that I don't like. In Phil. 4:7, it says:

"And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus."

So first they talked about the peace of god. But history has shown one conflict after another. And things aren't getting any better. So where's the peace. Though they could have meant internal peace. But to have internal peace during a conflict would be hypocritical and escapist at best. Which is not good. Then it said that the peace of god passed all understanding. Well despite what he said, I'll be the judge of what is or is not beyond my understanding. Also, seeing how the bible was written to be confusing, (among other unfortunate things) it's no wonder if what it said could be beyond people's understanding. Because there is no understanding gibberish. Another thing is that even if something was shown to be beyond understanding, big deal! For example, we have more understanding than a worm and can manipulate them because of it. But that doesn't mean that they don't have the right to live their lives as they see fit. It then said that this peace they talked about would "keep" people's hearts and minds through Jesus. So here they went again trying to acclimate people to the idea of captivity. But I'll not be swayed by their multifarious repetitions of such ideas. Because I know better.

Next, Paul again spoke of something being good that wasn't. In Col. 2:1, it says:

"FOR I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh;"

Now what I don't like here is him making his conflict out to be a good thing. Sure, we may need to struggle over things to keep in shape or to improve ourselves. But as I have shown, the things the bible would have people struggle

over had a very limited useful purpose at best. Which in my considered opinion doesn't even begin to compare with the negative aspects of what they taught. Or of religion in general. So the conflict he spoke of was very unlikely to be good. Let alone great.

There are a few things in this next paragraph that I don't like. In Col. 2:23, it says:

"Which things have indeed a shew of wisdom in will worship, and humility, and neglecting the body; not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh."

First he called "will worship" wise. Whatever that is. Though I don't consider worship wise myself. Then it included neglecting the body as an act of wisdom. But would you neglect your spouse; your children; your business; a neighbor in need; any animals that you have; etc. Well the answer is that you shouldn't neglect them. So it would be equally unwise to neglect your body. Also, taking care of these things would be a healthier "conflict" to contend with rather than anything religion might require of you. What it then seemed to say here is that there is no honor in satisfying the flesh. Which is true if that satisfaction, for example, comes in the form of having too many children in an already overpopulated world. As you can imagine, there are also many other satisfactions of the flesh that it would be best to avoid. But generally speaking, there is greater dishonor in not satisfying those cravings of the flesh that are truly justifiable.

What these next two paragraphs had to say makes me sick! In Col. 3:2-3, it says:

"Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth.

For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God."

Again the bible was trying to diminish the importance of life here on earth. But I think this life here deserves the affection. Also, if you have to have more affection toward heaven to get there, then I again say screw heaven. Because while we're here, this life is more important. Now teaching things like this may have made it easier to leave this life when the time came. But it also made it easier for others to convince people to throw away their lives. Supposedly for god. Which has happened often enough. This is only one of the many reasons that made facing death more comfortable not worth the cost. Then they again tried to sell the idea that the followers of Christ were already dead. So as I said before, if they considered themselves to already be dead, then convincing them to go all the way wouldn't have been too much trouble. They made dying sound easier every time they taught such a thing. But I would recommend against dying prematurely. It then said that their lives were hid with Christ in god. Well

let's say for a moment that such people's lives were hid. Why would Jesus or god hide their lives? Maybe it was because they didn't plan to make it easy for such people to get them back. Either in this life or in the supposed next life.

There are a couple more justifications for slavery coming up. But trying as  
271

usual to keep from being too repetitive on such subjects, I will only mention one of them. In Col. 3:22, it says:

"Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eyeservice, as menpleasers; but with singleness of heart, fearing God:"

Well he could say these types of things all he wanted to. (and he did) But I know that there is no honor in being owned by another man. Though the bible did its best to crush the idea of honor also. Also, I've heard it said that good help is hard to find. But owning the help is a pretty poor answer for it. Another thing that I have to say again is that it was pretty bad to bring the fear of god into the promotion of slavery.

There are also a couple more instances coming up where Paul was again promoting the idea of being in bonds. Though again, I will mention only one of them. In Col. 4:3, it says:

"Withal praying also for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds:"

Now I don't care how many reasons he came up with in favor of being in bonds. Because common sense says that to be in mental or physical bonds would be a disadvantageous situation to be in. For instance, a bird in a cage may have a pretty easy life. But for its own sake, it would be best if it were free.

These next two paragraphs again put forward some ideas that I am not happy about, to say the least. In 2 Thes. 1:4-5, it says:

"So that we ourselves glory in you in the churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations that ye endure:

Which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer:"

First of all, they spoke of enduring persecution and tribulation. But for anybody to endure such things for the privilege of being a slave or being in bonds is beyond stupid. Though it is a good example of what lengths people will go to for brain drugs or to justify telling themselves lies. Then it said that enduring these bad things was a token of god's righteous judgment. But that isn't righteous. It is only righteous for criminals to endure suffering. It went on to say that enduring persecution and tribulation made people worthy of heaven. But the only thing that enduring these bad things makes people worthy of is the bad things they endured. I on the other hand say that only in fighting or overcoming persecution



and tribulation are people worthy of anything better. Also, it said that being worthy of the kingdom of god was “also” what these people suffered for. So what was this other thing besides being worthy of the kingdom of god that these people suffered for? Well seeing how I don’t care, it’s hard to say. But whatever it was, I doubt if it was worth suffering for either.

In this next paragraph they spoke of the day when the earth was supposed to be destroyed. In 2 Thes. 1:8, it says:

272

“In flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

So why take vengeance on those who may be ignorant of the existence of god. Or on those who wish to be free and have correctly reasoned that they have the right to decide for themselves what it is that they should know. Well my best explanation is that anybody taking vengeance out on such people is an asshole! Now I say that if anybody deserves to be consumed by flaming fire, it is those who are willing to surrender their souls for deceitful words and promises.

These next few paragraphs spoke of the law of god. In 1 Tim. 1:8-10, it says: “But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully;

Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers,

For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine.”

First he said that their law was good. But it was created to take advantage of the weakness of man. Which isn’t good. Their law is also full of lies, contradictions and evil. It also shows an amazing ignorance of things we now know to be true and it also spouted an astonishingly massive amount of difficult to decipher irrelevancies. None of which are good in any way. Then it said that their law was good if a person used it lawfully. Well if as they said their law was meant for the wicked, how lawfully would he expect them to use it. Especially with all of the wicked things it taught. Also, he said earlier that the law was written so sin might abound. So wouldn’t using it lawfully also cause sin to abound? Another thing is that it seems to me that they should have said that their law was meant for everybody. Because probably anybody could be in danger of breaking it. Now there is at least one bright spot in what he said here. In which he basically called a number of bad things contrary to sound doctrine. But as I said before, with all of the bad teachings in the bible and the unfortunate

nature of religion in general, even the occasional good teaching is little more than a speed bump.

The quantity and quality of adherence to the type of thing this next paragraph taught is what makes it bad. In 1 Tim. 2:15, it says:

“Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.”

The act that they said would save women here is the same act that is now in the process of destroying our planet. Which is a bad thing. So bad in fact that there is absolutely nothing beyond reason to try to control it. Also, telling women to have children is like telling a fish to swim. What they said here was likely to cause overpopulation. That’s a pretty bad way to supposedly be saved. I think they should have come up with an alternate way in which women could be

273

“saved.” They also spoke of sobriety here. But somebody drunk on brain drugs isn’t very sober. Such as the high people are likely to feel from things like being able to call their actions god’s will or believing that they will have a wonderful afterlife. Etc. etc. etc. It makes their promotion for sobriety here nothing more than empty words.

These next two paragraphs dealt with one of the traits that were supposedly needed to make a good bishop. In 1 Tim. 3:4-5, it says:

“One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjugation with all gravity;

(For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)”

Well it seems that Paul considered having children under subjugation with all gravity as ruling them well. But it isn’t. Sure, children should be obedient to their parents. But what he taught went too far. We shouldn’t forget that children are people in their own right. A parent’s duty is to raise and guide them to adulthood as best they can. Which should not require being overly strict and domineering. Though the main thing I don’t like about what was taught here is that if it was ok for a parent to rule their children in subjugation with all gravity, then the natural conclusion here is that the clergy should also rule their parishioners in subjugation with all gravity. Which has often been the case in the past and probably will be in the future. Unless their sickness is stopped. I also remember earlier where they said that god’s messengers and servants were blind and deaf. Such people shouldn’t even be ruling children. Let alone adults.

From what this next paragraph said, it again seems that the wicked will never be punished. In 1 Tim. 4:10, it says:

“For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living

God, who is the Saviour of all men, specially of those that believe.”

What they were basically saying here was that Jesus was the saviour of “all” men. But especially of those that believe. Which I take to mean that those who would be saved would include those who didn’t believe in or even heard of him. So it would again seem that those who went through much tribulation to follow him were suckers. I would also have to assume that the “saved” included the wicked too. Which is beyond disgusting. Because if they were going to be “saved” anyway, I don’t see there being much incentive to be good. Also, even if preferential treatment went to those who believe, the fact remains that according to what they said, the rest would be saved too.

This kind of filth has been spoken enough of already in the bible. Such as the spirits of some of the wicked being resurrected along with the “righteous” while some were left in the dust to rot. Or saving the spirit of somebody guilty of fornication with their mother in “the day of the lord Jesus.” They also spoke of the resurrection of the dead for the just and the unjust. Then, as I said before, you have to wonder why god would want to punish somebody who did what he  
274

made them do. Or that his fallen archangel, satan, was able to make a lowly human do. Added to these things are all of the other filthy aspects of being a follower of this religion that I have commented on so far. Which means that “specially those that believe” are the equal of the worst of the lot. So it’s no surprise that they would say that basically the wicked would receive the same reward.

This next paragraph again tried to sell the idea of slavery. In 1 Tim. 6:1, it says: “LET as many servants as are under the yoke count their masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed.”

So from what Paul’s piece of filth here said, it seems that people should either accept slavery or blaspheme against their slavery to god. Well in that case, I say god can eat shit and die! Besides, god is a blasphemy. It is a blasphemy against freedom, justice, truth and goodness. So cursing god is nothing. Because you can’t blaspheme against a blasphemy. Also, he told slaves to consider their masters worthy of all honor. Which is also quite evil. One reason being that one person owning another makes the owner unworthy of honor. Then, what if the owner behaves dishonorably. Though a little further on it talked about people withdrawing themselves from dishonorable people. But where can a slave be expected to withdraw to.

More pitiful teachings can be found in 2 Tim. 1:8-9. It says:

“Be not thou therefore ashamed of the testimony of our Lord, nor of me his prisoner: but be thou partaker of the afflictions of the gospel according to the

power of God;

Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began,”

First of all, he again taught that being a prisoner of the lord is good. But you already know that I don't consider it good to be anybody's prisoner. Then, Paul was telling his son here, and likely everybody else, to be partakers of the afflictions of the gospel. Though I would recommend against enduring such an unnecessary affliction. Also, if they wanted to promote goodness here, they should have said that people would be called according to their works. Not according to the power of Jesus or god. What he said here again promoted the idea that it doesn't matter what people do.

The ideas put forward in these next two paragraphs are unhealthy ones. In 2 Tim. 2:3-4, it says:

“Thou therefore endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.

No man that warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier.”

Here it basically said to endure hardness for the sake of religion. But religion and the “shepherds” that promote it are very poor things to endure hardness for. Then it mentioned being a soldier for Jesus. Which is sick. One reason being  
275

that Jesus is no longer around. So it would in fact be others who are enlisting them. As was the case with the many religious wars that have been fought among Christians alone. Also, the two main functions of soldiers is to take and defend through the means of force. The taking part is likely to be unjustifiable. Especially for religious reasons. Then, what is unjustly taken by force has to be unjustly defended by force. In the religious realm, some of the results have been the inquisition, witch hunts, blasphemy laws, etc. None of which are good. Then it said that these soldiers don't entangle themselves with the affairs of this life. But as I said before, if anybody does anything in this world, they are entangling themselves in the affairs of this life. It then said that they don't entangle themselves to please whoever made them a soldier. Though such soldiers have more important moral issues to contend with rather than pleasing whoever chose them to be a soldier.

Next, let's see what was wrong with these next two paragraphs. In 2 Tim. 3:12-13, it says:

“Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.

But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived.”

It first basically said that those who follow Jesus will suffer persecution. Though from what I have seen, they deserve it. Because Jesus isn't worth suffering persecution for to begin with. Then it said that evil men would wax worse and worse. The example they gave is that they will deceive and be deceived. But that is the perfect definition for those who promote religion. So not only would the believers he spoke of suffer persecution, but deception on top of that. Another thing is that those who deceive probably wouldn't be as bothered by being deceived as those who don't deceive. Which would make what they endure in that respect even less. Likewise, by promoting evil, the religious may be able to handle evil better than others. But being evil isn't worth any such possible benefit.

Paul seemed to have a family business going with religion. Not only was his son Timothy involved, but coming up are some of his sick teachings that he instructed another son named Titus to pass on. It may be a little repetitive, but it just turns out that some of their exemplifications for evil are a little more repetitive than others. In Titus 2:9. It says:

“Exhort servants to be obedient unto their own masters, and to please them in all things; not answering again;”

First of all, they said that slaves should be obedient to their own masters. But I find it unlikely that they would be obedient to other masters anyway. Titus was also told here to tell slaves that they should please their masters in all things. And I bet he meant “all” things. If you know what I mean. Though Paul did say earlier that slaves shouldn't be menpleasers. Which I took as being sexually pleasing. But then again, whatever a master wants, a master will probably get.

276

Also, having the ability to make things extremely unpleasant for their slaves, I doubt if masters needed this kind of help in making sure their slaves did what they were told. Then to finish off this bit of fiendish philosophy, they basically said that slaves shouldn't talk back to their masters. Which was about the same thing as telling them to do whatever they were told to do and like it. That too is a pretty bad teaching.

Paul's exemplifications for being a prisoner are also getting pretty tiresome. But as I said before, you should be glad that I don't mention every such instance. This time, in Phil. 1:1, it says:

“PAUL, a prisoner of Jesus Christ, and Timothy our brother, unto Philemon our dearly beloved, and fellowlabourer,”

Well if it takes being a prisoner to follow Jesus, then what he represented must not be worthwhile. Which as it turns out is the case. Also, as far as all of their talk in promotion of being a prisoner goes, I can see how it helps their promotion

for slavery. I just hope I can help people avoid accepting such a philosophy for themselves. Now because of the attractiveness of religion, I have no doubt that many of the bad aspects of what the bible taught are thought of as being good. Which is another reason to reject it all. One reason being that the truly good things in the world don't need promotion. The main thing these people seem to want to do is to push their teachings to destructive extremes. Which is also likely to happen with the evil they promote.

Another of the teachings you should be glad I don't mention every instance of concerns being in bonds. One of which can be found in Titus 1:13. It says: "Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel:"

I just can't imagine what kind of diseased mind it would take for somebody to actually accept being in bonds. Neither can I see how freedom could come to mean so little. Though you should know by now how such people would have gotten there. One way is, as I mentioned before, the idea that anything that somebody might do is not their responsibility, but god's will, must be very appealing. As is the idea that they will live forever in some paradise after they die. Etc. But no matter how often the bible said things like this or what the deceived people might say, I am telling you again that it is best to be free!

Now I hate to do this, but I think that I would be doing people a disservice if I didn't mention at least about half of Paul's more repetitive bad teachings. So again, in Phil. 1:23, it says:

"There salute thee Epaphras, my fellowprisoner in Christ Jesus;"

So here is yet another example of Paul exemplifying himself being a prisoner. And no doubt if he thought it was ok for him, it should be ok for you. But apart from what Paul taught, let's look back again for a moment on some of the things other parts of the bible tried to get people to view themselves as, or justify. Being mentally blind and deaf; being cattle; being slaves and eunuchs; being

277

sheep for the slaughter; being human corned beef; behaving like little children; being unworthy of respect or regard; etc. Though as if all of those things weren't bad enough, Paul seemed extremely fond of drilling it onto people's heads that they should consider themselves as captives, prisoners and being in bonds. Along with other disgusting things. I can guarantee you that the bible doesn't say anything good enough to make up for the filthy things they teach. Though this religion isn't the only one to promote such extraordinary stupidity. For example, I saw a video of a Hindu once who caught some dung from a cow in his hands and ate some. Another similar example of religious inspired stupidity are those who would take a Muslim's word of their peaceful intent when, as I said before,

Mohammed himself personally led troops into battle. A Muslim would likely call their "religion" a religion. But it is actually a form of government. Etc. etc. etc. Such stupidity is enough to drive me to despair. But never surrender.

These next two paragraphs had Paul trying to make a case for a lack of justice. In Heb. 2:2-3, it says:

"For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward;

How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him?"

Here Paul asked how people would escape if the salvation of Jesus was neglected and every transgression received a just recompense. Well maybe he wouldn't have escaped, but most of us would. Because most crimes and their punishments aren't that serious. Besides, I shouldn't be allowed to escape for anything bad I did and neither should you. No matter how much we might like to be let off. Unless of course the crime wasn't that bad and too much time has passed. It is also unreasonable to expect people to volunteer themselves for punishment in whatever they may have gotten away with. But I am saying that we should avoid repeating any past transgressions in the future. Now needless to say, the reason why we shouldn't seek to annul justice as they suggest is because punishment causes offences to be less likely to be repeated. It also helps give victims justice and promotes protection for the innocent. Also, I have a better question than what he asked. Which is how we can escape evil if justice is pushed aside. Though apparently the bible doesn't want people to escape evil. But I sure do.

Given some of the vile things the bible had said, I would have to say that this next paragraph meant what it seemed to be saying. In Heb. 10:22, it says:

"Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

What I would take this to mean was them having their hearts sprinkled "on" from an evil conscience. But I think it would have been better if people had their hearts sprinkled on from a good conscience.

One of the things this next paragraph spoke of is about forgetting something.  
278

Though what they spoke of as being forgotten should have been forgotten. In Heb. 12:5, it says:

"And ye have forgotten the exhortation which speaketh unto you as unto children, My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou are rebuked of him:"

First of all, as I said, it is good if these people forgot the exhortation that spoke

to them as children. Because grown people are adults, not children. Also, as I said before, speaking to people like children would only reinforce any childish traits that they had. Which is a bad thing. Then he said that those people shouldn't have despised being chastised by the lord. Well if it's deserved and not out of proportion, people shouldn't despise being chastised by anybody. But as far as being chastised by the lord goes, they may have been chastised by what he supposedly said. Though that isn't the same as being chastised by the person. Such a thing also bestows almost the same authority on those speaking in the lord's name as it might for the lord himself. Which is also a bad thing. Another thing is that the lord's reasons for rebuking people were usually, if not always, pretty rotten. I would expect the same from those who claim to be doing the rebuking in his name. In that expectation, I have not been disappointed.

Another promotion for enduring god's chastening can be found in Heb. 12:7. It says:

"If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as sons; for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not?"

Well I for one wouldn't endure chastening from something that supposedly told people it owned them and treated people like children, cattle, etc. Then, as far as how god might have dealt with people goes, you could say that "what slave is he whom the master chasteneth not." Also, as I said before, when god punished people, it often seemed to be in the form of plague, war, famine, flood, drought, etc. Punishing the innocent as well as the guilty. The innocent among them wouldn't have anything sensible to learn from this punishment. Another thing is that with the possible exception of plague, all of these things can come about through human action. Especially with the effects of human caused global warming. Though with so much of human behavior being influenced by religion, I suppose god is in a way partially responsible for those things. Yet another thing is that any normal person would have to be under severe mental duress, or possibly being tortured, to believe anybody who said that the lord spoke to them. Or that god said anything the bible claims he said. So what's the use in god punishing people for not listening to him when it isn't actually him doing the talking.

These next two paragraphs again tried to turn people away from their fathers in favor of god, Jesus or whatever. In Heb. 12:9-10, it says:

"Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we

gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjugation unto the Father of spirits, and live?



For they verily for a few days chastise us after their own pleasure; but he for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness.”

The first point that he tried to make here is that it's better to be under god's subjugation than your father's. Well anybody who would buy this stupidity should try to ask their father and god a question at the same time. The first one to answer in an audible voice is the one they are better off listening to. Then he said that fathers chastised their children for their own pleasure. Wrong again! Fathers often find displeasure in the task of discipline. This discipline is also more for the child's profit than god's is. Because this discipline is meant to help children get along in this life. Which is much more important than any possible afterlife. Also, as far as parenting goes, it would have been nice if he mentioned the very helpful role mothers have in it.

This next “paragraph” told why people should serve god with reverence and fear. In Heb. 12:29, it says:

“For our God is a consuming fire.”

Well if god was a consuming fire, it would be as in the form of the consuming fire of hell. Also, as I said before, god's supposedly being big and powerful is a pretty poor justification for being its slave.

As you know, what the bible taught didn't stop at servitude to god. Another example of which can be found in Heb. 13:17. It says:

“Obey them that have rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.”

So first they said that people should obey those who rule over them. But it takes a little better reason than simply being a ruler to justify any servitude. I myself don't obey anybody or those I'm told to obey. I only obey those things I have reasoned to be right and true. Just as you should. Another thing is that history has shown most rulers to be either fools; liars; murderers; thieves; egotists; fiends; slavers; psychopaths; corrupt imperialist capitalists; warmongers; gluttons of various things; etc. Or various combinations thereof. But he told people to submit themselves to people like these? Well he can submit his lips to my ass and kiss it! Then it said that these rulers looked out for people's souls. But I say that any soul that people have is their own responsibility.

It then said that these rulers must give account for people's souls. Big deal! What if they screwed the job up or wasted a lot of lives. Does their one soul make up for all of the lives they may have ruined? You can bet your ass it doesn't! Even then, they can supposedly ask Jesus for forgiveness and escape any punishment. Which is unjust all to hell! Then they spoke of rulers doing whatever with joy. But if somebody is a ruler, they should be willing to take the

ups as well as the downs. Then it basically said that it would be unprofitable for people if rulers ruled with grief. Which may be true to some extent. But if there is good reason for unrest, it would be more unprofitable for people not to let their rulers share in it. Otherwise things would be unlikely to change.

This next paragraph is the last one I am going to be commenting on that was written by Paul. Which I hope makes you as happy as it makes me. Though what Paul said wasn't any worse than what other people in the new testament said. They were just more numerous. Maybe it was his individualistic ideas on what Christianity was supposed to mean that made it particularly unpleasant to read. In this paragraph, it again mentions one of those evil things that the bible tried to get people to accept through numerous and varied repetitions. In Heb. 13:20, it says:

“Now the God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus, that great shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant,”

Here again the bible called Jesus the shepherd and referred to people as sheep. Trying of course to get people to accept such a terrible thing. Which sickens me to no end with violent revulsion. Because people are not sheep. Nor should they think of themselves as such. One of the many reasons being that without having the responsibility to do what we ourselves have reasoned to be right, humanity as a whole is less likely to judge what truly is right. Also, concerning politics, a word I hear thrown around a lot is “freedom.” But being a sheep is the exact opposite of this.

It is also highly unlikely that you can accept the ideals of such captivity in any other realm besides politics without it eventually working its way back into the realm of politics. History has shown that clearly enough. So if you do indeed crave freedom, you must reject this and any other religion that promotes the opposite. Now what I promote is not anarchy. Because despite what some mindless idiot may say to you, people don't have to act like sheep to have order. I can tell you what real anarchy is. It is letting people having the “freedom” to do about anything they want. (Especially where money is concerned) The bible endlessly tells you that whatever what happens, it is god's will. You don't need to feel responsible for anything. And even if you do screw up, you can just ask for forgiveness. Etc. Can you think of any better cause for anarchy?

Now as far as how bad some of the things Paul said were, what James had to say in this next paragraph was up to the challenge of at least matching them. In James 2:9, it says:

“But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and ye are convinced of the law as transgressors.”

To the contrary of what this vile teaching said, I am of the opinion that the vast

majority of people are generally good. And though most are incredibly deluded, you should know by now that often isn't entirely their fault. Despite this, to promote the smooth function of society if nothing else, I say that people should

281

be given the benefit of the doubt and that you should have respect to persons, for persons, on persons or at persons. Though for some people, the only way to respect them is to disrespect yourself. Which you shouldn't do. Also, some lowlife may occasionally wrongly disrespect you. In such a case, it would be best to return that disrespect to them. Just don't let their misdeed cause you to disrespect some other innocent person.

Another of their sickening teachings can be found in James 3:8-9. It says:  
"But the tongue can no man tame; it is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison.

Therewith bless we God, and therewith we curse men, which are made after the similitude of God."

First of all, it said that a man's tongue can't be tamed as if that were a bad thing. Which it isn't. Because people should be free to say the things they feel need to be said. Then he said that people's tongues are an unruly evil full of deadly poison. Which could be true at times. But generally speaking, I say that people's tongues are a ruly good full of healing medicine. Now I know why he was trying to imprint these negative ideas on people. It was to lower their expectations of themselves and make it easier for people to screw themselves up. Because people's troubles are job security to these "shepherds." Which is a pretty rotten reason for doing so. Then he said that therewith they blessed god. Well I could see blessing god because people's tongues couldn't be tamed. But to teach that people should bless god because their tongues are supposedly an unruly evil full of deadly poison is beyond perverse. Moving on, after basically calling freedom of speech a curse, they reminded people that they are supposedly made to be similar to god, in whatever way. It would seem that they didn't want people to have very high expectations of god. Which in at least a couple different ways also helped with their job security.

What this next paragraph taught again makes me proud to be an enemy of god. In James 4:4, it says:

"Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that friendship of the world is enmity with God? whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God."

The first thing they said combined adultery with being friends of the earth. Now as you know, I hate to put words into the bible's mouth. But it's possible that they could have been saying here that if somebody is a believer in god and they decide to be friends with the earth, they are committing a form of adultery.

Though for a nearly endless number of reasons, of which this is just one, I say it would be best to divorce yourself from god. Should you be unfortunate enough to believe in it. Even then, for such unfortunate people, there should be enough friendship to go around. Also, because of what this and other religions taught, the earth could use all the friends it can get. Another thing is that what this teaching of theirs was again trying to do, for about the zillionth time, was

282

strengthen people's attachment to god. It also for about the zillionth time tried to teach a disregard for the earth. Both of which are bad things.

This next paragraph tried to tell people how they should be and feel. In James 4:9, it says:

"Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep: let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness."

Now there's another incredibly bad teaching. I think he should have kept his masochism to himself. Though I can see why he would have wanted people to be miserable. Because miserable people are more likely to dislike this life and seek out god. Which is a damn good reason to avoid what he taught. Unless of course you are some sort of lowlife and deserve to be that way. Otherwise, you should try to control these unpleasant things. Because to a large extent your anguish will hurt you more than it will solve whatever is causing you sorrow. Also, this was an especially bad teaching for the poor. Because from personal experience I can tell you that such things are exceedingly much too often the case to begin with. What people need are options on how to alleviate such things. Not seek them out.

There are a couple things I don't like in this next paragraph. In 1 Peter 1:17, it says:

"And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man's work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear:"

First, I would advise against calling on any god. Let alone one that has no respect for you. Because it is demeaning to you and would be showing regard for god's disregard. Which is perverse. Then it said that god judges people according to their works. Though according to what the bible taught, people could act about any way they wanted and find more than enough justification for it. Also, as I said before, why would god want to bother judging anything he has no respect, regard or consideration for. Or how would he judge somebody he created to be a certain way or caused to do a certain thing. You might also consider how he would judge somebody who simply asked for forgiveness. It then said that people should pass their sojourning here in fear. But it's possible that people aren't sojourning here. This may be all there is. Or it may be that

this is the only place where you will live this kind of existence. So I would suggest that you don't waste your time here in fearing god. Though it would be a real good idea to fear the punishment you may receive in this life for doing evil things.

The stone they spoke of in this next paragraph was Jesus. In 1 Peter 2:8, it says:

“And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed.”

So it basically said here that the word of Jesus was a stumbling block and an offence to the disobedient. But the disobedient aren't the only ones he was

283

those things to. Besides, with the parables and other unfortunate things Jesus supposedly said, I couldn't call anybody disobedient that rejected what he said. Also, it said that those who stumbled at his words and the disobedient were appointed to be that way. But it's pretty rotten to appoint somebody to be confused. And generally speaking, it isn't very nice to appoint people to be disobedient. Though in cases where disobedience is necessary, appointing somebody to be disobedient would be a little like appointing a fish to be wet.

Peter's teachings in these next few paragraphs are extremely depraved. In 1 Peter 2:18-20, it says:

“Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear; not only to the good and gentle, but also to the forward.

For this is thankworthy, if a man for conscience toward God endure grief, suffering wrongfully.

For what glory is it, if, when ye be buffeted for your faults, ye shall take it patiently? but if, when ye do well; and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with God.”

First of all, they started out by justifying slavery, again. They sure wanted to get that point across, didn't they. Now I know that slavery was prevalent back then. But that shouldn't have stopped people from renouncing it. Just as the prevalence of religion at this time doesn't stop me from renouncing it. Then, as far as fearing masters goes, it doesn't seem necessary for Peter to have taught that a slave should fear somebody who could do about anything they wanted to do to them. Another thing is how could a slave be subject to their masters with “all” fear. Wouldn't they need some of that fear to fear god with? Though from what this and some of the other things they taught goes, it would seem that in fearing a master, they were fearing god. Just as here what they are basically saying again is that in being obedient to a master they would be being obedient to god. That sort of thinking is sickening! They also say here that servants

should completely obey even bad masters. Which is bad for too many reasons to go into here. But I will say that if such an attitude was successfully imposed on slaves, I wonder how many of the “good” masters might have started doing bad things. Also, goodness doesn’t stand a very good chance when people are taught not to be disobedient to the wicked.

It then basically said that it is thankworthy for people to endure grief and suffering that they don’t deserve. Well I think that wrongfully enduring grief and suffering would be stupid. Not thankworthy. Besides, there are too many good things worth enduring grief and suffering for. So it would again be stupid to do so for bad reasons. Then it went on to ask what glory there would be in enduring pain and suffering brought about by your own faults. As if there would be no glory in it. But I think it would be very brave, mature and therefore glorious for any person to endure well the punishment for any wrong that they may have committed. It then said that even if somebody does well and still suffers for it, if

284

they take it patiently, it is acceptable to god. Yeah, sort of like it would likely be acceptable to a Whale for the Krill to take it patiently. But such things aren’t acceptable to me. Because every creature has the right to look out for its own self interests.

This next paragraph spoke about the example that Jesus set and that other people should follow. In 1 Peter 2:23, it says:

“Who, when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not; but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously:”

Despite what sort of example Jesus may have set, if somebody reviles you for no good reason, you should revile them back. Because doing otherwise would of course make it easier for them to wrongly revile you. It would also make it more likely for others to revile you. Or for the person who reviles you to revile somebody else. Also, it said here basically that god judges righteously. Though I haven’t seen much evidence of that.

As I pointed out to you often enough before, the bible said many bad things numerous times. Some of which I pass over to keep from being too monotonous. I also pointed out that to pass too many of them over would of course be doing you a disservice. Also, in my usual method of trying to say the most important things as much as possible, as you have seen, my comments are sometimes repeated. Though to keep things interesting, I do try to come up with different ways to state the obvious. So moving on to the next two paragraphs are some filthy teachings of theirs that I have already commented on. In 1 Peter 2:24-25, it says:

“Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead

to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.

For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.”

First of all, as I said before, Jesus simply couldn't have assumed responsibility for people's sins. Then it said he made people dead to sins. Though considering all of the sinning Christians have done since then, it would seem that he wasn't very successful. Neither could anybody or anything make sins go away simply by saying that sins are no longer sins. Or by saying that people are no longer responsible for them. Those were extremely vile things to teach. Because evil is hard to fight if people are told that they are no longer responsible for sins. There are probably also people out there who would be willing to trade their souls for the ability to deny accountability for their actions. Which would be an extremely immoral transaction. Then it said that Jesus supposedly did this so people could live unto righteousness. Though I don't know precisely what they meant by "unto," I would still say it was evil. Because you can't become righteous by denying responsibility for your actions. They again tried to get people to accept the sheep analogy for themselves. Which as you know, makes me sick. Some reasons being that sheep and people are not the same thing.

285

So they shouldn't be treated in a similar manner. Also, if they succeeded in getting people to accept being treated like sheep, people would eventually likely evolve to a point where they would be unable to behave in an independent manner. Which would also be terrible.

Likewise, if they successfully caused people to feel unaccountable for their actions, it would likely come to pass that they would eventually become unable to feel accountable for their actions. Which is yet another thing that would be terrible. Another thing is that I don't even like the idea of farming animals. I definitely wouldn't want to see people treated in a similar manner. It also said here that people were going astray. Well that was their opinion. Which my regard for is nonexistent. Besides, if we "went astray" as a people, it would likely be because that is the direction that we should go. They went on to say here that Jesus was the shepherd and bishop of people's souls. Though what they really meant was owner. But any soul that I have and the responsibility for it is mine alone. One reason being that, as they say, "possession is nine tenths of the law."

Teaching another wrong response to have to trouble, in 1 Peter 3:14 it says: "But and if ye suffer for righteousness' sake, happy are ye. and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled;"

Who were they trying to kid! Nobody should be happy because they are

suffering. At least no normal person would. Now it might make me feel better and more able to endure suffering if I knew it was for a good cause. But the suffering itself wouldn't make me happy at all. Then it said not to be afraid of the terror others may cause. Well creatures didn't develop a sense of fear to ignore it. We and other creatures have it because it serves a useful purpose. So despite their repeated attempts at trying to get people to be willing to give up this life for their sake, I say you should very much fear what danger brings. It then said that people shouldn't be troubled either. But being troubled about something is the first step in doing something about what may be troubling you. Though seeing how favorably they looked on being miserable, I can see why they wouldn't want people to do anything about it. But I say you should fight against what's troubling you. To exercise your ability to fight what may be troubling you is just a good idea. Don't let these devils succeed in breeding out your ability to do so. Also, I hope that despite the poor examples set by things such as religion, or the corrupt aspects of business and government, you can behave in a manner that makes you worth fighting for.

What Peter said in this next paragraph is so vile it's incredible. In 1 Peter 3:17, it says:

“For it is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well doing, than for evil doing.”

Well I say that it is never ever under any circumstance better for a good person to suffer rather than an evil person. Especially if it is the will of god. Also, to

286

teach that there may be some need to punish a good person is terrible. For example, if it were necessary to punish a good person to keep a bad thing from happening, then the good person likely wouldn't be all that good. Though if the good person were truly good and god had the ability to punish them for something bad they might accidentally do in the future, it seems to me that it would be a better use of any such power to keep the bad thing itself from happening. It would also be more just to punish somebody for something after they had done it.

Another unlikely scenario would be if a good person inadvertently caused somebody to do a bad thing. In such a case, the “good” person and the perpetrator should be punished accordingly. Now the likely reason Peter wrote what he did here was because he was trying to justify bad things happening to good people and vice versa when everything is supposed to be controlled by god. This brings me again to the topic of the comfort that lies can bring people. But throughout this book so far, you have seen many unfortunate things that have come from such lies. Most of you have also seen the consequences of



these lies in the world around us. Which makes the comfort of such lies far from worthwhile.

What this next paragraph had to say is also highly unfortunate. In 1 Peter 4:16, it says:

“Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf.”

So it said here that if people suffer as Christians, they shouldn't be ashamed and glorify god because of it. Which is a sickening thing to teach. For one reason, could you imagine anybody saying “All glory be on you God, and my humblest gratitude for letting me suffer so.” Neither could I. At least not a normal person.

Another promotion of the idea that people's suffering is the will of god can be found in 1 Peter 4:19. It says:

“Wherefore let them that suffer according to the will of God commit the keeping of their souls to him in well doing, as unto a faithful Creator.”

Now what if people's suffering wasn't the result of god's will. Wouldn't they be suckers! Also, if god were to make people suffer, it seems to me that they would deserve a direct explanation from him as to why he caused that suffering. Or at least a statement that it was simply his will. Not something some third party claimed was an explanation from god as to why he caused their suffering. There is only one thing worth enduring suffering for. And that is for what's right. Though because of religion, government, greed, cowardice, various forms of non-conventional warfare, etc., knowing what is right could be extremely difficult. But it isn't for me anymore. Then they said that people should commit their souls to the thing that caused their suffering. But not only is such an idea perverse, but to do so would show stupidity of epic proportions.

287

I guess it's about time to mention one of the many paragraphs that tried to get people to think of themselves as cattle. In 1 Peter 5:2, it says:

“Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind;”

No matter how often the bible tries to relegate you to the status of cattle, I would hope that by now even a believer would know better. Also, being “taken care of” in such a manner may produce pleasurable brain drugs. Such drugs are more subtle than those you could buy on the street. Though as anybody can see, the negative effects they have on people's lives can be monumental. Which far surpass any “good” effects. Because of that, those who promote such things are even worse than drug pushers. Another thing is that, as I said before, cattle are bred to cease to exist for their own purposes and are instead bred to exist for the

purposes of their owners. Though we have the ability, right and duty to seek our own destiny. Despite who or what may have created us.

Then it went on to talk about what should have been done with whatever wealth they may have had left over from feeding their “flock.” It first told them not to take what was left over by constraint. But here it was constraining them to do so. Then it told them to take this wealth willingly and with a ready mind. Well people who just want to gain riches also take wealth willingly and with a ready mind. So based on these qualifications, they would be hard to tell apart. Though what I think they were doing here was trying to enable these people to gain “filthy lucre,” as they put it, and think of it as something else.

This next paragraph again taught just about the most vile thing that the bible taught. In 1 Peter 5:7, it says:

“Casting all your care upon him; for he careth for you.”

Here they say that people should cast their cares upon god. The reason they gave for doing so was because god takes care of people. I would have to guess that you couldn't imagine just how sickening such teachings are to me. Now in my highly considered opinion on this matter, I say that people shouldn't go stumbling and fumbling through life and leave it up to god to pick up the pieces. Or call their mistakes or actions the will of god. Especially when there is no god. At least it is extremely unlikely that there is any kind of “god” as the bible describes. Also, seeing how we can fairly easily act responsibly, the kind of teaching the bible gave here is criminal! Then, there is another aspect to the idea that people can cast their cares upon god because he will take care of them. Look at the supposed great flood; or the good people killed in Sodom and Gomorrah; or the wicked he supposedly inflicts people with; or his lack of respect for people; etc, etc, etc, etc. Care my ass! People would be lucky if he gave them the same kind of care that a real shepherd gives actual sheep. Which is not the kind of caring I would want to receive anyway. So I say that people should take care in the things they do as much as possible. Though some people may not like this approach to life, future generations will be glad they did.

288

Taking into consideration the paragraphs that preceded and followed what this next paragraph had to say, also considering some of the other unfortunate things the bible had to say, I would have to say it was most likely speaking of the devil. In 1 Peter 5:9, it says:

“Whom resist steadfast in the faith, knowing that the same afflictions are accomplished in your brethren that are in the world.”

So what this seemed to be saying was that the devil stayed steadfast in the faith because religion causes the same sorts of afflictions in people that he himself

would cause them to suffer. Which shouldn't be a surprising revelation to you by now. Though I myself think people could do without things like that.

There a couple of different ways of looking at one of the things this next paragraph said. In 2 Peter 2:1, it says:

“BUT there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.”

Here it talked about false prophets and religious teachers. As if there were any other kind! Then it went on to say that they denied the lord that bought them. Now there are two main descriptions of the word “bought” in my dictionary. One is the past tense of buy and the other said it means to twist. So this could mean that they were either purchased or twisted by the lord. But neither action is acceptable to me. Then it said that the one virtue that these people had, which was to deny the lord that would do one of those two things to them, would bring them swift destruction. I would call that a perverse thing to teach.

The bible taught another example of god's poor sense of justice in this next paragraph. In 2 Peter 2:9, it says:

“The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptations, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished.”

First of all, this day of judgment thing is supposed to be the destruction of the world. Which god theoretically would cause because people gave into temptations. So if god knew how to keep temptation from the godly, doing so for everybody would have been more helpful. Another thing is that the destruction of the world would most likely be at the hands of the godly who, instead of thinking for themselves and taking responsibility for their own actions, mingle their desires with the supposed will of god. Then they promoted the idea of delayed punishment by leaving the unjust to the day of judgment to be punished. But being god, he shouldn't have had to wait to punish wrongdoers. Neither should the wronged have to wait for justice.

Also, delaying punishment of wrongdoers could benefit them. One way is that saving punishment for the day of judgement would mean mass judgment and punishment. That would be helpful to them because as the old saying goes, “misery loves company.” It would likely also be less fair to victims than justice meted out on a case by case basis. Then there is another old saying, “time

289

heals all wounds.” So the punishment for an ancient crime could be less severe. Yet another thing is that when you give a wrongdoer that much time to adjust to the idea of being punished, it could make it easier for them to take. Or even make them relieved to get it over with. All of which could lessen the severity of

their punishment. Which I don't think the wicked deserve. Even if the way they were was the supposed result of god making them to be that way.

Moving on to the next paragraph, it spoke about some of people's supposed faults. In 2 Peter 2:10, it says:

"But chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lusts of uncleanness, and despise government. Presumptuous are they, selfwilled, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities."

The first thing I would like to point out here is that given some of the things the bible had said, I would have to doubt these people's ability to know what is unclean. Though the main thing I don't like here was their attempt to link the unclean with these other supposed faults. For example, it spoke badly of those who despise government. But as you know, some governments deserve to be despised. One reason being because of the far greater damage that can be done by a smaller number of government officials. Who themselves are more likely to "lust after uncleanness." They too are presumptuous, selfwilled and not afraid to speak evil of the dignities of those whom circumstance had put beneath them. Though as far as being selfwilled goes, it's better to be under the control of your own will than someone else's. That is as long as you're not a self centered moral midget. Also, let's look at the kinds of government they had back then. Which they said it was unclean to speak evil of. They allowed slavery and people being made eunuchs. They also practiced their trickle down theory of economics through unashamed imperialism. But they told people that they shouldn't speak evil of such "dignities?" What a joke!

They next gave a prediction about the world's end. In 2 Peter 3:3, it says: "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts,"

So in the last days there were supposed to be scoffers. But there are always scoffers. Which made their prediction meaningless. Besides, in the case of religion, I am thankful for anybody who would scoff at such a thing. And to the contrary of what they were suggesting, it is those who don't scoff at religion in general who are most worthy of destruction. Then it said that these scoffers would be walking after their own lusts. But by saying lusts, what they most likely meant was people's own self interests. Though there is usually nothing wrong with walking after your own self interests. As long as it does as little harm as possible to others or the planet. Also, as I said before, walking after your own self interests would likely be one hell of a lot better than walking after the self interests of someone else.

These next two paragraphs attempted to justify the stupidity and evil that the bible taught. In 2 Peter 3:16-17, it says:

“As also in all his epistles, speaking of them in these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction.

Ye therefore, beloved, seeing ye know these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness.”

Well as you may know, freely admitting something and talking about it in a matter of fact manner can make light of even a bad thing. But I'm not going to let them get away with trying to justify these things. So the first thing I denounce here is the idea that they were justified in making the scripture hard to understand. (which included many things that didn't deserve to be understood) Because their main goal was to keep people from understanding. Which is never good. Then it basically said that the unlearned and unstable wrest these hard to understand and misleading scriptures. Now in case you don't know, wrest means to twist or turn, extract by force, distort or pervert something's true meaning. Though for the bible to cause an unlearned person to extract by force something's true meaning isn't all that terrible. I just don't think that a moral guidebook is the proper place for such a questionable mental exercise. But for the bible to cause an unlearned or unstable person (which most of the people who bother to read the bible are) to pervert something's true meaning is really bad. Especially considering that along with the unlearned and unstable, you can also include the unfortunate. Such as the brainwashed or those whose desperation causes them to “grasp at straws.”

It then basically said that the bible can lead such people to their own destruction. (and those they drag down with them) But if their aim was eugenics in a positive direction, look at all of the devolutionary processes in the bible or of religion in general that I've periodically pointed out. In my highly considered opinion, it makes any positive eugenics they may have been attempting to be ineffective at best. Then it talked about the bible leading people away with the error of the wicked. But as I said before, people don't need any help in screwing up. And these “shepherds,” who make their living from fighting the results of such screw ups would likely be chief among those who benefit in some way from the numerous ways that people can misbehave.

Another attempt by the bible to get people to treat this life like it doesn't matter can be found in 1 John 2:15. It says:

“Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.”

Of course, in rejecting the world and the things in it, they tried to make it easier for people to give up this life. But no matter how often they tried to get people to accept this kind of crap, you shouldn't accept it. Also, given the choice that they

offered between life and the love of god, I say that people should choose life.  
291

Because for the short time you're here, you should concern yourselves more with this life. One of the many reasons being that the tangible is more important than the intangible.

Next is another of those paragraphs that referred to people as children. In John 2:18, it says:

"Little children, it is the last time; and as ye have heard that anti-christ shall come, even now there are many anti-christs; whereby we know that it is the last time."

As you know, if you treat people like children, let alone little children, they would likely tend to behave less responsibly. So the main reason I believe they said such things is because those who don't act responsibly are more in need of the control these "shepherds" sought. Also, they again said that it was back in their time that the fulfillment of their end of the world predictions were supposed to happen. Though somehow, as I said before, there are still many religious people trying to sell this death cult crap. Unfortunately, these days we are in fact in the process of causing such a catastrophe. Which could quite possibly have an exponential increase. That is apart from the population disaster. Which is getting exponentially worse. I wonder how many religious morons will step up and claim that the troubles we face today are the last days they were speaking about. In too many ways to count, spreading the mentality that is helping to cause it.

They were really piling it deep in these next two paragraphs. In 1 John 2:20-21, it says:

"But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things.

I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and that no lie is of the truth."

Well people don't know all things even these days. So how could they know all things back then. Though they probably considered their warped ideas about religion as being the same thing as knowing all things. Which was a sick thing to teach. Also, people who think they know all things would be less likely to question what they believe or seek more knowledge. Then he told those people that he wrote them because they knew the truth. Which I take to mean the writer's truth. But the "truth" such people promoted isn't the truth. Another thing is that if those people knew all things and the truth, why should they have listened to him. Or anybody. It then said that no lie is of their truth. The truth of course supposedly being their religious ideas. But I've already utterly disproved that idea.

Though there were many more references to people as little children around here, for now at least I will only comment on this one. In 1 John 3:7, it says: “Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous.”

You know, if he didn’t try to encourage people to be like little children, they  
292

would be less likely to be deceived to begin with. I may have mentioned before this other negative aspect to their repeated attempts to get people to think of themselves as little children. Which is that even if people were like little children, it wasn’t being very helpful continually telling them that is what they are. Because it only reinforces their view of themselves in that way. So instead of calling people little children, to really help them he should have told them why they were little children and most importantly how to grow up. Though even if he could have, such a thing would have been poison to the cause of “shepherds” like this. Now unlike their repetitious, demeaning teachings, by my continually calling religious leaders evil liars, I am not trying to reinforce a view of that being what they are. I am outright telling them that is what they are and why that is what they are. Because unless those who still spread this garbage realize it, they are unlikely to change. It then said that a person who performs righteousness is righteous. Well apart from whether or not what is perceived as being righteous actually being so, there are those who do supposedly righteous things for decidedly unrighteous reasons. Which does not make them righteous.

Another of the bible’s many examples of injustice can be found in Jude 1:6. It says:

“And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitations, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day;”

It seems that the sin of these angels was in not staying put. But if they weren’t meant to go elsewhere, they wouldn’t have been able to go elsewhere. Though even that doesn’t mean they didn’t have the right to try. Now I take this exemplification of subjugation to be aimed at the people they were preaching to. To try to get them and any current believer to stay in their supposed place of slavery to god. But if anybody today has been fooled by these devils, I hope I can change their minds. Because if we don’t seek out new horizons by trying to improve ourselves, we will never know how far we can go. Instead, we would probably atrophy. Also, it called the judgment day the great day. But as you know, that was when the world was supposed to be destroyed. Only a demented idiot could think that there was anything great about that. Even if it is supposed to happen before people can go to heaven. Because not being so self centered,

I would sacrifice everything, even any soul that I may have, rather than see the world be destroyed. As in my opinion should everybody else.

Next, they spoke of some supposedly bad things. But I don't think they're bad. In Jude 1:8, it says:

“Likewise these filthy dreamers defile the flesh, despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities.”

So first it called dreamers filthy. Well maybe some are. And definitely those who have dreamed up the various kinds of religions that exist are. But generally speaking, whatever kind of dreaming they were speaking of, whether thinking of

293

new things or imagining stories while asleep, calling such things filthy is itself filthy. Then it called despising dominion bad. But as I said before, there are times when dominion deserves to be despised. Especially the kind of dominion they promoted. It then again called speaking evil of dignities bad. Which it could be in some cases. But as I also said before, there are some “dignities” that deserve to be denigrated. Also, considering all of the unfortunate things the bible considered to be dignified, what they said here is again itself filthy.

Not surprisingly, in Rev. 2:10, they gave more bad advice on what kind of attitude people should take concerning their lives. It says:

“Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: Behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days: be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life.”

First they told people not to fear the things that would cause suffering. But as I said before, fearing the things that could cause you suffering is always a good idea. Then it said that the devil would cast some of them into prison. Of which they were likely speaking of the authorities. But though people can sometimes be mistaken, in most cases, I think that considering them devils is going a little far. Especially when they were willing to go through the trouble of giving them a trial. It then said that if they were faithful until death, they would be given a crown of life. But as I said before, despite what morons like this taught, you shouldn't let your hopes for an eternal life cause you to shorten this one.

The person who supposedly wrote the book of the revelation, whom they called “St. John the divine,” sure seemed to like speaking about satan. An example of which can be found in Rev. 2:13. It says:

“I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is: and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith, even in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr, who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth.”

Now the person they spoke of here was likely killed for spreading the message



of this cult. But calling his killers satan was going a little far. Especially when Jesus himself once spoke about wanting nonbelievers being brought to him to be slain. But the main point I wanted to make here is that I don't know what all of this talk of satan was for. Because as I said before, the bible said many times that anything bad that happened was the will of god. So why blame satan for anything. Another really disturbing thing here is that by promoting the existence of satan, the bible makes it an object of worship. Because praying to something isn't the only form of worship. It is also a form of worship when you believe something is real that isn't. Such as the supposed fallen angel satan.

As I also said before, I can't say it is impossible that such belief could in some extrasensory sense make such a creature actually exist in some way. Which even though such an existence would likely be extremely limited, it still wouldn't be a good thing. Even if the bible was lying about the motivation of such a  
294

creature too. Yet another thing is that with the bible promoting a need for evil as it often does, even if an evil creature like satan was created through people's belief, I doubt if the creators or promoters of this religion would really see it as a bad thing.

What these next two paragraphs spoke of wasn't very fair. Speaking about a supposed woman named Jezebel who was disreputable, in Rev. 2:22-23, it says: "Behold, I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent their deeds.

And I will kill her children with death; and all the churches shall know that I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts: and will give unto every one of you according to your works."

Here it basically said that this woman would be thrown into a bed. That doesn't seem like a very great punishment. Though admittedly, being kept there could be. If that were the case. Then it said the people who committed adultery with this woman were supposed to suffer great tribulation, unless they repented. But what about the woman. She apparently wasn't given the option of repenting. Instead, it said that her children would be killed. Which is a pretty rotten thing to do. Especially considering that being a prostitute probably has less to do with bad genetics and more to do with being a victim of trickle down economics.

I would next like to mention a few bad things about what this next paragraph had to say. Speaking about the prophesied destruction of the earth, in Rev. 3:2, it says:

"Be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die: for I have not found thy works perfect before God."

It said here to strengthen the things that remain and are ready to die. But if they

were going to die, that would only be a waste of strength. Then, as far as their being ready to die goes, I say that nobody should be ready to die. (unless of course it is absolutely unavoidable) Because it is wrong to die only from a lack of will to live. (Not taking into account a paraplegic or something) It then said here that he didn't find their works perfect. But those people were already apparently ready to die. To be cracking the whip on them along the way is pretty disgusting. Also, I don't know what his idea of perfection was, but I would be willing to bet that it was pretty sickening. Another thing is that if those people were imperfect, seeing how from what they taught god made them to be the way they were, wouldn't any imperfection be god's fault?

Moving on to the next paragraph, it spoke of the second coming of Christ. Which was supposed to happen about the same time as the world was supposed to be destroyed. In Rev. 3:3, it says:

“Remember therefore how thou hast received and heard, and hold fast, and repent. If therefore thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee.”

So why should they have held fast, repent and watch when the earth was  
295

supposed to be destroyed anyway. To save their souls? This piece of shit god was supposedly going to destroy the earth! What are all of our souls when compared to such a staggering loss of present and future life. I for one am not nearly that petty. For me at least, I would rather suffer all of the torments of hell into infinity than be part of that! Then it said that if these people didn't watch out for Jesus and the destruction he was going to bring, he would sneak up on them. But if they could do nothing to change it, why should they have looked out for it. All that would do is cause a lot of needless worry. Also, despite what the bible taught, there is something people can do to prevent the destruction of the earth. Which for a number of reasons will be difficult to prevent. One of which is when people are actually taught to look forward to such a thing. In fact, it was from having seen one too many evangelists speaking about the supposedly wonderful day when the earth would be destroyed that caused me to write this book.

Many of you out there probably know of the tradition that describes the devil as being red in color. Well in describing god, in Rev. 4:3, it says:

“And he that sat was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone: and there was a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald.”

Here it said that god had the color of a jasper and sard stone. Both of which are reddish in color. So it would seem that god had yet another similarity to the devil for people to accept. Though to be fair, I don't know what truth there is in the idea of a red devil in theology.

I don't like this next paragraph's appraisal for people's reason for being. In Rev. 4:11, it says:

"Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory and honour and power: for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created."

Well I am not, nor should you be, an instrument of any gods pleasure. Unless it derived pleasure from an equitable share of life and its sovereignty. But from what the bible taught, that isn't the case. So this god would have no right to manipulate people for its pleasure. Now if some god gave me life, I might thank it for doing so. But after that, my life would be my own. Seeing how I am the one who has to live it. Also, people may be screwed up. To what degree they are personally responsible is another matter. Though being screwed up, I can't say that things like kings or slaveholders were completely unjustified in their actions. But from a moral standpoint, such things are wrong. Likewise, it is wrong for a god to claim dominion over people. Another thing is that, as I said before, might doesn't make right. Only right makes right. So one lifeform should have respect for another lifeform. If it is deserving. Especially a sentient lifeform. Though I don't claim to be perfect. For example, though I have gone years without fishing, I will kill worms or minnows to catch fish. Though the bad thing is that I don't need the fish. When I fish, I only do so for recreation. Though I haven't always done so in the past, I usually release the fish I catch.

I hope you don't mind my going off on a bit of a tangent here, but somebody I  
296

know recently brought up another old saying that can pertain to kings, slaveholders and apparently this god. It is an old saying that could be used to justify the evil things the bible taught. This old saying is, "Nice guys finish last." Such a self centered and ignorant philosophy would likely cause many negative cumulative ripple effects throughout society. One reason being that an unkind action may be short in duration. But people's memories of bad things are long and deeply ingrained. There is another saying that I brought up before that I like much more. It is, "If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem." Now as I said before, there are many instances where many people are basically insane in many different ways. But for a person to say to themselves, "I'm part of the problem, and I'm fine with that," to me is just adding another form of insanity to add to the list. Multiple forms of mental illness likely have a cumulative effect too. If there is anything that speaks well of the innate goodness of man, it is the ability for people to do good with such unfortunate things going on. Though with all of the things that are progressively getting worse and worse, sooner or later, that resiliency is likely to fail you.

According to this next paragraph, Jesus looked a little different in heaven. In

Rev. 5:6, it says:

“And I beheld, and, lo, in the midst of the throne and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it were slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth.”

So why would Jesus be made to appear as such a grotesque and bloody creature. A creature that would seem more suited as a resident of hell. To try to get people to accept such an ugly sight as being good? Well it doesn't work for me.

This next paragraph spoke of one of the ways that the lord was going to cause the earth to be destroyed. In Rev. 6:4, it says:

“And there went out another horse that was red: and power was given to him that sat thereon to take peace from the earth, and that they should kill one another: and there was given unto him a great sword.”

It seems that up to that point that there was peace. So it couldn't have been war that made god mad enough to destroy the earth. Though there was no good reason for god to destroy the earth anyway. But what I especially don't like about what this said was its attempt to get people to accept the idea of god causing war. Because if people didn't cause this war, they sure didn't deserve to suffer from it.

As you know, I am not am not a fan of the Jewish people. But I don't care for the treatment of them that they tried to pass off as being good in this next paragraph. In Rev. 7:3-4. It says:

“Saying, Hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we have sealed the servants of our God in their foreheads.

297

And I heard the number of them which were sealed: and there were sealed an hundred and forty four thousand of all the tribes of the children of Israel.”

The thing I don't like here is the idea of branding people like cattle. But with all of the other ways that the bible tried to get people to think of themselves as cattle, what they said here is no surprise. Now despite how I feel about branding people, as you know, I am in favor of people receiving some sort of tamper proof identification. Because unfortunately, in the world we live in, there is no way for people to maintain their national sovereignty without it.

These next two paragraphs spoke of some of the things people could expect in heaven. In Rev. 7:16-17, it says:

“They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat.

For the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead

them into living fountains of waters: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes.”

First of all, it said here that the sun wouldn't shine on them. Which could be an unpleasant thing to go completely without. Then it says that they wouldn't be exposed to any heat. But sometimes a little heat can be pleasant too. Also, those people should have hoped that they were exposed to some heat. It then said that Jesus would feed them. Which would mean losing the sense of accomplishment in feeding themselves. Then it said that Jesus would lead them to fountains. But with all of the bible's talk of shepherds, sheep and flocks, I think that herding would have been a more accurate description of it. It then said that god would wipe away their tears. But why would god bother wiping away the tears of creatures he has no respect for. Another thing is that as I talked about before, in Rev. 21:4 is also mentions god wiping away tears. But having reached heaven, why would those people be crying. Well among other possible reasons, it's most likely that they would be crying because they were suckered into wasting their physical lives for what they found there.

What this next paragraph had to say doesn't set a very good example. In Rev. 12:7, it says:

“And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels,”

As you may remember, this isn't the first time they spoke of conflict in heaven. So I hope you will excuse me if I repeat any observations. Though for important observations, a little repetition isn't unreasonable. Now the evil aspect that I find in this teaching is the idea it puts forward that no matter how high of a plateau of being creatures can reach, there can still be strife. Which also makes such actions on earth seem less wrong. Also, I wonder why god himself didn't decide the outcome of this battle. From the types of things the bible usually taught, he should have had the power to do so.

Though if I was interested in listening to stupidity, it would be interesting to hear  
298

a religious expert's explanations of this. One of which would probably be that “evil is necessary” crap. Another thing is that I would have appreciated an explanation as to why they were fighting that was short and to the point. So I could decide for myself on that point who was right and who was wrong. For them to say that it was good against evil doesn't mean anything. Though for the dragon to be in someone else's territory, the likelihood that the dragon was in the wrong is quite high. But when you take into consideration all of the filthy, rotten and disgusting things that the bible taught as being good, you can't discount the justification for this warfare being in this dragon's favor.

I don't like some of the things these next two paragraphs had to say at all. In Rev. 12:10-11, it says:

“And I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of Christ: for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accused them before God day and night.

And they overcame him by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony; and they loved not their lives unto the death.”

The first thing I would like to comment on here is its basically saying that this supposed glory of god wasn't supposed to happen until the devil was cast down. But with what the devil was supposed to represent, I don't think they should have ascribed him that much power. Not only because true evil isn't that powerful, but also because the more power people think the devil has, the more power it could have. Then it said the devil accused those people day and night. Though I can't see a devil having nothing better to do. But as far as this story is concerned, as long as they weren't false or unreasonable accusations, I see nothing wrong with it. Also, these accusations would seem to show that, unlike god, he didn't like to see bad things happening.

Another thing is that I doubt if the devil would be stupid enough to expect absolute perfection from those he accused. Hypocrisy would also be quite stupid. So it's unlikely that the devil's accusations would have been unjustified. It then said that they overcame the devil by the blood of the lamb. But instead of overcoming the accuser, they should have done something about overcoming the things he was accusing them of. Then it talked about those people not loving their lives as if it were a good thing. Which as you know is quite evil. Yet another thing is that the word evil itself is interesting. I wonder if its being “live” spelled backwards is an accident. If not, then their teachings that make it easier for people to cease to “live” for god's sake should give you another hint as to how evil such teachings are.

They again try to make branding people like cattle seem acceptable in this next paragraph. In Rev. 14:1, it says:

“AND I looked, and, lo, a Lamb stood on mount Sion, and with him an hundred forty and four thousand, having his Father's name written in their foreheads.”

Not only is god's ownership of people wrong, but his method of showing that

ownership was also wrong. If god wanted to have his name written on these people, he should have put it somewhere appropriate like on their asses. Though there is already something down there that exemplifies the idea of god, allah or whatever much better than any word could. It's called an anus. Also, I wonder what form this branding took. Did he have his name imprinted into their

foreheads? Was it tattooed into their skin? Or was the writing in the form of a scar. Whatever the case was, I can't see anybody actually wanting such a mark on their foreheads. For one reason, it would be highly unattractive.

This next paragraph spoke of the punishment somebody would receive if they received the mark of "the beast" in their foreheads or on their hands. In Rev. 14:10, it says:

"The same shall drink the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb."

Well I could see god punishing somebody he thought deserved to be punished. But why would Jesus and god's angels need to have been there to witness such a wrongdoer's torment. To see that it got done wouldn't take all of them. Also, theoretically it shouldn't be necessary for them to watch this torment as a warning against disobedience. So I would have to say that they would have watched such torment because they got some sort of pleasure out of it. Which seems rather sadistic to me. Another thing is that they said this wrongdoer was being tormented with fire and brimstone. But Jesus and his angels were supposedly present witnessing this. So does this mean that this person was being tormented with fire and brimstone in heaven? Or was Jesus and god's angels in hell witnessing this torment. Either way, something seems out of place.

What this next paragraph had to say was pretty grotesque. In Rev. 19:13, it says:

"And he was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God."

I think the idea of clothing dipped in blood is a little too gory. So it isn't an idea that should be thought of as being wholesome. Also, with the word of god being what it is, you definitely shouldn't consider the bloody nature if it as being good.

The person this next paragraph spoke of was the "word of god." Which made what it said even worse. In Rev. 19:15, it says:

"And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God."

So here it said the word of god would smite the nations and rule them with a rod of iron. But for something as evil, repressive, etc, as the word of god to do such things is almost too terrible to contemplate. So such a thing should not be thought of as being acceptable.

300

This next paragraph spoke of what was supposedly in store for the devil and humanity. In Rev. 20:3, it says:

“And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season.”

What I don't like here is the idea that the devil was supposed to be let loose after some thousand year period. Because the devil is supposed to represent evil. So what this was saying again is that evil is necessary. Though at least this time his supposed evil was only “necessary” after some thousand year period.

One of the bad things about what this next paragraph had to say was that it was very wasteful. In Rev. 21:1, it says:

“AND I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea.”

It's bad enough that god wasn't enough of a god to punish the wicked without punishing the innocent too. But here he supposedly destroys the earth and all of its different lifeforms. What a sick thing to teach! Also, this destruction is supposed to take place before the wicked can go to hell and the good to heaven. Though it is sickening for god to destroy the earth to accomplish such things. It is also my highly considered opinion that if this destruction is supposed to happen before the supposed next life can proceed, then it would be better if both good and evil remain in limbo forever. Another thing is that, as I said before, it was no big feat for the bible to predict doom and gloom when most of the things it taught were geared toward eventually causing vast destruction.

From what this next paragraph had to say, it appears that god's reason for destroying the old heaven and earth was more evil than his reason for supposedly destroying the earth in the great flood. In speaking about the new jerusalem on the new earth, in Rev. 21:27, it says:

“And there shall be no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.”

Now what I take all of this to mean is that there would still be wicked people around. They simply wouldn't be allowed into the new jerusalem. But if god didn't destroy the old heaven and earth to remove people like this from their presence, why did he do it. Well my best explanation for him doing so would be that he is the ultimate evil!

This is the last paragraph I will be commenting on in the bible. It told of what was supposed to be outside the walls of the new jerusalem on the new earth. In Rev. 22:15, it says:

“For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.”

First of all, I would have to assume that it was because of people like this that made god destroy the old earth. So for god to have destroyed the old earth and



still have people like this around annuls any sane reason he may have had to destroy the earth to begin with. How could anybody accept this filth that they taught! Only the god of assholes would do such a thing! Now as you know, god supposedly created a new heaven. But from the kinds of people outside of the walls of the new jerusalem, I can see why there was no talk of creating a new hell. Because their heavenly reward was right in the middle of it! So for all of you believers who still believe, this again makes the JOKE on you! The things people will accept to get whatever comfort they do out of religion is tragic.

Also, though the wicked may not be able to get inside the city, I would say that it would be those in the city who are the unfortunate ones. It should have been the wicked who were behind walls. And kept there. Another thing is that I imaging that all of the angels would have lived in this city. Whose numbers were described as ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands. Along with them would be the hundred and forty four thousand Jews along with a great multitude which no man could number. Now the new jerusalem was supposed to be square. With each side as far as I can figure being about one thousand four hundred miles long. Even then, with all of the beings that were supposed to be inside, it seems to me that it still would have gotten uncomfortably crowded. Something else I would like to mention here is that it said that outside the walls were some beings that they called dogs. Talk about the pot calling the kettle black! The Bible taught people to be totally subservient to god and authority, to have blind faith, to prefer god over life, etc. Compared to what they advocated, being a dog would be an improvement! One last thing. The next time you look at a dollar bill and unfortunately see the words "in God we trust," think about the various unfortunate things it really means.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### A POUND OF CURE

I would not expect very many believers to have read this far. Or that anything I've said to really change their minds about anything. Another of the many reasons being that though I've heard of followers of some cult being deprogrammed, I would imagine that it would be much more difficult to do while the brainwasher still had access to their minds. Though some people do manage to leave cults even on their own. Which probably doesn't make a lot of difference. Besides, when it gets right down to it, it isn't necessary to "fool all the people all the time." All that is really necessary is to fool enough of the people for just long enough. Now for those believer's minds that I have changed, I am not one to leave people hanging. So there are some additional philosophies and information that I would like to talk about that may not have been covered or covered very well in this book so far. Though you aren't out of the woods yet. And as for everybody else, be warned. Most of you are going to come to know how the believers probably felt. With every ounce of denial, anger, self deception or even superciliousness that you could imagine a believer to have felt from what I have written so far.

One of the many reasons being because though you yourselves may not be believers, you have been exposed to the various forms of cultural and supposedly moral philosophies since birth that have been heavily influenced by religion. Which could make it difficult for anybody to look beyond. Now in this last chapter I will be covering a necessarily limited number of different topics. I wish I had space for more, but such topics weren't the main point of this book. Also, though each of them would be deserving of an entire book by themselves, being constrained by space, I will try to be as direct and to the point as possible. But as for the topics that I do mention, don't fool yourself into thinking that I haven't thought about them in much greater detail than I have room for here.

The first topic I would like to talk about that organized religion is often against is euthanasia. Though there are some places that allow for it, at least for now it most often is not allowed. The main problem I see with it is that if, for instance, somebody was a quadriplegic and decided to end their life, other similarly afflicted people might feel pressured to do the same. Even though they may not want to. Despite this, I say that people should have the right to make up their own minds. Some people who have found themselves in a hopeless situation

have even been forced to go through the painful process of starving themselves to death. What kind of fiend would make somebody go through all that. We treat dogs better! Another example of that kind of cruelty is where doctors let somebody suffer to death from rabies rather than end their lives. In cases like this, to end further suffering, I would consider giving such people a lethal injection without the patients or families knowledge as to when exactly it was going to happen.

There is another point I would like to make about mercy killing. First of all, people kill each other all the time. Through crime, wars, police actions, legal  
303

executions, etc. So let's take the word "killing" off the table. That leaves us with "mercy." Well I would hope that anybody who has a problem with the idea of mercy would find a nice tall building to jump off of. It also amazes me that somebody would force someone else to live a life that they themselves wouldn't want to live. Now if doctors don't want to deal with killing people that have come to know, they should create a specialty to deal with such things. They could call such a person a euthanasitist or something. Who would council and provide as painless of a death as possible to people unfortunate enough to need such services. Also, rather than having such services show up on a family's bill, it would be better for the family's doctor to charge the family extra for services rendered and pay the euthanasitist themselves. Though I am in favor of single payer universal health care coverage anyway.

Another issue often apposed by religious organizations where emotional stupidity raises its ugly head concerns abortion. Being opposed to it is insane just on the basis of there already being too many people in the world. Speaking of insanity, I remember seeing something on TV that was talking about a doctor who performed abortions being murdered. There was this sick, twisted asshole (who was probably religiously motivated) standing in the street in front of the clinic where this doctor worked. It may have even been where he was murdered. I don't remember. But this vile creature was holding up a trophy and offering it to anybody who would kill another doctor who performed abortions. With filthy scum like that in the world, rather making a case for a right to life, it makes a case for the right to nonexistence.

There are some additional ways to look at the abortion issue rather than from an overpopulation standpoint. First, take a proportionally sized picture of an adult woman and a fetus and place them next to each other. The rights they should have are proportional to their size. Another thing is that a mouse or bird knows much more about being alive than a fetus does. As does a cow, sheep, pig, fish, etc. But most people don't care much about killing those. Though the

antiabortion morons might say that killing those is a matter of survival. Well with the overpopulation problem, guess what! Besides, a fetus can't miss something its never known. There is also the life of the child to take into account. Which I would be willing to bet would often be less desirable than the lives most abortion opponents had to deal with. Now a fetus may develop into a human. But the fact remains that it isn't one. So if a woman wants to end her pregnancy, she should be allowed to do so. Though if it is to be done, it should be done as humanely as possible.

When a fetus actually becomes a baby, it brings up the topic of parenting. Here in the U.S. we are facing a real dilemma because many children are being raised by single mothers. Which is unfortunate because I think fathers have a valuable role to play in raising children. One of the things that would help promote the male and female family structure is if the media was as interested in promoting it

304

as they are in promoting single parent family units or even homosexuality. Something else that is unfortunate is that these days, even if a child has two parents, chances are that both parents have to work. That gives a child much less opportunity for guidance by a parent. Instead, parents often have to hope that children can learn the right kinds of things from friends or what they see on TV.

Another problem is that parents themselves are often screwed up in various ways. Which I am trying to fix. Yet another unfortunate problem is that besides religion and the media, a large proportion of anything in the way of morality that is taught in school is geared toward making people a tool of government and industry. It's like having a fox teach a chicken how to be a chicken. Or in the case of religion, having a parasite like "god" and its followers teaching humans how to be human. I would suggest that parents discuss morality with their children. Such as less evolved animal motivation compared to human motivation and how it effects human society. In doing so, parents also may learn something.

Another thing parents could talk to their children about is behaving honorably. Because there are things that are practically customary in our society that is counter to honor. Like telling children or teaching by example that it's alright to do whatever is necessary to succeed. Which too often involves immoral behavior. Having too often been the victim of thieves myself, such an attitude has apparently translated into doing whatever you want to get whatever you want that somebody else just happens to own. Now I'm no angel. I have stolen things myself. Mainly from having fallen in with the wrong crowd in my youth. Though I have never stolen anything from a friend or acquaintance. Neither have I ever

stolen anything really expensive or anything through violent means.

Also, being pissed off about the way the world works, I can't say it is impossible that I might again be part of the problem in this respect and steal something again. All I can do is try to avoid such temptations. Which one person in a certain economic situation might be better at than another person in the same economic situation. So taking all of this into account, in speaking to your children, you should emphasize that they should try to avoid being put into a position where they might have to steal to get what they need. You should also tell them that stealing to get what they simply may just want can't be justified at all.

Another point of honor people should talk to their children about concerns aggression. For example, in the media, being an aggressive "two fisted, take no shit" kind of guy is often lauded. One of the problems with that is that somebody may pick fights with someone because they are smaller or because there are more of them than there are of those they wish to pick upon. I would also like to point out that to pick a fight with somebody just to see if they are worthy to be a friend is not only immoral, but a little bit gay. Though if somebody starts a fight

305

with you, it would probably be a good idea to give them a good one. If for no other reason than to keep them from wanting to do the same thing to someone else. Now when it comes to people teaching their children to be aggressive, it's likely because they would do it because they don't want them to become victims. Though to me it seems to be a very tricky path to tread to teach children to combat aggression without making them aggressive. So parents should also teach their children, for the health of the society that they themselves depend on, that they shouldn't make other people victims.

Parents should make them aware of how the temptation to do so can be caused by being in a bad mood or wanting the thrilling brain drugs it gives to those who are mentally disabled in that way. It should also be pointed out that being aggressive may not actually "prove" anything. Such as being "manly." Because an aggressor is mentally prepared for aggression. Where as the person they decide to be aggressive against may not be. Another thing is that some people may teach their children to be aggressive for the unfortunate reason of their own insecurity or maybe even homophobia. There is another aspect to the "hit first and ask questions later" type of personality that is too often idealized in the media for entertainment value. One unfortunate side effect to this is that anybody behaving in such a manner would tend to make a government or elitists in general think that people in general are deserving of whatever mistreatment they may want to impose on them. Despite all of these problems, I can't deny

that there could be a positive aspect in a way to all of this aggression. That being because I've heard it basically said that depression can be caused by anger directed inward.

But despite the possible health benefits of unleashing it unjustly on others, I think it would be better for people to be depressed in that way. Though I'm no expert, I would have to assume that there is a better way to keep people from being depressed. Or maybe it is something that we can evolve our way out of after clearing away all of the garbage that society is now mired in. So to sum all of this up, people should teach their children to be prepared and to be aggressive only when it is unavoidable. One last thing parents should teach their children about honor is that if you have nothing else, it is good to be able to say that you at least have that.

The next topic I would like to talk about concerns drugs. As I mentioned earlier and as any religious nut can tell you, the brain produces its own drugs. Which can be as mentally harmful as anything you could buy. And sometimes worse. The important thing is learning how to honorably coexist with them. Then there are other drugs like tobacco and alcohol. Though there are even worse drugs out there. It would of course be best if people didn't feel the need to take any drugs. The main reason that many probably do so is out of boredom. But another thing parents can tell children is that there are far worse things than being bored. For example, the power of the mental slavery drugs can produce

306

was shown in an experiment I once saw something about. They took some rats and gave them two levers to push. One lever would give them food and the other lever would give them cocaine. They couldn't receive both. If I remember the experiment correctly, all of the rats starved to death.

Even a supposedly harmless drug like marijuana can have problems. I know because I used to smoke it in my youth. There had been plenty of times that I was "jonsen' it" for a joint. Though I don't smoke it anymore. Mainly because I can physically handle it anymore. These days, the desire for it never even crosses my mind. Another bad thing about weed is that I have had things stolen from me probably because somebody wanted to get high. I also know that it is good at sucking a large portion of ambition out of you. Unfortunately, many people are apt to take some drug for one reason or another. So it would be nice if somebody invented some drug that didn't have some of these problems associated with it.

As for the issue of legalization, though there are good arguments both for and against it, I would prefer to be against it. After all, religion is legal. Corruption is practically legal. But we are not the better for it. Another point is that the

corporate whip is bad enough. Being a corporate junkie wouldn't help matters much. It also seems to me that there should be a limit as to what degree and in how many different ways it is legal to numb the pain. Despite my personal feelings and the other things, unfortunately, decriminalization and government control seems to be the best way to go. Because the reality is that prohibition just doesn't work. Now besides effective parenting, another thing governments should do is try to create more recreational activities to help dissuade people from using drugs. Though the most important thing governments could do is provide people with employment that gives them a decent living. And which doesn't leave them at the mercy of whatever slumlord that crawls out from under whatever rock they happen to be hiding under.

There is an unfortunate kind of behavior that the bible mentioned here and there that I would next like to talk more in depth about. It concerns prostitution. I of course am not happy about it. And as with drug use, I think every opportunity should be taken to discourage it. Probably the best way to prevent prostitution would be to support and provide work for those who are in danger of going down that path. Even if they are young runaways. Because though some may actually choose this lifestyle, I would have to imagine that most choose this lifestyle because they simply have no alternative. Or because the alternatives society provides are equally bleak. I hope you don't mind my going off on a bit of a tangent here, but the main reason for that was stated by president Calvin Coolidge. It also helps explain why the slumlords I mentioned earlier get away with the things they do. He basically said, "The business of government is business."

But to me, the business of government is taking care of the people. Also, the  
307

vile way some businesses have treated people are astonishing. Take for example the Irish potato famine. Even though from what I have heard, Ireland produced four times the amount of food necessary to keep people from starving to death. Though it was apparently better for business to let an estimated one million people starve to death. Had it not been for emigration, the number would have doubtlessly been higher. For more examples about business, you need to find a documentary called "The Corporation." I found it a little overly long. But most of the things it has to say are right on the mark. Seeing how "pimp" governments are often more interested in helping the exploiters rather than the exploited, it's no wonder that many turn to prostitution. So unless things fundamentally socially change, it is unlikely that we could completely do away with prostitution. Though it would be a good idea to discourage it. But the way society in general and the legal system works, in my opinion this discouragement



often goes too far.

So I say prostitution should be legalized. (which as you can guess would be unpopular to at least some religious organizations) In doing so, regular health examinations and condom use would be required for them to keep their licences. This would also lessen if not eliminate the need for prostitutes to peddle it on the streets. All of these things would help put the predatory pimps out of business and make things safer for those they prey upon. Prostitution could also be taxed. Which is difficult to do to a pimp. But as it is now, in many places, young girls and sometimes boys are enticed or coerced into prostitution by pimps. As you probably know, these pimps sometimes beat them, get them hooked on drugs, take an unfair proportion of their money, etc. Who out there would say that we shouldn't do whatever is necessary to stop such things from happening.

There is another topic that I would next like to talk about that for obvious reasons the bible had little to say anything about. Technology. Though technology is the cause of most of the problems that now plague us, technology itself isn't the problem. It is all of the moral sabotage that is found in the bible and in other religions. Unfortunately, technology isn't very compatible with primitive ways of thinking. For example, as I said before, many people use religion as a justification for their behavior. Even though they may not be practicing members of any religious organization, they will still do whatever they want and leave the results in the hands of the gods. I see this same sort of thing being supplemented by a belief that technology will eventually solve their problems. But nothing works as well as responsible behavior. Another problem with technology is that whether it is good or bad isn't taken into consideration all that much as long as there is money to be made.

So to fix any problems with technology, we need to look at the concept of money. I have found things in the bible that were both for and against it. Though the kind of power that comes from having it in abundance is most often praised or at least justified in the bible. One exception to this was something I

308

think the apostle Timothy said. Which, basically stated "the love of money is the root of all evil." But that isn't completely accurate. Because surely evil existed before money did. What is actually the root of all evil is the desire for humans to fulfill whatever desire they may have. Though money is an extremely excellent amplifier of evil. Unfortunately I don't see any way to do completely without it. Though if ants and bees can form a mutually cooperative society without it, I think we could do better than what some primitive small insects do. Despite obvious failures, I think we could form a society in which money doesn't play such a fundamental role. A society where the increasingly scarce resources

needed to provide an often opulent lifestyle isn't wasted on parasites like lawyers, overpaid business executives, economic gamblers, landlords, etc. Instead, giving a greater reward to people with actual value to society. Like doctors, physicists, technological engineers, technicians, etc.

Obviously, when the importance of money is controlled, one of the positive aspects would be to more easily control the destructive ends toward which technology is pushed. Though to help technology along in the absence of the driving influence of money, it might be necessary to create something like a powerful "Department of Innovation and Improvement." Where those with new ideas are encouraged. And for the sake of society, the desire to improve things would also be encouraged. Another thing is that after obvious things like food, shelter and water, probably the most important thing for any society is simply people having something to do. Fortunately, the greater your education or technical ability, the more options you have as to what you want to do. The satisfaction you get from that work would likely be greater than that of a simple laborer. As long as you aren't driven like techno-slaves.

Though it is also obvious that those who benefit from the way society works now would probably resist change in any way they could. Which when they have all the power of the media, police and military behind them, makes them a formidable opponent. On top of that, the system I propose would be so alien to most people that their "knee jerk" response to it would probably be to think of reasons why it wouldn't work instead of thinking of ways in which to make it work. Such a system, as I mentioned before, would elect leaders by lot among those who may wish to be involved. All would serve for the same four year stretch that we now use. Those chosen by lot, at the top, would be an oligarchical council of twelve. With one chosen by lot to have the power to break ties on issues that they vote on democratically. There is of course much more I have to add on this topic. But this isn't the place for the nuts and bolts of it. Though I know it would work better than our current system. Unfortunately, as I said before, it initially would probably take the power of a dictator to clear away all of the misguided ways of doing things. This society would be more along the line of a Socialist government than anything else.

I prefer this approach to the status quo elitist approach. After all, the most likely

309

differences between the well educated or rich elite of this country and the poor or less educated are probably just due to circumstances. In fact, if there actually was a eugenics program initiated, most of the so called elite probably wouldn't fare very well. The kind of society I envision would add another item to the idea of supply and demand. Which would be the cost to the environment. Now I hope

you don't think that I seriously expect to be given the opportunity to change the government or the way society works. But I do have a plan. Though you still have to wait until later to see what that plan is and more fully know why it is necessary.

As I mentioned before, another impediment to any real change is the cozy relationship that often exists between religion and government. Which is no surprise. Seeing how they are both basically in the same business. That being gaining or maintaining control over people and gaining wealth. I am surprised that sometimes the one has tried to remove the influence of the other. Because when religion and government support each other, they can double their hold over people. The reason being that if for some reason the one's hold over the people is lacking, there is the different approach of the other to take up the slack. With both religious and secular leadership seeking wealth, power, an easy living or any combination thereof, it's no wonder that they would help each other to obtain these things. This is probably the main reason why that here in the U.S. religious organizations are mostly exempt from having to pay taxes.

The relationship between religion and government reminds me of a story I once heard about a Russian king who lived long ago. I don't remember his name, but not wanting to pass up any trick to control his people, he apparently he decided to infect his subjects with a particular form of religion. It's possible he did so to help put an end to any strife caused by differing religious factions. But I think a more likely reason was that he thought it would be easier to hold on to one leash than many. Now knowing that religion would help him control his subjects, this king next had to decide what religion to infect his subjects with. His choice boiled down to a decision between the Christian or Muslim religion. But this king apparently liked to drink. And the Muslim religion didn't allow drinking. So he chose the Christian religion.

Just think. The deep religious faith that many of those people probably have in Jesus is due to alcohol. If things were otherwise, no doubt there would be many these days who would use their equally unjustified faith to justify suicide bombing. The subjects of controlling people and suicide bombing brings up two other subjects. One I have talked a little about before. Which is the Jew dominated media and their influence in the financial world. The other is terrorism. Not that I believe everything I see on TV, I remember seeing something on it once where they said that even one of the prime ministers of Israel had himself in his youth planted at least one terrorist bomb. Which probably killed innocent people.

310

From what they said, the reason it was done was to drive out the British who

were acting as peacekeepers. And from what I know of the Jews, it isn't that hard to believe. As if the Jewish mafia wasn't bad enough, (if you make a distinction between the two) we also have people like that to deal with. Having such people around with so much influence is not something I would tolerate if I had anything to say about it. Another thing is how morally justified can we be to fight terrorism when even these "friends" of ours are willing to use such methods. Because, as the old saying goes, "when you lie down with dogs, you're bound to get fleas." Which is a philosophy that holds much significance in other instances.

The idea of terrorist bombing brings to mind a philosophy that I have often seen on TV. I have even seen it more than once in cartoons. A philosophy that if it isn't Jewish, it at least plays into their hands. This philosophy states that if you use the same overly severe methods against an enemy as they may use against you, then you are no better than they are. For various reasons, I don't make any distinction between Israelites and Jewish people here. So with Israel having resorted to using terrorism to gain their goals, it's no wonder that the Jewish dominated media would want to suppress any urge for others to respond in kind. I on the other hand am not interested in being more polite in warfare than an adversary. In any conflict, I would be more interested in winning. Besides, if you have to refrain from using similar methods that an enemy may use to make yourself better than they are, then you have serious problems.

Another thing to take into consideration as for how to respond to an attack is the reason behind it. Also, I for one am not responsible for the state of the world. When people are treated like sheep, how much cruelty are the sheep deserving of for the state of the land on which they were led to graze. Though I try to do what I can, there is only so much I can personally do. For example, I am not willing to walk around naked just because this government-corporation decided to take a gigantic shit on the American people and have basically slave labor from impoverished third world countries make our clothing. Along with about everything else. So if I had my way about it and an attacker decided to kill innocent civilians, the civilians of whatever country the attackers may be hiding in had better be ready to experience even greater reprisals. Now to avoid conflict, the best way isn't to put yourself into god's hands. The best way is to put yourself into your potential enemies shoes. Try to use open, unselfish and honest reasoning. That way conflict would be less likely to arise to begin with.

Getting back to the Jewish problem, no doubt there are probably some of you out there who think that despite all of the things that I have said concerning them, that I am being too hard on them. Well here are some additional things to consider. Though I can't say for sure that it is true, according to something I saw on TV, when Israel was involved in a war with its neighbors, president Nixon was apparently ready to unleash nuclear war if Russia sent in troops to help Israel's

enemies. Just think, ending the world over the terrorism using “chosen of god.” Also, it may have even been in that war that some Israeli planes and helicopters tried to sink a U.S. navy surveillance ship. Presumably to blame it on their enemies and sucker the U.S. into getting more involved on the side of Israel. Another interesting thing is that though the captain of the ship received the congressional Medal of Honor, it was given to him in a back room somewhere. Yet another interesting thing is that though there was an aircraft carrier near enough to help them, for reasons that I find suspicious, no help came.

No doubt religion is a major reason for our virtual slavery to Israel. Which no doubt they would call friendship. But you should know by now the cost of their friendship is far too high. For another example of the cost of this friendship, take these things into consideration. During the Reagan administration, the U.S. sold weapons to its worst official enemy at the time. Iran. Which interestingly enough, according to a news story I saw about it once, was done through a country that Iran hated even more than us and was in a better position to attack. Israel. (But with Israel being the slave masters of U.S. military might, Israel didn't have much to fear) It's probable that these weapons were sold to fulfill a back room deal to gain the release of U.S. embassy hostages. But what is known is that our share of the money from the sale of those weapons was used to secretly support another U.S. ally. It is also an open secret that the U.S. had at times flown in drugs from those and other U.S. allies to sell here to support those allies. Though it is hard to prove because as you could imagine, the U.S. would be better at keeping secrets or keeping people from talking than any organized crime syndicate could.

It is also known that at times the U.S. had allied itself with criminal organizations to obtain some goal. Such as it probably did to sell the drugs here that the U.S. brought in. Because these criminal organizations would likely be protected to some extent in their sale of these drugs. Otherwise, it would seem unlikely that criminal organizations would have bothered. Now just suppose the U.S. aids Israel in a less open manner by allying itself with another criminal organization. Namely the Jewish mafia. Which is an organization that Israel probably finds quite useful. Of course, I can't say this is true, but given the extent to which this government is apparently willing to support Israel, it is a definite possibility. Yet another thing that makes these kinds of things highly plausible is that here and there, over many years, I have seen news stories of, seen documentaries or read about the U.S. doing things you would expect from Stalinist Russia or North Korea. There is something else that supports the U.S.-Jewish mafia thing. Which is that as I said before, according to a couple of things I have seen about the matter over the years, despite the support that Israel receives from the U.S.,

Jewish criminals here can emigrate to Israel to escape our justice.

Another thing about the Jewish mafia is that to me it is just another term for  
312

Israel. After all, the bible often speaks in its own way of the necessity for evil. Isn't it convenient that god should have so often shown his power by performing or supporting evil acts. Also, seeing how there is no god, would you care to guess where that puts the things the bible taught the Jews to do in his name. Or the things they still do in his name. With such evil being the case, how much of a stretch is it to justify outright criminal behavior. To me, it is no surprise that the Israeli secret service has become renown for assassination. Another thing about the bible promoting evil as it does, it would seem that the main thing god would have "chosen" the Jewish people to do is perform a function of evil. But being at least a fairly moral person myself, if some god chose me to perform a function of evil, I would tell him to go fuck himself and relish any punishment he could unleash upon me. So given all of the things I've written in this book so far about the Jewish religion and its people, is it any wonder why I dislike them to the extent I do?

What I said earlier about the government's likely involvement at times in drug trafficking brings up the subject of the war on drugs. It seems that the U.S. doesn't want to win this war. Which as I said before, would be extremely easy to do. Or if ending prohibition is off the table, all the U.S. would have to do is basically put a bounty on the heads of dealers who, for instance, sell cocaine, heroin or "meth." If somebody is busted with these drugs, the informant quickly gets an anonymous check in the mail for, let's say, five thousand dollars or more. Depending on how big a fish was caught. After all, from what I have heard, in Stalinist Russia they had no shortage of informants. Even though they were paid less and those they informed on weren't going to be treated with "kid gloves." Now though I don't have the figures to back up this next idea, it seems likely that if the U.S. spent a quarter of the money that it uses on the war on drugs to actually pay off informants and advertized the fact that they are more than ready to do so quickly and anonymously, after a while I doubt if you would be seeing many drug dealers.

Though it could be argued that the U.S. doesn't want to win this war because it couldn't cope with the number of prisoners. But if the U.S. spent a quarter of the money that drug related criminal activity likely cost the public, they would probably have more than enough money to give them some sort of employment at a livable wage. There could be a couple more unfortunate aspects to this failure to win the war on drugs. Which is that the U.S. would rather spend the money on law enforcement. Or that as with warfare in general, some small but influential

group besides drug dealers are making a great deal of money from it. The topic I would next like to talk about concerns freedom and people's rights. First of all, for many reasons, freedom basically sucks. Also, if you gave everybody complete freedom, paradoxically, nobody would have it. It is like sovereignty. If everybody had it, nobody would have it. But people do need some rights. For instance, they say that here in the U.S. we are supposed to

313

have the right to free speech. But for now all I am going to say is that isn't the case. I'm not talking about the right to yell "fire" in a crowded theater. I'm talking about the right to say what you think. Which for various reasons is often repressed in one way or another. In fact, I wouldn't doubt if this book were made basically illegal to possess in one way or another. Though there are some rights that people shouldn't have. Such as the right of people with HIV to remain anonymous. Because somebody's right to know a danger exists is greater than somebody's right to conceal that danger. To even be debating the right of people with HIV to remain anonymous when the disease is still spreading is stupid. Now they may someday find a way to make people immune to this disease. But even then, people would still have this genetic garbage floating around in their cells. Even though I am no expert, I would have to imagine that such a thing would ultimately have a detrimental effect.

Though from what I hear, this disease doesn't have any noticeable effect on Chimpanzees. Because they are immune to the disease. But until I hear any information to the contrary from actual doctors, I don't think there would be any price too high to pay if necessary to keep this virus out of people's bodies. Unfortunately, even doctors can be mistaken. Take for example a study that was done that, in my opinion, was criminal. Apparently some doctors were secretly testing people for the HIV virus. Though to me, that wasn't the criminal part. To me the criminal part was in not telling or not being able to tell those who they found to be infected that they were infected. So the blood of all the people that the infected people unknowingly infected is on those doctors hands. Now when it comes to the HIV virus, there are some things I would throw my support behind as a means of stopping it. Like putting to death anybody knowingly spreading it. Another thing would be to test everybody. Then, those found with it could have the letter "A" tattooed on the back of one of their hands. Though it may be a little severe, from what I have heard, I wouldn't be opposed to the approach taken by the Cuban government. Which is to take those found to be infected and quarantine them in separate communities.

Another thing about people's rights concerns an actual difference that I have noticed between the democratic and republican parties. While they are both

sides of the same coin, I have noticed that the democrats usually say “rights” while the republicans usually say “privilege.” Which brings up an interesting question for you to sharpen your teeth on. First, government often tries to sell the unfortunate idea of privatization to people. Government-business often does other unsavory things. The question is if it is a right or a privilege to be abused in such ways. Unfortunately it is usually the rich who’s opinion holds sway. Take the issue of taxes for example. They are something that the rich or businesses can often minimize. If not avoid completely. One way they try to get around them is by complaining about big government. Which is most often double-talk

314

for “screw the little guy” and more environmentally destructive government deregulation.

Yet another issue that comes up about rights are those that come about through majority rule. Not only is the opinion of the majority often paid for by the rich, but it also loses much of its moral authority when the majority is brainwashed beyond all recognition. So the minority should have some rights as well. Now by looking at the world, I think the idea of rights for both rich and poor could use some extensive reexamination and reshuffling. If I had my way about it, one of the results would be to stop using what little energy reserves we have left in “business as usual” practices and instead use those energy reserves to build an infrastructure that would support a sustainable lifestyle. Before it’s too late! Though the “business as usual” thing should be done away with anyway even if somebody came up with a clean, unlimited form of energy production.

The concept of people’s rights brings up another topic that I would like to go a little more deeply into. The law. It has been said that the U.S. is a nation of laws. If that idea was supposed to comfort people, for me at least, they have failed. Because every despotic regime that has existed has also had laws. The laws that we have are about as useful to the average person as theirs were to them. Because their laws, as ours are, were written for the benefit of the rich and or powerful. Also, no matter what any law says, the law in general only means whatever those in power say it means. No doubt most of you have probably heard horror stories about the way the law sometimes works. You may have even experienced one for yourself. I have been through a couple myself. Probably the main reason for this is because the letter of the law often overrides the intent of the law.

For example, take one of my legal nightmare experiences. First of all, the intent of insurance is to provide protection for people who have received damage. Now I was on a motorcycle and stopped at a light one day. There was a pickup truck



behind me. Another car plowed into the back of the pickup truck that in turn plowed into me. The motorcycle I was on nearly disintegrated under me from the impact. The officer that showed up said that in an accident like that, he usually expected to find a couple people dead. Some friends who saw the motorcycle later on in the impound lot were amazed that I survived. Though incredibly I was just banged up good with some road rash. If I remember correctly, the officer there told me that the person who caused the accident had some open beer and weed in his car. Of course, I tried to sue the insurance company of the person who caused the accident for damages. But in looking at this person's medical history, the insurance company found that the driver at least used to be prone to epileptic seizures. Which was some information he didn't share with the insurer. So the insurance company denied responsibility.

Now though this person may possibly have received his insurance fraudulently, the fact remains that the insurance company gave this person a certificate of  
315

insurance that allowed him to drive. He didn't forge one himself. So as far as I am concerned, the insurance company was responsible. But through legal maneuvering, the intent of insurance was annulled. If I had my way about it, insurance companies would cease to exist. I would arrange for a government agency that would richly compensate if necessary all those who wrongfully or simply unfortunately received damage through no fault of their own.

Another problem with the law that we use is that, from what I have heard, it originated from some documents that came down from the time of ancient Rome. But practicing law the way they did should be as dead as their language and numerical system. Unfortunately it lives on. One of the ways that it worked, sometimes the meaning of a relevant word had to be looked up. Sometimes the meaning of that meaning had to be looked up. On occasion, even that meaning had to be looked up. As to whether or not they used the same kind of confusing syntax that the law now uses, I don't know. But I would imagine so. All of this adds up to the ability of the law to use overly intricate linguistic maneuverings to bypass the intent of the law. On top of all that, lawyers are known to employ deception to achieve their goals. Earlier you heard me call lawyers parasites. But when you have to lie to earn a living, as lawyers often do, calling them parasites is the best they can hope for. They are about as useful to society as tulips used to be a measure of actual wealth in Holland. If they wanted to do something of more value for society, they would get a stationary bike with a generator attached that was hooked up to the power grid and pedal it.

One nice thing I have heard about the French legal system is that, if need be, it isn't unusual for a French judge to tell a lawyer to shut up and sit down. So to

sum all of this up, (and cut this short) our legal system needs to be completely redone. Though I can't explain how to do it in a couple paragraphs, I do have room for an outline. First of all, intent should be made paramount. Any legal wording should be directly to the point, written in plain language and kept as short as possible. Another thing I would do is take judgments about basic crimes like murder or rape, to name a couple, and write them down in a book. As for everything else, such as those rows of law books that take up a number of shelves, I would burn them all. Because of the corrupt nature behind the creation of most laws, the idea of legal precedence would also disappear. If I had my way about it, every point of law would be judged on a case by case basis.

As for judges, they would be appointed by lot from among all those who would care to enter into such a lottery. Any judge would have to answer to a court for any highly questionable judgments or unseemly behavior. If his conduct is found to be wrong, he would be fired. If his conduct is found to be actually severely criminal, he would face a jury trial. Which if lost could be appealed and retried once. In a timely manner and by a different jury. If a crime is severe enough, any accused person would have the opportunity to request a jury trial. Which if

316

lost, could be appealed and retried once. In a timely manner and by a different jury. In a jury trial, a jury of eleven would be chosen by lot. The judge would be there basically to keep order in the court and make suggestions to the jury. Though he could not restrict anything a prosecutor or defendant advocate might want to say to a jury. As before, in a guilty verdict, a defendant could request a retrial. Once. Being just a basic outline, there are of course a lot of blanks to be filled in. But in my considered opinion it is better than the system we have now. Anybody who disagrees with my ideas is likely making too much money off the system as it is now or is basically wearing a collar and being led around by a leash.

The next topic I would like to talk about is overpopulation. Though I have brought up this topic before, there are some other things I would like to say about it. Even though this another of those topics where I would need to devote a whole book to go into properly. The first thing I would like to say about this topic here is that there should be nothing that should be out of bounds when it comes to controlling this problem. Though there is one solution I would like to avoid. Which would be any kind of "Soylent Green" solution. It should be clear to anybody that the survival of your grandchildren (or possibly even your children) and of our ecological system depends on it. You can leave such things to moronic ideas like survival of the fittest or going to live in paradise after the world is destroyed. Or you could do the right thing. Like take responsibility yourselves

and do something about it.

Now just in case you don't know how bad this problem is, I can give you some idea. Right now there are seven billion people in the world. A number that is likely to exponentially increase. But if our population just stays where it is now, your grandchildren at least are likely to be doomed!!! Though epic destruction could happen much sooner if global warming causes methane release to go into a feedback loop. Which could very possibly happen. Just try to run away from such inescapable facts. Try to deny them. See how far you get. Those who would try make me sick. One of the many proofs that there is at least no good god is that, if there were, such people would already be dead!

You may be wondering why our planet can't handle the number of people it now has. Of all of the reasons, probably the most important reason is that developing countries are trying to achieve the same standard of living and lifestyle that we have here in the U.S. But our planet can't support that many people living the way we do. Our planet is going downhill as it is. Of course, the goal should be to live more sustainably. I have heard a quote on this matter. It said "Live simply, so others can simply live." Unfortunately, there isn't as much money to be made in living simply. Such a saying has another downside. Because what it is most likely to turn out to mean is "Live simply, so others can simply breed." Then, as for how bad things can get, I remember hearing somewhere that somebody extrapolated human population growth. What this person found was

317

something like if the population were to keep going at the rate that it is, in about fifteen hundred years, the weight of humanity would be equal to the weight of the earth. Then, in about another fifteen hundred years, the weight of humanity would be equal to the weight of the universe.

Of course, things can't go that far. But the question is at what point do people start to actually do something about it. The only country that I have ever heard of to try and actually pass laws to limit the number of how many children people can have is China. Which from what I have heard, hasn't worked out too well. But hopefully they can do better. Without resorting to the often used method of telling them to go kill someone else. The population problem of such countries is in stark contrast to one of the screwed up eastern European communist countries that existed until recently. There, because of falling population levels, they actually had to order people to have children. This brings up another problem with population control. That being determining an equitable proportion of the world population for each species of human. (you will have to wait a bit to find out why I say "species" and not "race") Though I have the answer, you still have to wait to see what that solution is and why. I'm sure there are those out there

who would say that I am being overly pessimistic. (among other things) Which as far as I can figure, I am not. Though even if I were, the cost of being a pessimist and being wrong is far less than the cost of being an optimist and being wrong.

Another negative aspect to the overpopulation problem is how the kind of emotional garbage that religion is famous for promoting contributes to it. Take for instance those charities they show on TV that show images of destitute children to get people to contribute money to keep them alive. Which often turns out to be a ploy to allow those running those charities to make a good living for themselves. I say those children should be allowed to die. Except in cases where (I could only wish) overpopulation and environmental degradation wasn't the cause. After all, people have been turning arable land into desert long before there was global warming to blame it on. Now if such children are fed, they and their parents should be sterilized. Because like it or not, if you feed a bunch of small hungry little rabbits, all you are going to end up with is even more small hungry rabbits. Who would more than likely like to emigrate here. Also, if those children's parents were stupid enough to have children when their survival hung by a thread, then their punishment can be to watch them starve. And if that doesn't bother them enough to stop, there is no reason why it should bother others enough to help.

This may sound cruel, but despite what Jesus taught, it can sometimes be even more cruel to be kind. I saw one example of how cruel kindness can be on some news program once. In it they were talking about and showing images of the results of some overly empathetic people having dug some wells for some aboriginal African herdsman. Because they no longer had to move their cattle

318

around to look for water, they stayed where they were. Soon, most of the plant life around them was gone. Which caused the cattle and most of the other plant eating animals in the area to start starving to death. People who I have heard referred to as "honkey, whitey" or any other derogatory term that I have heard non-Whites try to make up for Whites have been responsible for some other disgusting things that have been harmful to the less technologically progressive people of the world.

We increased their medical knowledge, which increased their numbers; put a stop to many of their customary warfare rituals, which increased their numbers; sold them better weapons and equipment that increased their ability to hunt, which increased their numbers; etc. (Though the ability to kill with the better weapons I mentioned couldn't offset the population growth caused by the other things) But using good will instead of good sense is just one of the things that needs to change. Though as you will be seeing later, chances are you are really

going to dislike what I see as the only reasonable solution. Especially if you are a “Bible thumper.”

No sane person can deny the importance of controlling population levels. Some people may call what I am about to say “racist,” but from what I have heard, population levels have stabilized among White people. I wouldn’t even doubt if it has decreased some. Despite this, as I said, much of the world’s problems are the fault of the White man. We also have had a major role to play in global warming, desertification, forest destruction, depleted fish stocks, etc. Then there is the problem of pollution. Take for example something I heard about Beluga Whales that live in the St. Lawrence seaway. When they find a dead one, they apparently have to bury it as toxic waste. But other more populace peoples are quickly catching up with the U.S. when it comes to pollution. As far as carbon dioxide levels go, I have heard that China has even surpassed the U.S. With no end in sight. Now though the problems I’ve listed are extremely important, unless most of the rest of the world can do something about their population levels, let alone their increase, I don’t see much chance of protecting our true creator. The ecological system. It created us and could possibly create others “civilized, intelligent” creatures if allowed to survive.

It’s almost too horrible to contemplate that people would destroy their true creator for reasons like ignorance, narcissism, social security in old age and greed. With religion smoothing and leading the way. When it comes to the ecological system, the next question is what is fair. Well a lot of that question has to do with whether or not you are one of those who believes things like god having made you in his image; having been made a little lower than the angels; having been given dominion over the earth; being the chosen of god; the destruction of the earth would be a good thing, etc. If anything to the contrary has been taught in the Hindu or various Oriental religious sects concerning overpopulation, it apparently hasn’t done much good. Then there is the value

319

people put on their consciousness, ability to “think” or their brain drug-emotions. Though to me, all such considerations are a bunch of crap. Because bacteria in a petri dish behave the same way.

Despite these problems, to defend our ecological system, I say that one third of all land and water, distributed evenly throughout the world, should be left alone by mankind. Which must first include areas that have been left unexploited so far and take migration routes into consideration. I would also like to see a governing body established in the United Nations that would enforce the protection of these areas from the encroachment of mankind. Who out there would dare tell me that two thirds of the earth left for the use of one kind of creature is unfair to such

creatures. Also, a lot of stupid nonsense has been talked about humans living on the moon or mars. I may be no scientist, but even I know that the very low gravity in such places is not a problem that can be minimized. Besides that, the worst place on earth is far better than anyplace else in the solar system. Such as deserts or polar regions. It may not be as exciting as space travel, but it would be much better to make a life there.

When it actually comes to changing the problems of the world, I am not one to seek compromise or do things in half measures. Because that is unlikely to get anybody anywhere. I also prefer a multipronged approach to all problems. It is also unreasonable to expect to be able to use reason against insanity, greed, egotism, etc. So don't be too shocked about where the topic of fairness has next brought me. Which is eugenics. Though as usual, I don't have the room to fully explain why I think it is necessary or how to accomplish it, I will as usual do what I can in the little space I allow myself here. First of all, in a world that is already overcrowded, how fair is it to let the stupid, ugly, retards, dwarfs or any other screwed up person breed. Also, as for the rest of the people in the world, those who would limit the number of children they have simply on the basis of reason would be exactly the types of people you wouldn't want to limit the number of children they have. So it would take an actual eugenics program to see that its goals are done properly.

No doubt most people, being brainwashed, would scoff at this idea. But such people should ask themselves if they aren't very attractive, how much would they like to be. Also, though a stupid person would be unlikely to be able to judge this point properly, it is better to be intelligent. Or if you aren't in very good health, how much would you like to be. Etc. I know I would like to possess all of these attributes to a greater degree than I have. But there is no easy way to gain these things. Though there is a way in which people could be less selfish and give these things to future generations. Which is by supporting a eugenics program. Also, seeing how there is no god and we have the ability to judge, on that point there is nothing wrong with each species of human breeding itself for intelligence, physical beauty, health and longevity. I have no doubt that the last point I made about species would make most people uncomfortable. But you

320

are just going to have to accept the fact that one species of human is unlikely to accept eugenic guidelines being imposed upon them from another species of human. Though simply getting people to accept the need for a eugenics program is difficult enough as it is, there are more reasons why it would be a good thing.

Another reason for eugenics would be to counter mankind's devolutionary

practices. Such as war or people who are screwed up in various ways having lots of children while intelligent people limit the size of their families. Then there is the use of medical technology to help screwed up people to breed. This wouldn't lead to a decreased need for such technology. It is interesting that even though god wasn't involved in creating this technology, many people who benefit from it in this way would leave the condition of future generations in god's hands. The overly aggressive are also unfortunately more likely to breed than others. That might work well with wolves. But I don't see it working well in an organized, mutually cooperative and community goal oriented society. Then, as I mentioned before, there are those who brownnose or kowtow. Such people are too cooperative and dependent. Along with their other problems. Though when behaving in such a way causes them to become more successful, as it is more likely to do, chances are that they would unfortunately have more children.

But most of all, there is the devolutionary processes caused by religion to counter. For instance, it caused the excessively screwed up and stupid among them to believe that god actually wants them to breed. Or seeing how it made servitude and blind faith seem fine to the extremely stupid, having many children was easier for them to do. Then there are people like me who know that religion is sick and sees all of the sickness it causes or supports in the world. It makes bringing children into such a screwed up world much harder to do and therefore makes it less likely to be done. So you can see it wouldn't hurt to go in a more positive evolutionary direction. Though to make such a thing work, there are two things that would be required after finally deciding under what parameters such a thing would be done. First, some self restraint. Secondly, some assurance that everybody is receiving equal treatment.

When it comes to eugenics, countries like China or India that need to drastically lower their population levels are at a distinct advantage. All they need to do to greatly improve the quality of their people is simply restrict breeding to those with favorable characteristics. Though he wasn't much of a general, Hitler showed how this could be done. You create an elite military force made up of the kinds of people you would like to see breeding, like Hitler did with the SS, and give them the best equipment. That way it would be those whose cause is righteous who would have the most power. For a general outline as to how eugenic considerations would be accomplished, I would do what the Chinese sometimes do. Which is allow every couple one child. (Though they recently raised it to two children per couple.)

321

Unfortunately for the Chinese, most want to have a male child. Not only to carry on a likely already common name, but because they earn more. So if the

Chinese regained their sanity and went back to the one child per couple rule, and other overpopulated countries started doing so, I would require the gender of the child be determined in the usual random manner. After that, any extra children would only be allowed if the parents pass a eugenic inspection. Less desirable couples would be allowed to have as many children as they want if those children come from genetically superior zygotes. Though because of overpopulation, even that would have its limitations. Also, even the eugenically selected children would themselves have to go through this process as adults. Another thing would be to keep reproductive genetic samples on hand so that eventually the longevity, disease free life or other eugenic goals of the donors could be entered into consideration as to how fit to use such samples are.

Given the mindset most people are in and the type of life they are used to living, no doubt most people will find these kinds of ideas unpleasant. But not having known otherwise, it is unlikely that you can know how unpleasant it is to be screwed up. Then there are the problems of rape; murder; corruption; robbery; assault; exploitation; destructive lies; environmental destruction; etc. Though I have only had room to tell you some of the main ways to greatly reduce these problems, bad genetics is likely largely to blame. So if you disagree with what I have said so far, you might want to ponder as to how unpleasant a eugenics program would actually be. Also, as I pointed out in various places, with the population problem being what it is, why not make something good out of a bad situation.

Now there are probably those out there who would leave such things until we become good at genetic engineering. But the things we don't yet know and the difficulties involved in such an approach can't be underestimated. For example, in one of the programs I saw about the topic, one of the things they talked about were some genetically modified seeds. Along with making the seeds do what they wanted, it also made the shells of the seeds thinner. Though I am far from an expert on the subject and I could be wrong, this would seem to show that genetic sequences inside chromosomes may have various interdependent functions to some degree. So if you introduce a gene to change something you want, you could be changing something you don't want to change. Also, there are two ways that I know of to get genes into a cell. One way is to blast the cell either with genetic material, or with something that has the genetic material on it. The other way is to infect the cell with a virus that contains the genetic material they want to introduce. As I said, I'm no expert, but I have to wonder what happens with the other genetic material that the virus already comes with.

After all this, they leave it to the cell itself place the genetic material into the chromosomes where (hopefully) they need to go. Which seems to be a rather haphazard way of doing it. I don't know if we, in any rational timescale, will be



able to bypass the cell and place just the genetic material we want directly into the right spot on the chromosome itself. If we can ever do it. There is also an aspect to genetics that I have heard of called epigenetics. If it is actually a real thing, they say that it would add so much complexity to the issue of genetics that it would make the human genome project look like child's play. So for various reasons, the best way for mankind to physically improve itself is through breeding. Or, as I said before, the lack thereof.

The next topic I want to talk about is going to be a little more lengthy than others. The reason is because I know the extent of the brainwashing people have been exposed to and how completely their weaknesses have been turned against them. So I want to explain my position as clearly as I can in the little space I allow myself here. Some of you may even initially think that I am insane. If you don't think so already. Which even if that were the case, you might want to consider that in an insane world, if it might be possible that sanity could come from an "insane" person. Also, as I warned you earlier, things are about to become increasingly unpleasant to read. Unfortunately for those who may disagree with what I say, you should consider things like basic arithmetic; the flow of electrons through various materials; nuclear weapons or basically anything else. These things don't work the way we want them to work. They work the way they have to work. Knowing this, let's move on to the topic of "racism."

Earlier I told you that I was going to explain why I said "species" instead of "race" concerning humans. Well you are about to find out why. Concerning humans, you might be wondering what race is. To me, it is a categorization of species. Though to some, what differentiates a species is the ability to interbreed. In human terms, this doesn't mean a lot. Because more modern humans were able to interbreed with Neanderthals. Who in my opinion, were extremely ugly. Also, because of the politically correct backlash such information would cause, I am a bit skeptical of claims that a human can't impregnate a Chimpanzee. For a better look into the "race" issue, let's look for example at a species of bird that long ago made its way to the Galapagos islands. Before they evolved into different species of birds physically adapted to exploit different ecological niches, there was less difference between them than there are among different species of human today. So it would seem that what makes a species a different thing is, among other things, a mere desire for one group of animals to find their own way and be "racist" against those they wish to exclude. After all, once these birds were there, they didn't live in isolation from each other.

Unfortunately, here in the U.S. there are laws against demonstrating the same kind preferences that those birds were able to exercise. People are also

constantly bludgeoned with a carefully manipulated public opinion against demonstrating such preferences. Luckily for those birds, they didn't have a business community, government or a Jew bird media to call them racist, haters

323

or supremacists looking only to keep their bloodline pure. They had the freedom to choose their own "friends." Now I don't expect to change a brainwashed person's mind about this matter any more than I expect to have changed their minds about religion. Especially in the space that I have to do so. Though religious people can look at it this way. It has been said that actions speak louder than words. And a lot of emphasis over the centuries has been put on what god supposedly said. Though if such a thing exists, what god does is a much truer example of what he would actually want than anything anybody might say he said. Let's see if you will put as much emphasis on what he actually does, if he exists.

For another instance, look at areas where slightly different species home ranges overlap. There is the Tiger and Lion in India; the Bobcat and Lynx; White Tail Deer and Mule Deer; Wolf and Coyote in America; various species of Dolphin and Whale; etc. times millions. (as far as the earth alone is concerned) Yet these creatures almost universally separate themselves. So if you were to follow the true law of god, you would have to do the same. As for everybody else, there is what I call the evolutionary imperative. Such as was shown by the Galapagos birds I mentioned earlier. To which ends not only is "racism" good, but it is absolutely necessary. So much for the interracial "melting pot" idea. Unfortunately, we live in a world where money and greed, among other unfortunate things, can trump both the real law of god and the evolutionary imperative. Which I have a plan to change for at least those who wish to survive and still have a technologically progressive but sane civilization to live in.

Another thing about different species among humans, in case there aren't any zoological classifications, I will create some. Such as Homo aryanus, Homo caucasus, Homo mongolus, and Homo negrosus, etc. I have been told that Darwin wrote a book called "The Descant of Man." In it, he was against the idea of there being different species of man. I would have to suppose that the reason for this was because he had to some degree driven himself insane. Because throughout Zoology there are many similar creatures with different Zoological classifications. Maybe after having taken so much away from Christianity, he was desperate to play the role of "Mister nice guy." For obvious reasons, you are unlikely to hear about these human Zoological classification in the American educational system. I know because, in it and elsewhere of course, I myself have been furiously and viciously exposed to various forms of brainwashing. I

heard a lot of nonsense about how similar humans are genetically. Though with all of the differences there are between different species of human, I would have to assume that there is a significant amount of genetic difference to make them that way.

In case you are wondering what these differences include, other than the obvious, let's look at the difference between Caucasians and Negroes. Reliable information has come to my attention that Negroes have longer arms and legs

324

than Whites. They also have narrower hips and scar more heavily. Negroes also have more of what are called quick reflex muscle cells that give them a bit of an edge in sports. There are also some drugs that don't work the same on them as they do on Whites. Etc. etc. etc. And those are just the things I have managed to find out. No doubt there is information about other differences that are suppressed or not made readily available. Instead you have been told that the only difference was the color of your skin. Oh how suckered you have been yet again!

Whether or not all of this is a revelation to you, this does bring up some other questions. Which again I will try to answer as best I can in what little space I allow myself here. First of all, earlier in this book I have told you here and there that you would have to wait for the ultimate answer to all of our problems. Well the time has come to start giving you the answer. Also, by and by, more reasons why. Which I can warn you now is also going to eventually become impossible to deny. So prepare yourself, because the ride is about to get even more lumpy. Especially for those who would disagree with what I have said so far.

It has been shown often enough that segregation isn't the answer. Separation is the answer! For one reason, any massively popular support for any real effectual change in the problems of the world is highly unlikely. The only rational solution for those with the intelligence and fortitude to do so is for such people to band together in any way that they can and separate from their company those who are lost. Though I didn't invent this concept. I did come up with this answer independently. As you may have guessed with my talk about the evolutionary imperative, the White man has the same right to seek a separate destiny, for instance from Negroes, that every other creature in the universe probably has. Expedience or emotions be damned! I for one don't plan to quietly take being forced into a symbiotic relationship with other basically parasitic species just because some well off elitist scum is afraid of getting the feathers of their comfortable lifestyle ruffled a little.

Also, apart from going against the evolutionary imperative, there is absolutely no mutual benefit for the White man for instance that comes from having other

species of human around that, as far as I have been able to find, even begins to offset their negative aspects. Now many other creatures have gone down the path of parasitism. Which they have the right to do. Though any organism so inflicted has the right to separate those creatures from their company. These other species often claim they would like to be our “friends.” For now, all I am going to say about that is that it brings up an interesting paradox. Because if they were really interested in just being “friends,” they would do the friendly thing of leaving us alone. But instead, for instance, I unfortunately heard of a black reverend spouting some stupidity about a dream he had. I also heard him say once, “We may have come over in different boats. But we’re all in the same boat now.” Or so such creatures would like to think. Also, if the black man for

325

instance can’t get along without “whitey,” what in the hell makes anybody think that we should have anything to do with them.

I hope you will forgive any lack of decorum or excessive crudeness in what I have to say next. But I don’t want to diminish what I have to say in niceties. So I would like to say that any creature that failed to do what is necessary to defend the interests of its own kind is a pussy! But most importantly, do you know what happens to pussies? They get fucked! Even for those who like getting “fucked,” there has to be a limit. Unfortunately, a lot of mentally diseased White people can mask their cowardly treason behind the emotional thrill of supporting some other species of human rather than their own. But like it or not, you can’t be a species traitor and be “for” some other species without being “against” your own. Of course, all of this brings up another point about the rights of the White man to seek to separate other species of human from their company.

In our economic system, many Negroes for instance help make things or provide services that the White man uses. (though a lot of that has to do with what I consider to be unjust laws that force Whites to let them to do so) The White man also provides products and services for the Negro. If the White man is to be truly justified in seeking a separate destiny, which they are absolutely justified in seeking anyway, economic interaction should be discouraged whenever or wherever those with the courage to do so want to do so. Which as I said earlier, the White man isn’t allowed to do. Though the universal law of the evolutionary imperative supersedes any such law. Also, let’s go back to the rights of the minority. In which those who feel as I do, along with White people in general, are in. I don’t plan to walk around naked just because my clothes are made by, as I said before, basically slave labor in other countries. The world I have to live in is not of my choice. But that doesn’t mean that I don’t have the right to do whatever I can, however I can and wherever can to separate the

things from me that I don't need or like.

Obviously, money is probably the most important thing that plays against any such right. Though there is a point where all this interspecies business is not only costing Americans a great deal, but is putting us ever deeper into debt. It also inflicts upon us the same kind of dilemma that, as I mentioned before, caused at least one species of Ant to evolved to the point that they can't even feed themselves without taking other Ants slaves. Seeing how there is no "racial" cause for patriotism being promoted, American businesses feel free to bail on the American worker and send jobs overseas. Or import invasive species of human here from desperate countries to take our jobs. Which as you can guess, makes unionizing against any present or future excesses of business almost impossible.

Then there are all of the other companies that might not have betrayed America who have to just to survive. Though apart from money, there is the Jewish media that I have talked about before to contend with. Who at every turn try to

326

encourage this interspecies garbage. (except in cases where they seek to go on a "J" date) They often accentuate the negative and diminish the positive in White culture. Another thing they do is prey on people's emotions and subject them to a sort of Stockholm Syndrome to sow confusion among those who have basically become their slaves. But seeing how the Jews have and still do often treat other Semitic people, I wouldn't expect any better treatment toward those who aren't Semitic. Another example of this slavery is, as I mentioned before, this countries willingness to back Israel to the bitter end. Despite their Jewish supremacist crap; Israeli nationalism; substantial criminal element, etc. Though with an estimated world population of these Jewish things of fourteen million out of a world population of seven billion, I should hardly know of their existence.

Also, with only about fourteen million Jews in the world, it's no wonder that they so often seek the moral high ground by supporting the underdog. Seeing how they are unlikely to be anything but an underdog in terms of world population themselves. Following all the unavoidably incomplete yet inescapable points of logic that I have made so far, what I am about to talk about may shock you more than anything I've yet said. Unfortunately, with the things I am about to say not being the main point of this book, I can only scratch the surface compared to all of the things I could say about what I know. You simply have no idea! These points are another of those topics that could take up a whole book by themselves. There are also the things I have personally experienced. Which for the sake of space must go unsaid. Though there is one thing in particular that I would like to point out first. Which is that the truth, as far as I have the ability to state it, is my greatest weapon. I can only hope that you wouldn't think that I

would abandon such a weapon now.

The next topic deals with the relationship between Whites and Negroes. I know to a depth that I can't fully explain here that I am right. So I intend to shut the door on any debate any other species of human may want to throw my way. To that end, if you think things have already gotten ugly, prepare yourself for worse. First of all, it most often has only been through the brainwashing media that I have ever heard a Negro speak like a White person. And then, why is it that you think that Negroes invented ebonics and so many Negroes speak it. Because they like "whitey" so much? Did they invent Kwanza because they like White people so much? Or was it for the friendship of Whites that so many turned to the Muslim religion? And in many cases, support the terrorism it promotes? This also brings to mind something I saw on a news program once. On it they were interviewing some black students from various schools who did well in school. These black students were complaining that most of the other black students disparaged them to varying degrees for "acting White."

For many media fooled White guys out there, don't pluck your eyebrows; Don't put on makeup; Don't act black or wear your pants below your butt. If you want a real dose of reality, try taking a walk through a Black neighborhood. Or worse

327

yet, being white and being thrown into prison where you are vastly outnumbered by a bunch of pissed off monkeys. Which as far as I am concerned is cruel and unusual punishment. Now as I pointed out with the story about the black students, amazingly from time to time I see things on TV that also show the real relationship between Negroes and Whites. Though knowing how the media works and why, I would say it is a certainty that there are many more instances that the media doesn't report on in an effort to avoid "rocking the boat."

Another of the stories that did happen to slip through was something about state police in Florida being positioned by some highway off ramps that led to black neighborhoods. They were there to pull over White tourist types and tell them that they had better get back on the highway and go elsewhere. On a couple of occasions I saw videos of black males striking in the face with their fists White females. Also, if I had the resources to gather a picture of all of the White women that had been killed by Negroes and showed each one for five seconds, I have no doubt that it would take quite a long time to go through them all. But on a couple of occasions I saw black people on TV complaining about black on black violence. Apparently black on White violence was preferable. Another thing I saw was a video of a White person and a black guy who got into an argument. If I remember right, it was about one getting grass clippings on the other's driveway. I am guessing the White guy called his black neighbor a

nigger. The black guy beat the White guy multiple times with a shovel. When I saw this on the news, from what I remember, they said that the black guy didn't go to jail for it.

Though I saw this video again on one of those shows that show videos of criminal behavior. It was such poor quality that you couldn't even tell that one person was black and the other White. Neither did they mention that aspect of it. Though there they said that the person with the shovel got ten days in jail. Which even if that were true, it still isn't very much time for assault with a deadly weapon. Though on that point, I can guarantee you that Negroes often, if not always, get much better treatment by the law than a White person would for that type of crime. Now as far as shovel boy and the rest of the Negro community is concerned, if being called a slang term for their species is so offensive to them, they should seriously consider not having any children.

For this next story, I would first like to mention something I saw about the KKK. From what I remember, their grand wizard or whatever basically told an audience at a rally that he wanted to see all niggers dead. He didn't tell anybody to make them that way. He simply said that it was in that condition in which he preferred to see them. It came to pass that some people affiliated with the KKK did kill some black guy. On the basis of what the speaker had said, the KKK was sued and had their assets seized. So much for freedom of speech! In contrast to that, I saw a news segment about a black professor telling his audience basically that black people needed to kill White people. He also said that White people

328

needed to be exterminated off the face of the earth. Even though he was an actual professor and should have known better, he said it was the only solution he could come up with. This should not only give you some clue as to the kinds of things you can expect from the Negro community, but from other species of human too. Also, even though my formal education is quite lacking, this black professor isn't the first person I have found myself to be mentally superior to in philosophical matters. In this instance, you know I have come up with a better idea. Separation.

Now despite what this professor had said, unlike the KKK, I never heard of anything bad happening to him because of it. Also, though I can't judge very well how the Negro mind works, I still wonder why he came up with this conclusion. Though there are a number of different possibilities, I will only go into the one that I find most likely. There is this thing called the self fulfilling prophecy. Where somebody's poor expectation of someone can cause them, through a sort of unintentional "evil eye" thing, to unknowingly cause someone else to do slightly more poorly than they might normally do. If I remember right, it even works the

other way with a good expectation. So with Negroes (or any non White) having to compare themselves with Whites, even when they look in the mirror they may expose themselves to this evil eye thing. Maybe he feels that this is the reason why blacks here do poorly or why there isn't a black populated country in the world that isn't seriously screwed up. (Despite the "monkey see, monkey do" example set for them by developed countries) So it could be that this professor thought that the best way to get rid of White envy is to get rid of White people.

But I would have to doubt that the problems of the Negro in general are the fault of White people. Unfortunately, to the contrary of what this professor said, that Negroes exist means that they have the right to exist. I just feel that it is absolutely imperative that they not exist around White people. The idea of White envy brings up something else I saw on TV that didn't involve a black person. This Italian-american (wop) guy raped and killed (If it happened in that order) a very pretty, young teenage blond White girl. Though I don't remember precisely how he worded what his motive was, basically he found the beauty of such a person to be offensive to his sense of self worth and what he considered to be his wop species of human. Which is rather strange because I don't see Italians as shown in the media as being far enough from being White to cause that kind of hatred. Apparently the disproportional number of people with at least Italian last names that "found" work in the Jewish media aren't very representative of their species. Also, if even an Italian-american can feel this way, I would again expect even less from a Homo-Africanus.

For some more of the nearly endless number of reasons why I obviously dislike Negroes and feel that they should be as separated by distance from Whites as possible, look at what they did to their own kind in Rwanda and elsewhere. Only

329

a moron or an utterly brainwashed, "ultra fag" traitor would take a chance on them treating White people any better. This brings to mind a martial arts awards program I once saw on TV. Most of the "people" receiving awards and most of the people in the audience were black. So why would a species that already has a bit of an athletic edge be so interested in martial arts. Given everything I know, I would have to say that these creatures had more than self defense on their minds. On another occasion I saw a black martial arts instructor teaching a rather sizeable class that, except for a couple of people, was entirely black. What he was teaching them at the time was how to do a proper death strike to somebody's throat. Such things make me want to look further at the mindset of such creatures. This example concerns a black comedian who I happened to be watching quite a while ago. Before I decided to shun everything those things do. In this program the comedian was talking about a trip that he took to what I think



was Liberia. He said that it brought tears to his eyes seeing a black populated city. Because it made him think, "black people really can do this!" But if black people have such low expectations of themselves, what are they doing getting so pissed off at White people who may feel the same way. Among the many things that Negroes dislike White people about is that Southerners at one time made their ancestors slaves. They even make it sound like White people invented the practice. But even their own species in their own countries at times didn't treat each other much better. And at times, even worse. Then, from what I have heard, even now there are at least a couple countries in Africa where slavery at times is still practiced. Though probably to a lesser degree than it used to be. Also, because of wage slavery, many Whites here at times haven't been treated much better. Another thing is that because of the slavery issue, many blacks here think that the White man, Northern and southern, owe them something.

Well maybe they could take a shovel, and instead of beating a White man with it, use it to dig up some of the graves of the Northerners who died in the Civil War to see what they can get. Or look to the children that they didn't get to have for what is "owed" them. This brings up a more pleasurable way in which Negroes have found that they can get back at "whitey." Which is yet another topic I could go into much greater detail than I have space for here. This topic involves Negroes dating white chicks. First of all, I can't blame them for doing so on the basis that a good looking White girl is better looking than a "good looking" girl of any other species. It is also my opinion that an ugly White girl is better looking than an ugly girl of any other species. One of the proofs of White female attractiveness is that blond hair dye far outsells any other hair color. Though don't get me wrong. There are some incredibly fine looking White brunette girls. Another point is to look at old black and white movies; in stage plays; aristocratic white makeup or wigs in times past. Or the white makeup of Japanese geishas.

330

For films, white makeup may have been more camera friendly, but there is no doubt that it simply made the women using it more attractive.

Yet another point concerns something I saw once about Vietnamese women during the U.S. war there. The money they spent getting cosmetic surgery to get that "round eye" look was more than the countries gross domestic product. Or maybe it was more than the yearly value of the countries exports. It has been a while since I saw it. So I can't say for sure. Not to mention all of the other things women of other species do to look as "White" as possible. Though not only the women do this. A famous Negro entertainer that you probably heard of was also famous for having himself surgically altered to look "White." Another example of

White aesthetic superiority concerns a story my cousin once told me. We lived in the same house for many years and hung around together quite a bit. I knew him well enough to have little doubt he was telling the truth. First, being a musician, he knew many black people. He told me once about a black guy he knew who only dated white girls. My cousin asked him once why he didn't date some black girls. His answer was, "What would I want one of those ugly things for." Well according to that guy at least, getting back at whitey may not be a black guy's only consideration.

Unfortunately, such people who don't wish White people well have found a way to, as the old saying goes, "kill two birds with one stone." Yet another thing is that I live in a somewhat small town. Here we have a pretty well integrated black population. About ninety eight percent of the time that I see a black guy anywhere with a girl, it is a white girl. (Though they're usually ugly. As for the others, they're only ugly on the inside) Only a few times have I ever seen a white guy with a black girl. Yet White people are supposedly fucked up if their patriotism, among other honorable things, causes them to dislike Negroes along with the brainwashed, traitorous white cunts that date them. Also, dating white chicks is probably another reason why so many Negroes learn martial arts. In case any White guy should rightfully object to it.

When it comes to the relationship between blacks and Jews, I am reminded of something I saw on TV years ago. The Jews in Israel had imported many thousands of Negro Jews from what I think was Ethiopia. Who apparently many Jews consider to be their own kind. Years later, I saw an interview of one of these imported Jewish Negroes. He was complaining because he didn't think that their kind were being treated as equally as he thought they ought to be. What a surprise! Also, I remember when Israel was importing these Jewish Negroes. They showed the leader of Israel greeting some of these people at the airport. Despite the problems we have had here with them, their leader was crying tears of joy! Oh well, it is just another example of how completely emotions can screw people over. Not that emotions are a bad thing. They just need to be channeled into a positive direction.

All of what I have said about Negroes and for the greater number of reasons  
331

that I haven't mentioned is why, like the KKK leader I mentioned earlier, I also like to see dead niggers! And largely for the same reason that a dog with fleas would likely like to see the fleas dead. Anybody wanting to sue me because of what someone else did, because of what I said here, is welcome to try. Though I doubt if they could successfully sue me for stating an opinion. It is also another reason why I see separation as the answer to all of these problems. You "White

devils” out there who may disagree with me need to grow some balls. Search your souls for a shred of honor. Think that despite the law, if you are pushed, that it is a good idea to push back. Or if there is another option to surrender. I would say it is also a very good idea to start demanding some rights of your own. Regardless of any so called “consequences.”

Despite what you have been told by species traitors; “Whitey haters;” those who are emotionally crippled or those whose chief concern is money, the least you could do is shun all these “people” and everything they do to the best of your ability. Along with the white suckers who the Jew media has put a lot of money and effort into fooling into thinking that it doesn’t matter if you’re black or White. Or those who have been fooled into thinking that is ok to act, talk, dress, or worst of all, interbreed with Negroes. White people who would hire, vote for or buy things from a Negro should also be shunned to the best of your ability. This is because such people are far worse than Benedict Arnold ever thought of being. Because he only betrayed who he considered to be his countrymen. Those white people who support Negroes are betraying what they are! Of course, there is another option to take with all of this. One that is demanded by the government and was taught by Jesus. Which is to bend over and spread your cheeks. And if things get worse, all you need to do is bend over a little farther and spread your cheeks a little farther apart. To which I say anybody who can still think that way can fuck off and die!

Also, after bending over, you would have to be able to stretch like a rubber band to “spread’em” far enough to take the various kinds of shit that Negroes and other species have to dish out. When it comes to “taking it” I just heard a story that is too juicy to pass up. Though to tell it properly I have to go back to the topic of my having had to deal with the hell of being on welfare. Having had to work for welfare myself at times, I know that it was just another of their punishments for being on welfare. Which served two useful purposes as far as the government is concerned. Those being to make people more accepting of virtual slavery and exploitation. Another of the many bad things about being on welfare was that slum lords knew how much welfare would pay them for rent and would take every penny they could get. Then, the only thing I could really afford to eat was cheap macaroni & cheese, hotdogs that were more fat than protein and old bread. Yet I was still expected to spread those meager resources to cover all of the extra expenses that come from doing the work for the employees

332

that the state already employed to do that work. Such as providing lunches and having to bathe or wash clothes more frequently.

Now the reason I brought up the subject of maltreatment by welfare is because of the small amount of justification for what happens in the true story I am about to tell you. There was this Negro woman who, along with many other Negroes, had to go on a rather lengthy daily commute to basically a White populated area to work for the welfare that they received on account of having children. Through in this instance, the state basically paid various businesses to not hire White people, through tax incentives, and hire these kinds of people instead. This Negro woman had a sixth grader in school who apparently wasn't happy with the situation and brought a gun to school. There he shot and killed a little girl classmate of his. Almost certainly because she was White. Though as I said, I don't know what kind of crap the state may have put these "people" through. But for those white people out there willing to "take it," I can only hope that someday you get to "take" what that little girl had to! Unfortunately, there is a good chance that this little girl was better off being killed. Because of the people she had to associate with and the things that the Jew media promotes, she very well could have grown up to be a nigger fucker anyway.

Now the government for whatever reasons may think that Whites separating from blacks is a bad idea. But I obviously don't. Another thing is that if you look at the media, all you are likely to see is that all of the problems of the Negro is whitey's fault. Or, as I said before, that it doesn't matter if you're black or White. On that last point, I am reminded of the many wealthy people who say that money doesn't matter. Which a poor person like me knows to be a desperately stupid idea. In the same vein, many White people who are more wealthy in beauty than other species of human could think that it doesn't matter what species people are. Which likewise is an astonishingly stupid idea.

As I said earlier, Negroes aren't the only problem facing the White man. When it comes to being forced to "take it," we also have Mexicans to deal with. They're flooding over our southern border to take American jobs. They also breed like cockroaches and quite often only learn English out of necessity. If at all. On top of all that, though they may not be as bad as Negroes, they too are a "butt ugly" species. Then you have to wonder why so many are so eager to leave Mexico. After all, it is a country rich in natural resources. On top of that, from the last that I've heard, they already receive sixty five billion more from the U.S. than we receive from them because of that "free trade" crap. The problems with Mexico must stem from the people who live there. Also, let's look at their history. They were famous for sacrificing large numbers of their own species to their various gods. And though I have only heard hints of it, I wouldn't doubt if they cannibalized the leftovers. That a culture and people that could do such things wasn't completely eradicated is yet another reason why I wouldn't want such creatures hanging around.

These things bring to mind a Mexican advocacy group called "La Raza." Which means "The Race." That sounds pretty racist to me. Though according to something I saw on the news once, they actually receive around ten million each year from the U.S. government for whatever reason. A rich white traitor named Bill Gates has also given them millions of dollars. Yet most people would probably view me as the asshole. For such people, consider a flier I once saw on a bulletin board at a Laundromat. Part of it was in English and part of it was in Spanish. It advertised the time and place of what I would imagine was a Mexican advocacy group meeting. One of the things it said on the flier was "We want America back." It made me wonder just how much of North America these Central American Indians and Mestizo fucks thought they were entitled to. Now as I have said, I know that separation is the best solution to this. (and many other problems) Though the least this government could do is make it illegal to hire any Mexican who isn't a citizen. And enforce the law! Let any crops rot in the field if necessary. If the White man wants them bad enough, we will pick them.

Unfortunately, this government isn't very interested in stopping illegal immigration. One reason being, difficult to believe as it is, I recently heard another brain dead politician spout the treasonous idea that the best way to put unemployed Americans to work is to increase immigration. Which among other unfortunate things is a rehashing of that "trickle down" crap. Such people need to go on line and see if they can find toilet paper to use that has American flags printed on it. Though simply reading the bible a lot and going to church will likely bring them to the same ends. As does voting democrat or republican. Are these things what so many Americans in the past endured scalplings and other equally unpleasant things for?

Now as far as the situation on our southern border is concerned, those people can come into the U.S. just as easily as we can cross the border to visit Mexico if we want to. Which itself makes any notion of border security just another farce for the brainless or brainwashed to enjoy. Then there are all those who for various reasons have to sneak into this country. Of these people, according to a governmental estimate I recently heard about the topic, they said that ninety eight percent of all such people that try to sneak their way into the U.S. eventually succeed. Which is probably an underestimate. This government sure goes through a lot of trouble and expense to placate Americans who don't want to be part of Mexico and make them think that they are actually doing something useful about the problem.

Another thing this government could and should do, (but isn't likely to) besides stopping granting citizenship to such people or the "anchor babies" they spit out here is, as I said before, create a fool proof National ID system. Which would be

easy enough to do. But as I said, this government and its brainwashed minions are more in favor of exploiting cheap foreign labor. Though if the U.S. did something rational to protect America, not only would all of these invaders deport  
334

themselves and find another solution to overpopulation, but they could take most of the border guards who are pretending to be actually doing something meaningful about the problem and put them into actual law enforcement positions. Not surprisingly, when I have seen these people demonstrating against laws that would limit their rights to invade, along with Mexican and American flags, many of them for obvious unfortunate reasons also carried crosses. From what I have seen of these demonstrations, it brings up an old saying I've heard. Which says that "if you give them an inch, they will take a mile."

Of course, I don't expect any of the options I've suggested to be done to any meaningful degree, if at all. Which again is a reason for separation. Also, fortunately we only share a border with one screwed up country filled with people who want to be our "friends." If these kinds of people from other countries had such an easy path to get here, White people would probably be hard to find amongst the masses of them. And this country would probably be as screwed up as the ones they left. Another thing to look at is how willing other species besides Negroes are to date White women or how desperate most are to "share" our country with us. That should give the White man a clue as to what extent we should be willing to stick up for our own kind. Don't let some other species threaten or sweet talk you into taking it up the ass. Ask yourself if you are man enough to support or otherwise see to the survival of your own kind.

Though the U.S. isn't the only place with these kinds of problems. Anyplace in the world that the White man has tried to make a place for himself, these third world lowlife fucks are trying to horn in on the action. In Australia, from what I hear, they are having trouble keeping Indonesians out. Also, in Europe they are having Negroes from Africa and Muslims from the Middle East trying to weasel their way in. Leaving the White man no sanctuary. (these things also help put that whole Hitler thing into perspective) On top of that there is the overflowing human petri dishes of India and China. Now taking all of these things into account, I am telling you White people out there that you had better start looking out for your own asses. No other species of human is going to. So those who sell that "politically correct" dogshit can stick it you know where. I have shown you some examples of the real world. Like it or not, as I said before, you can't be "for" some other species and be "for" your species. You have to choose sides. If you flip a coin, one side or the other is going to end up on top. (unless a virtual

miracle happens and it lands on its edge) I am telling White people that you had better care what side that is.

While we're on the subject, I have a few words of advice for members of the KKK or other White patriot organizations. Though I don't want to sow distrust among you, even the leadership of these organizations must acknowledge the fact that the government may plant operatives in your midst that would seek to work their way into leadership positions. Even if it meant doing so with a bag of  
335

Negro heads. That way they could persuade others to commit actions that wouldn't cast your organizations in the best light. So do what you must to separate yourselves and as much as possible and let the other races bring the fight to you. That way, at least you won't be viewed as the aggressors. Also, those of you who at least hopefully view yourselves as White separatists, but somehow still believe in Jesus, you may as well go out and perform fellatio on every black guy you find.

Oh how I wish I could have gone into much greater detail on all of this "racial" stuff. But that isn't what the main point of this book is about. Now despite what I have said so far, no doubt there are some out there who may think that I am overstating things and agree with the interspecies "melting pot" nonsense. Well I know how you feel. Because at one time long ago I used to feel pretty much the same way. It's amazing how true and correct knowledge can change a person's view of things. For those of you out there who may disagree with what I have said so far, what a warm and fuzzy delusion you live in! Though fear is probably a factor in how you feel. Or maybe you are just too well paid for your treason! Unfortunately for such people, though it shouldn't be necessary, I have some additional reasons for separation. Let's see how many of these additional reasons those who may wish to do so can argue against.

1. To return to the White man the freedom to express an opinion.

To show my level of patriotism toward the only thing that really matters, besides the environment in general, I would hang a Nazi flag outside my window. Except to do so is basically illegal. If not in fact so. (Just as it is probably illegal to put up a "Whites only" sign on a store you own) Then, if I defended my right to fly that flag, I can absolutely guarantee you that the law would see to it that I ended up with the "short end of the stick." Somebody could even shoot me and probably get off with little more than a slap on the wrist. If even that. Though I couldn't discount the possibility of being assassinated by the Israeli secret police or the mob. With the U.S. turning a blind eye. Another point concerns something that happened during the Viet Nam war. There was an army camp where some soldiers had put up a Confederate flag on their tent pole. Some Negroes told an

officer that if the flag wasn't taken down, there was going to be trouble. Not surprisingly, the flag was taken down. Unfortunately, when you give a gun to a nigger, the only right the White man is likely to end up with is the right to shut up. That is unless there is information that a Negro wants to get out of them.

I also have a personal story of when the 9-11 terrorist attack happened that I am not going to go into. There is no doubt in my mind that there are probably an endless number of such stories out there that people never hear about. Those who disagree with what I say can't express a rational opinion when the government and the media so completely control what they think. In many ways that they aren't even aware of. The solution to all of which is separation. I don't

336

mean separate but equal. What I advocate is complete separation. It may mean dividing up the nation. But as far as I'm concerned, The United States doesn't really exist anymore anyway.

2. Because of what is commonly referred to as "racism."

Like it or not, specisism will always exist. Now having to deal with an asshole is bad enough. But to be expected to put up with crap just because you are a different species is something that no White man should have to endure. Especially in a country that is his home. I know there are people out there who would like to pretend that there is little difference between people or that those differences don't really matter. After all, people are real good at pretending. For instance, many people close their ears and eyes to the truth so that through their ignorance they can pretend that they are worthy to go to heaven after they die. Other people like to pretend that Jesus and those who promote him aren't emotion pandering scumbags. Just as there are others who like to pretend that Mohammed and those who promote him aren't worthy to suck the curl out of a pig's penis. Not to mention the multitude of other things where lies are more comfortable or profitable than the truth. So I say the best way to get rid of the problems caused by specieism is separation.

3. The delusion of democracy.

As I talked a bit about earlier, an elected representational form of government is a farce. But being too powerful to fight, the only answer is separation. Also, as I said before, those who feel as I do are probably in the minority. But if evolution depended on majority rule, to say that evolution would be extremely limited in diversity would be an understatement. Another thing is that as far as I can tell, most people are too opposed to change or full of crap in one way or another. They also seem increasingly desperate to be lied to. Especially if they think that their standard of living or immorally gained money is at stake. Or who would vote for somebody who would close or drastically change the way in which a company



that they work for works. Taking these things into account, where does “majority rule” leave those who see that the world needs to change.

Again, separation is the answer. Despite the obstacles that government is likely to put into the path of those who have no other honorable way to go. Especially the obstacles that other species of human in government may put in the White man’s way. One unfortunate way some of those people get political power is done is through gerrymandering. Where they divide up voting districts to help assure people in power get enough votes to stay there. Unfortunately this also often gives different species of human of a lesser population more power in government. Neither of which sounds very democratic to me. The least this government could do is find somebody with no knowledge of a certain area, give them an approximate sized map to work with, and tell them to divide up the voting districts into how many pieces they need.

#### 4. War

337

You might think that the possibility for war is a good reason to avoid separation. No doubt laws and their enforcement that act like flea powder could make such fleas go to war. But taking things I have mentioned and things I haven’t mentioned into consideration, I still think that separation is the way to go. Besides, as they say, “Only the dead have seen an end to war.” For anybody to think that the current politically correct cult will outlast mankind’s natural violent tendencies is dreaming. If anybody thinks it will, they may as well believe all of the other stupid shit the bible tries to get people to accept. Another thing is that with things like overpopulation only likely to get worse, coupled with increasing environmental damage and the need to use technology to produce food, war is indeed likely to happen anyway. So with a possibility of war, the worst place to have a potential enemy is amongst you.

Those who for various reasons would allow such a state of affairs to continue, let alone get worse, are worse than the religious nut jobs who dance with venomous snakes. Such as those who think the answer to our problems is to basically end nationality and species oriented sovereignty. Besides, as far as I can see, the ability of the world to take from the White man increasingly exceeds our ability to give. Also, for those who would take from us, the least we could do is make them fight for it. Which would decrease the chance of it happening. Another thing is that if others know not to expect anything from you to begin with, the best way being through separation, they will be less offended when they receive nothing. Which again would decrease the possibility of war. Though to be truly justified in keeping something for ourselves, we must avoid taking things from others and damaging the environment in which they live.

When it comes to speaking about war, I must again bring up the topic of Muslims. Who themselves in most places also breed like cockroaches. The problems that causes will of course be blamed on the White man and be fought against on religious grounds. Now I consider religion to be filth to begin with. I have even less regard for the Muslim religion. Let alone their culture. Which is a fact they are unlikely to ever accept. So again, separation is the answer. Also, because of religious considerations and probably also because of business considerations, the U.S. is willing to accommodate these lowlifes. Even though there will likely always be those among them who would commit any murderously violent act against as many civilians as they can to get their own way. Though for the rich and powerful, not only are they a little better paid to take such chances, but they can afford a little better protection. They obviously can also afford to sway public opinion in their favor. I on the other hand don't like the government's willingness to play "whack a mole" with such people. Because they aren't going to be able to whack them all. So unless they like whacking moles, the best solution is to ship the moles off somewhere. Like what happened between India and Pakistan.

Another unfortunate thing is that Muslim "extremists" are likely to succeed

338

someday in setting off a nuke in some city. This could very well result in a ferocious yet largely pointless response in kind against some unlucky Muslim country. Most likely one with oil. In such a scenario, the White man will probable end up surrendering to an even greater degree than we are already expected to. Because no doubt the media and educational system to promote greater "understanding" between different religions and species. To which I again see separation being the best preventative measure. Besides, it's hard to justify aggression against a people who want nothing other than to be left alone.

#### 5. Spying

Though I have mentioned this subject before, there are a few other things I would like to say about it. First of all, I saw something on TV recently where they were talking about all of the military technology they had recently discovered that the Chinese have gained through spying. From what they were saying, it would have been a far shorter list to talk about the things they didn't find out. If indeed there was anything they didn't find out. Neither do they know exactly how it happened. Which means that they don't really know how to keep it from happening again. (though I do) On this news program I watched, all they would admit to is the Chinese finding out how to build any nuclear warhead we have. It may have also have had something to do with their ability to develop stealth fighters. I had already heard before that they had found out how to build a

neutron bomb. But I have to admit that I don't know if that was through direct spying or allowing Chinese students to attend our universities. Though unlikely as it is, I can't say it's impossible that they found this out on their own.

Another example of lost military technology happened because we helped the Afghans during their war with Russia. Some moron decided to give the Afghans some stinger missiles. You may have seen videos of our military jets dropping flares to throw off missiles. Well according to another program I watched, stinger missiles are so good that flares don't do much, if any, good against them. Unfortunately, "somehow" the Chinese now make a carbon copy of them. Coupling these things with the increasing debt we are accumulating to them, if you aren't outraged enough to embrace separation, I hope you are practicing your "bend over and spread'em" maneuver. And paying attention to the "being White doesn't matter" propaganda. Because you're going to need it.

Now the Chinese of course aren't the only ones stealing military technology. Sometimes even our "friends" do it. Though I can't say for sure how true it is, I remember seeing another program years ago where they were talking about Israel having sold some stolen U.S. missile technology to South Africa. One of the unfortunate things about all of this is the massive amounts of money the American people put into developing these technologies. Some of the cost of which was covered up by military contractors being allowed to do things like charge the government ten thousand dollars for a toilet seat or two thousand dollars for a hammer. Not only would separation cost us far less in that regard,

339

but it would also make us much safer. On top of all that, there are all of the instances of industrial espionage to consider. Though no doubt there are those who would say that through separation, there would be far less industry. Though with the wasteful, inefficient and ecologically damaging ways industry usually works, we could do with less of it the way it now works anyway.

#### 6. The right to exist.

As I pointed out earlier with what I said about species and the evolutionary imperative, there is absolutely no doubt that the White man has the absolute right to seek separation. Hopefully other species of human feel the same way. Also, if genetic diversity is important among all the different kinds of life there is on this planet, which it definitely is, then it is also extremely important for humans. There is no doubt in my mind that genetic diversity is also much more important than any unjustly imposed economic considerations or any cheap "politically correct" emotions. Another argument the mentally challenged may come up with against the White man's right to exist is that they may say that in a hundred thousand years, humans will be quite different anyway. (if we last that long) This

is the same kind of “nothing really matters” kind of crap that religion sells. Or the “pass the buck” crap that our government often uses. But what happens in some far distant future isn’t going to matter much to somebody who today has someone else decide to “pop a cap in yo ass.” Neither am I willing to see the White species go the way of the neanderthal. Also, in a loose analogy, if I need some wood for something, I’m going to get some. Not plant a tree and wait for some.

Another thing is that what exactly we evolve into is something that must be looked after today. Yet another thing is that I unfortunately have heard far too often about Israel talking about their right to exist. Along with having defensible borders. How often have you ever heard about the White man’s right to these things. Or that being White even matters. But as you know, to me at least, being White does matter. To a non-White, being White probably means spit. And for those eager to sell out whoever they can, however they can, for as much as they can, they probably consider being a White patriot a disease. For white people who think like that, they need their lips sewn onto Mohammed’s anus in that human centipede thing. Not that it would matter much. Seeing how they’ve obviously become use to eating shit.

This government also throws all of its support behind Israel’s supposed right to exist. I would be willing to bet that this government wouldn’t throw much support, if any, toward any White groups right to exist. Especially if it was in separate, sovereign areas within the borders of our country that we were born in. Yet another thing that makes our existence quite difficult to maintain is that anytime anything bad happens anywhere on the planet that causes its citizens to need to relocate, it is usually to the U.S. that they want to relocate to. Often times using the old “political asylum” ruse to do so. Though in any cases where political

340

asylum was an actual reason, they themselves would have to have been at least in part responsible for the things they are seeking asylum from. So yet again, separation is the answer.

#### 7. Overpopulation

Though I also talked about this topic before, there are a few other things I would like to say about it in relation to separation. The first thing being that seeing that there isn’t likely to be anything to stop its effects, let alone limit it. So the only logical alternative is to form a government in areas where we can shield ourselves from it. Also, as I said before, other species of human are unlikely to welcome Whites telling them how many children they can have. Especially given the ecologically unsustainable lifestyle that capitalism has forced us into. Then again there is the topic of immigration. How likely is it that an African-

american is going to tell an African-African that they don't want them around. It is equally unlikely that a Mexican-american is going to tell a Mexican-Mexican that they don't want them around. The same goes for Orientals.

Unfortunately, for more reasons than tobacco companies had to deny the harm of their product, this government has seen fit to try and solve the world's problems by telling the White man to surrender everything he has. Such as his land, women and jobs. And maybe get Whites to pay for their universal health care. Though I by far prefer the idea of separation. Another thing is that there was a movie made that was passed off as a true story. Though it wasn't. Despite that, it gives you some idea as to where the government's approach to overpopulation will likely lead. The movie was called "Abandon Ship." You should watch it after you've seen the mostly righteous points made in "The Corporation."

It's regrettable that I had to stray so far from simply talking about the things the bible said. Though you can see how religion relates to all of the things I've said. Also, as I said earlier, because of the wildly unpopular things I had to say, chances were that you would think that I am full of crap. So I had to make a little more extensive explanation of my positions. Now with all of the problems we face, you may be inclined to just give up. But you should never give up. Especially since all of our problems are solvable. One way would be to have most of the people in the world read this book. Which is unlikely to happen. Or I could be made dictator of the world. Which is extremely unlikely to happen. So again, the solution is for those with the knowledge as to why it is necessary and the willingness to do so to separate themselves in whatever way they can. Though there is the do nothing option that I mentioned and leave the mess for your children to deal with. But if we don't start to fix our problems now, the end result will likely be much more draconian than what you likely perceive the solutions I have reasoned the best courses of actions to be. With astonishingly less to show for it.

Leaving problems you know are only going to get worse for your children to  
341

deal with is just too disgusting. And believe me, I have thought about these things in every possible way. I have also thought about them in quite a number of impossible ways. All the while taking into consideration whether or not the cost of doing something concerning a wide range of topics is worth the cost of doing nothing. You have seen the answer to such questions. So if anybody can still find fault with my reasons for separation, the main reason is probably because they have been rendered incapable of rational thought on the matter through brainwashing. Along with other unfortunate things of course like an

inability or desire to reason, misdirected emotions, fear of living in a world where money doesn't decide what is right and what is wrong, etc. It would be interesting to hear any objections to what I have said about anything. Because sometimes it is interesting to hear a little incoherent babble. Just as it interests a doctor to look at an interesting disease.

All of this also brings up an interesting question. One for which because of the inventiveness of man on the topic over the centuries, there may be no solution to. Which is how to get people interested into doing the things I have come to the conclusion that it is necessary to do without making it seem like another "run of the mill" cult. Though to me at least the quality of the things I have had room to tell you should be sufficient to lift the things I have promoted above any such lowly status. Apart from that, in forming any new nation, I would listen to people's suggestions as to what the rules of it would be. I'm not so egomaniacal as to think that other people couldn't have good ideas. Besides, it would keep me from having to come up with them. But I would insist on Atheism. From there, they could take it or leave it. I don't hear of many "cults" doing that. Now on the whole separation issue, the question is how to bring such a thing about. Unfortunately there is no easy answer to that question. After all, it took us quite a while to get us into the mess we have with the environment and everything else. It could take a while to get ourselves out of it.

Though If I were rich enough, the answer would be easy. I would simply buy up land and set up communities like the various "China towns" that exist here and there in the U.S. Along with our own state run businesses, industries, universities, recreational parks, activities and everything else that any ecologically sustainable western style civilization would need. With the exception that you have to be a member to even be in the area. I would also create a new currency for those areas. But unfortunately I am not mega rich. Neither am I likely to find financial support among the mega rich or the business community. Because the system I envision isn't a capitalist one. Despite these problems, it could still be done. Though starting out would likely require taking "baby steps."

One thing that would make it easier is to claim a tax free status on the grounds of it being a "not for profit" organization. A tax free status could also be claimed such as the Amish or other religious organizations have. After all, justification for separation for people who think the same way I do is about a million times more

342

demonstratable than any of the fantasies religions are based on. Neither could anybody rationally object to a separation that, as I said before, most every creature in the universe probably practices. But if worse comes to worse, something else that could be done is something along the lines of the kibbutz

system that the Israeli's used. Though there is another impediment to our seeking separation. It is advertising in the media to get people and businesses involved in such a thing. Because even if the media did allow it, chances are their brainwashed or cowardly white minions would fight against it in every way they could. Though there is something the media couldn't ignore. Register to "vote" and write my name in for president and every other office they have on the ballot. Not that I would be even begin to expect to get elected to anything. But if enough people did it every time there was an election, it would at least get people's attention.

Now as far as this book is concerned, this is the end of my trying to improve things for the better. Unfortunately, this is where the inevitable bite comes into play. Though I would settle for your moral support of the philosophies I have put forward, regretfully there are two things I would like to ask you for money for. The first thing would be to get this book published into print and distribute them for free. I would also like to have money to set into motion the formation of a united, Atheist and Rationalist, White Sovereign Nations. Which being more "holy" than any religious organization could ever hope to be, such a donation should legally be as charitable as any contribution to a religious organization would be. Though if I received any money, the first thing I would do is hire a lawyer to wave his legal wand and make the organization I have created listed legally as a not for profit organization. That way I could assure that any donations would be tax deductible.

But first, there is something I would like to make you aware of. You probably know about those dracula movies where a cross would burn the skin of a vampire where it touched him. Well if I touched any money that I knew to have been overly self sacrificing to the donor, it would mentally effect me in the same way. So give as much as you feel comfortable with as often as you can. But please don't do yourself undue harm by giving too much. Worthy though the cause is. So if you would like to contribute money for either of these causes, send it to, Eduloution. P.O. Box 264, Bay City, MI. 48707. Please specify to which purpose you would like your contribution put toward.

THE END

## POSTSCRIPT

As you know, a severe problem facing us is the energy crisis. I have some ideas that could buy us some time in that regard. Though unfortunately, I am not a scientist. One of the many unfortunate aspects of which is that I don't know what may have already been tried. My ideas center around the efficient disruption of the water molecule. There are two things that gave me the idea of using water to create energy. The first is that I learned in firefighting training that some fires can burn so hot that, at least initially, they will become explosive when you spray water on them. The second is an experiment I saw where they took a small canister of thermite and placed it on a large block of ice. After the thermite burned a bit, the block of ice blew itself to pieces. Unless there was some other process going on that I don't know about, this shows that after some of the water is broken down into hydrogen and oxygen, there is a lot of energy to be gained from its combustion.

The first idea I have, there is little doubt in my mind that it would work. The only question would be for how long it would work. It involves injecting hot steam into a preheated furnace that is hot enough to break the water molecule's molecular bond. Now I know that this would have to be extremely hot, but please hear me out. Over forty years ago the U.S. experimented with nuclear powered rockets. Which they hoped to be able to make operate for six hundred hours. I don't remember what material they used to house the nuclear material. But it operated at 5600 F. It would be helpful if in the decades since they discovered a material that could withstand such temperatures for even longer. Whatever the cost of manufacturing and periodically replacing the lining of the furnace with such a material would probably be less than the cost to the planet of using oil, coal, gas and nuclear power.

Also, using such a high temperature for the inside of the furnace may not be necessary. Because 2% of water disassociates into hydrogen and oxygen at 3600 F. (A full two thousand degrees less than the nuclear rocket) I would imagine the percentage of disassociation would go up sharply from there. But even 2% of hydrogen and oxygen combusting might be enough to keep the furnace at the correct operating temperature. After all, the Space Shuttle engines operated at 6000 F. Though that was with six parts hydrogen to one part oxygen that didn't need to be disassociated first. But with water being two parts hydrogen to one part oxygen, it might burn even hotter. Which could make up for the lack of volume of hydrogen and oxygen and the heat lost in disassociation. On this question, this is one area where my lack of scientific knowledge particularly comes into play. Because even though the steam inside of the furnace would be hot enough, I don't know if the available hydrogen and



oxygen would ignite while being diluted by so much water vapor.

344

As far as the percentage of hydrogen and oxygen in the steam goes, if I am right about it rising sharply after 3600 F, it might not hurt much to operate the furnace at three or four hundred degrees hotter. I also don't know if radiant energy from a parabolic dish can be focused to any degree. But if it can, the rear of the furnace could be set up like the main mirror of a Cassegrain design reflecting telescope. Bringing the focus of at least some of the radiant energy to a point where the steam enters the furnace. Another point in favor of using a furnace is that being ground based instead of being designed to fly, it could be built much more robustly. And keeping the outer parts of the furnace cool could be a main source of the hot steam that would be injected into it. Along with the heat that would be created, it would also create a lot of pressure. Most of which would probably be lost when the hydrogen and oxygen atoms recombined into water or whatever. But however it plays out, there is no doubt that even more energy could be gained from this pressure differential.

Another approach that could be used is to use something other than extremely high heat to break the water molecule's bonds. For example, every substance has a resonant frequency that will disrupt it. This brings to mind an eye operation that I saw years ago. They stuck a needle into the side of someone's eye. From the tip of the needle they emitted the resonant frequency of the lens and shattered it. The pieces of which they sucked up with another needle. Of course, water has a different structure than a lens. But there still should be a resonant frequency that would disrupt its molecular bonds.

As far as the energy needed to create such a frequency goes, the average car can have a stereo installed that can produce many thousands of watts of power without effecting the performance of the engine. This also brings to mind a machine I saw being used at a candy factory. It used a focused beam of ultrasonic sound to cut toffy bars. Though I don't know how efficiently that machine produced that sound. Whichever process is used, suppose the steam passed through a curtain of such a resonant sonic frequency before it entered into a furnace as I described earlier. As far as any standing waves go, they should be easy enough to eliminate. This could very well produce sufficient amounts of hydrogen and oxygen from the steam.

Though instead of having the steam pass through a curtain of sound, it should be more effective to have the steam travel down an appropriately long straight pipe on its way to the furnace. Down the length of which is emitted water's resonant sonic frequency. It might also be helpful to amplify the decibels of this sonic frequency with some sort of horn. As long as amplifying the decibels in this

way didn't corrupt the purity if the resonant frequency. This pipe could also have resonantly pulsed laser or maser energy shot down the length of it. Who knows, maybe using a combination of these energies could disrupt water's molecular bonds at a lower power consumption level than either of these energies would require on their own. It would also be helpful if laser or maser

345

energy could be amplified to a higher decibel level in some way as efficiently as a horn does it for sound. Also, a constant combustion may not be necessary. Simply store up electricity for say fifteen seconds and discharge it over a few seconds to supply whatever device is used with enough voltage and amperage to do what it needs to do.

Another thing is that wherever water molecules are being torn apart or hydrogen and oxygen atoms are recombining, it would probably impart an electric charge. If there is enough of it, then it would be worth the trouble of capturing it. It might also be possible to obtain electricity from the hot exhaust gasses that would be on their way to a boiler through a magnetohydrodynamic process. Thereby increasing efficiency even further. Even though it would of course require more energy, it might be more efficient to obtain hydrogen and oxygen from ice. One good thing about this approach is that being a solid structure, it would be more susceptible to sonic disruption. And because water molecules are less dense in their frozen state, they may be easier to break apart. Even if it should eventually be that the sound is being shot at a frozen fluff of ice particles. Separating the gasses should be easy enough to do. Should it be necessary to do so.

When it comes to electrolysis, I have some ideas that only a scientist would be able to judge the validity of. Suppose you had some water between two strong neodymium magnets. Would the north and south magnetic polarity have any useful effect on the electrically charged water? Also, if instead of using a direct current, suppose an alternating current was used that operated an appropriate frequency. (probably using a square sine wave pattern) Such an approach might create even more hydrogen and oxygen. But for all I know, the magnetic field might strengthen the molecular bond of the water.

All of these things of course add up to one thing. Which is gaining unlimited energy from water. Even though this is said to be impossible, given the stakes, it might still be worth the effort to look into. Such experimentation would be less technically difficult or costly than nuclear fusion experimentation. And much more likely to produce positive results. When it comes to what is technically possible, any scientist should know that science can sometimes produce unexpected results. For example, I for one wouldn't have thought it was possible

to use the energy produced by a diesel engine to compress diesel fuel to a point where it could be injected into the high pressure environment of a diesel piston cylinder when it was at the top of its compression stroke. Or there is the guy who makes bullets that, if they hit something hard like a steel plate, they will stay together and punch their way through it. But if they hit something soft like flesh, they will break apart. So just maybe there could be something to the ideas I have given here. Maybe all that is needed is to use them in the right combination. These ideas I have given here are for free for anybody to use. As

346

long as they also use them in a free manner. All I would ask is that I be given some credit where any credit may be due.

End of Postscript



