

Qx2 – Policies in *Genesis* – 1

Dear: In the previous chapter (introducing this “excursion”), I tried to describe five different paths through the religious quagmires “revealed” in the “holy books” of our culture. Named, these five paths are the literal, allegorical, historical, and scientific approaches – and then the path that I plan to take, which I’ve dubbed the “quintessential approach”. By this I mean that I plan to focus on personal and public policies promoted in these “holy books”. In this chapter, I’ll start along such a path through the Old Testament’s (OT’s) *Book of Genesis* (usually called just *Genesis*).

Before starting along the path, permit me to add some additional comments about the planned approach. I chose to name it the quintessential approach in part because I had trouble finding a more descriptive term (to describe an emphasis on the quintessential feature of any “holy book”, i.e., the policies it promotes) and in part to make fun of the ancient philosophical ideas that everything consisted of five elements (before the time of the periodic table and elementary particles such as quarks!): that fifth element (the “quintessence”) was the “soul of the universe”, whose historical and regional identifications varied from Ioupiter, Yahweh, Jupiter, to Jesus.

In a way, this quintessential approach is a scientific approach – insofar as the first step in the scientific method is to collect and try to make some sense of some data. But that’s only the first step in the scientific method, so at most, maybe I could describe my planned approach as a “preliminary scientific approach” or “observational approach”. But whatever the name used, my plan is to seek answers to the question: What personal and public policies are advocated in the principal “holy books” of our culture?

Further, let me mention that, whereas it’s abundantly clear (even from the first few sentences in *Genesis*) that the quality of religious explanations of natural phenomena is at the level of mere speculations by primitive minds and whereas even the concept of God, itself, is silly, I therefore plan to treat all subsequent “science” in all “holy books” as preposterous and ignore it, focusing only on policies. Yet, let me also mention that whereas sometimes the policies advocated in our culture’s “holy books” are so difficult to discern, sometimes I’ll rely on some historical investigations – not necessarily to try to understand how the policy was created but to try to understand what the crazy clerics were promoting!

That said (or at least written!), let me begin (once again!) with the first paragraph of the first chapter of *Genesis* as given in the *King James Version* (KJV) of the Bible [to which, as per usual, I've added some notes in "square brackets", such as these].

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God [i.e., the quintessence of the universe] moved upon the face of the waters. And God said, Let there be light; and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light Day, and darkness he called Night. And the evening and the morning were the first day.

Ignoring all the nonsense in the above quotation (some of which I tried to show you in the previous chapter), its only obvious "policy statement" is that light is "good" – a policy with which most people would agree, especially certain grandchildren who are afraid of things that go bump in the night!

Yet, although it may be quibbling, let me mention that the claim (by the cleric who wrote the above) that light is "good" is of questionable quality. Some "thing" (or process or idea) is "good" (a judgment of its "value") only in relation to some objective. When I want to sleep, for example (which seems to be quite frequent these days!), I don't consider light to be "good"; it's better when it's dark. And obviously a lot of nocturnal animals (bats, cats, etc.) aren't too "keen" on brightness, either!

Further, in fact, light has meaning only with respect to darkness (i.e., the absence of light) – so if there were a creator of the universe, then to be fair and knowledgeable, "he" would necessarily consider darkness and light to be of equal value: so, if light were "good" then so, too, would be darkness! And actually, if God were other than a figment of primitive people's imagination, then maybe "he" should have judged dark "better" than light: reportedly, even he admits that dark was first. Therefore, if something is to be classified as "good", shouldn't the first be given at least equal billing? I mean, isn't this how God gained a reputation for being "good"?!

But I quibble. I grant the cleric who wrote the above that, for those incompetent animals such as humans who have difficulty seeing in the dark, light is "good" – for human survival – especially if there are a lot of lions, tigers, and alligators roaming around in the dark, or if the electrical power fails, or if you don't have a nighttime companion – provided of course that

you don't have more fun at night, or if you don't want people to see what you're doing, or if you... Hmm. Maybe I'm not just quibbling!

But any quibbling aside, let me give the author of the above quotation the benefit of considerable doubt. Let me assume that the author knew that, as in all moral judgments, something is judged "good" vs. "bad" (and all shades in between) only relative to some objective. Thus, when I want to work, I, too, consider light to be good, and when my objective is to sleep, I consider light to be bad. Therefore, let me assume that the author meant that his god had some work to do (making the birds and bees, and so on, doncha know), and therefore, relative to his objective, describing light as "good" would be consistent – assuming the author's god can't see in the dark and/or that he has other purposes for the light. Therefore, as a policy issue, let me accept the clerical author's judgment that light is good.

But then there's the policy issue in *Genesis 1*, 21 and 22, in which God describes as "good":

...every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly...
[and which] God blessed... saying "Be fruitful and multiply."

I mean, who in her right mind would agree that ALL bacteria are good? Who in her right mind would tell any virus to "Be fruitful and multiply"? Malaria is "good"? Polio is "good"? The Black Plague is "good"? The AIDS virus is "good"? "Good" for what?! Gimme a break!

Talk about dumb public policy! In fact, if God wanted "good", then in the case of rats, sharks, and rattle snakes, I would suggest...! Which reminds me of something that I think that Ingersoll said (although this certainly isn't an exact quote): "Well, if we're talking improvements, how about making 'wellness' catching – rather than 'illness'?!"

Yet, let me again give the clerical author the benefit of even more doubt. Maybe originally there were no parasitic bacteria and viruses in the water – although I've never seen anything in the Bible to suggest that any sterilization was attempted (no doubt because such ideas weren't developed until more than 2,000 years after the Bible was written, after science finally broke from the bonds of the clerics' imprisonment). Further, I'll assume (although, as far as I know, there isn't a shred of data to support the concept) that "wellness" was originally catching and that everything truly was

“good”, just as God allegedly claimed. Furthermore, I’ll assume that, by describing something as “good”, the author meant that it assists in the attainment of God’s objective – whatever that (so far, unstated) objective might be.

And similarly it continues for the rest of the first chapter of *Genesis*, pronouncing the policy statements that various things are “good”. Let me summarize the rest in a form that most religious people in our culture would probably consider “irreverent”. About 2500 years ago, some crazy cleric (probably Ezra) looked around at his world and decided that it was “good”. Not knowing that he was the product of about a billion years of evolution, not knowing that each species (including humans) finds its ecological niche “good” only insofar as it evolves well, and apparently not realizing that about 100 years earlier in Greece the first ideas of evolution were being considered (e.g., Anaximander’s idea that people had evolved from fish) – or if realizing it, rejecting it – the crazy old cleric decided that some giant Jabberwock in the sky had come down to make everything in the world so that all of it would seem “good” to humans. Whatever. But can you imagine that some “modern” humans still “think” that the crazy cleric’s idea is correct? And that such people are Presidents and Prime Ministers?!

But it would be “good” if somewhere the crazy old cleric had considered (and that “modern” humans would consider): “good” for what? That is, what’s the objective? The nearest the clerical author came to such a consideration seems to be in *Genesis 1, 28*. There, the author does provide us with the first glimpse of his guess about God’s objective – from which we can finally assess his claims that earlier activities and productions were “good”. Thus, at *Genesis 1, 28*, we have God’s “commandment” to the first man and woman (both of whom, it’s claimed here, were created on the sixth day – although that claim is contradicted in the next myth in *Genesis*):

“Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it...” (according to the *King James Version*), or

“Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it...” (according to the *Mormon’s Pearl of Great Price*, which for reasons to be explained in later chapters, is unsurprisingly identical to the KJV), or

“Be fruitful and increase, fill the earth and subdue it...” (according to *The New English Bible*).

So there you have it, Dear, right up front, on the second page of the Bible: God's prime charge to people, the prime goal of humans, the first "commandment" as dictated by God Almighty HIMself: sex, sex, and more sex! Make lots of babies!

Thus, according to the first book of the Bible, God's objective for humans is that we're to reproduce – and it's for this purpose (we're led to conclude) that light and land and vegetation and stars and all animals were made and relative to which all were judged to be "good". Well, that's cute, of course, but surely I'm not the first one to notice how conveniently close God's alleged objective is to the obvious purpose defined by Mother Nature (i.e., the purpose "programmed" into all life by DNA molecules, namely, to continue living). But rather than quibble over this goal's authorship, let me instead attempt to express my whole-hearted support for the implied policy statement – subject, however, to some constraints.

That is, Dear, I'm in total agreement with the general principle: the ultimate measure of "good" (even of light, land, vegetation, stars, and all other life) is relative to the continuation of the human genetic code. I trust that the original author wouldn't mind if I restated the objective as follows: our prime goal (and therefore our prime measure for concepts such as good and bad, i.e., morality) is to promote our trio of survival goals (of ourselves, our genes, and our values). Unfortunately, though, "the devil is in the details" – along with a huge number of clerics who promote the policy of "be fruitful and multiply" into absurdity!

Thus, currently, the human population is roughly ten times larger than poor old Mother Earth can accommodate, rationally and realistically, without straining resources (including the environment) and without robbing future generations of their "natural" inheritance. Yet, in spite of this assessment (which no sane human questions), Christian, Islamic, and Mormon "leaders" adamantly and stupidly cling to the asinine "revelation" (written by some primitive scribe with understanding similar to that of a modern three-year old): "Be fruitful and multiply." But I already wrote about this in an earlier chapter (●). Here, therefore, let me just repeat my summary: I consider the Pope to be the most evil person in the world (where, again, by "evil person" I mean an ignorant person who has the power to influence many people, thereby causing great harm to humanity, and I consider the Pope to be "the most evil person" because his ignorance harms most people) – and then, let me move on to other policies advocated in *Genesis*.

For example, in *Genesis 2, 21*, there's the first hint of another horrible policy that, in later chapters and other books of the Bible (as I'll show you) keeps building until it becomes one of the fundamental themes advocated in the Bible, the Koran, and the Book of Mormon: that men are superior to woman (and therefore, for example, only men can be clerics). The theme starts here quietly enough with:

And so the Lord God put the man into a trance, and while he slept, He took one of his ribs and closed the flesh over the place. The Lord God then built up the rib, which He had taken out of the man, into a woman...

Essentially certainly, this male-chauvinism was deliberate: faced with the question "where did the first humans come from?" and with the observation that all humans came from women, the old (and, no doubt, male) myth-makers chose a story that suggested that females were inferior, being somewhat of an afterthought of God and made from a nonessential rib of a male. Later, I'll show you more and clearer examples advocating that men are superior to women, but let me wait until they arise.

Now, consider the story about Adam and Eve. Below, I'll quote some of this story, and because it's easier to read, let me quote just from *The New English Bible*. After giving us a conflicting story about how and when the creation of the first man and then the first woman occurred, there's the following outline of the bizarre story (from *Genesis 2 and 3*), to which I've added a few notes in square brackets:

The LORD God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to till it and care for it. He told the man, "You may eat from every tree in the garden, but not from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; for on the day that you eat from it, you will certainly die..."

[Subsequently we're introduced to a serpent that "was more crafty than any wild creature that the LORD God had made" (but, although a "wild creature", he had excellent command of the prevailing language); in due course, the serpent said to Eve, the mythical mother of humanity:]

"Of course you will not die. God knows that as soon as you eat [the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil], your eyes will be opened and you will be like gods knowing both good and evil..."

[Then, after 1) Adam and Eve ate from this amazing tree, 2) they hid from God "among the trees of the garden", 3) God couldn't find them (and thereby, so much for

the claimed omniscience of God: he didn't know even where the kids were hiding in a little garden!), and 4) Adam fell for God's trick and answered when God asked "Where are you?" (Silly Adam, that's one of the oldest tricks in the book; even my grandchildren...), then finally God said to the serpent:]

"Because you have done this you are accursed more than all cattle and all wild creatures. On your belly you shall crawl..." [By the way, Dear, did you know that all cattle and all wild creatures were "accursed"? Ah, you can learn amazingly useful stuff in the Bible!]

To the woman he said: "I will increase your labor and your groaning, and in labor you shall bear children. You shall be eager for your husband, and he shall be your master."

And to the man he said: "With labor you shall win your food... You shall gain your bread by the sweat of your brow until you return to the ground; for from it you were taken. Dust you are, to dust you shall return..."

[Finally, the LORD God reportedly ends this incredible revelation with the reported statement made to some unidentified other gods:]

"The man has become like one of us, knowing good and evil; what if he now reaches out his hand takes fruit from the tree of life also, eats it, and lives for ever?"

God then reportedly drives the pair of kids out of Eden, even posting a guard "with a sword whirling and flashing", to make sure the kids can't return.

Now, Dear, I hope you'll spend some time reflecting on the quality of the ideas in this story, trying to answer the question: what policies are being advocated? In what follows, let me show my opinionated answers to that question, along with the opinions of some other authors. And let me start commenting at the start of the story, where my comments can be somewhat jovial – for I'm sorry to find it appropriate to warn you that, as I progress through the story, my mood grows progressively more sour and dour.

In the first sentence of the quotation above, we're told that God's prime purpose in putting these two innocent kids on Earth was to "till... and care" for the garden. What silliness! In the first chapter of *Genesis*, the prime purpose for humans was defined to be "Be fruitful and multiply." That's a purpose that most people quite willingly pursue – save, of course, for Catholic nuns and priests who, following orders from the Pope, choose to disobey God's commandment to "be fruitful and multiply." [Wow! Come

to think of it: what sinners all Catholic nuns and priests thereby are – breaking God’s first recorded commandment, i.e., to “Be fruitful and multiply”. And that sinning doesn’t even account for the sins of all those clerics who chose to have sex with little boys! Or are they really so dumb as to think that...?!]

But that aside for now, what’s with this new commandment about tilling and caring for the garden? Do the innocent animals, do the fish, does any other life form need to “till... and care” for gardens? Is this task to be what distinguishes humans from all other life forms? Does some cleric seriously propose that, next to having sex, our prime purpose is to “till... and care” for gardens? Can any cleric make such a statement with a straight face?! We’re not to help one another, we’re not to develop physically or mentally or socially, we’re not to build rockets to explore space, we’re not to...? Just “till... and care” for the garden? Surely somebody’s gotta be kidding!

And surely it’s reasonable to ask: what, pray tell, was God’s reason for making humans? Does he just want someone to do his gardening? Was he really that worried about weeds? If so, why? Can’t this all-powerful god control even the weeds in his little garden? What are we, his little pets? Does he just like watching people pull weeds? Does he like to watch people having sex? A supernatural voyeur? What’s with this crazy god?! He needs a wife!

But far, FAR worse, the purpose of humans (according to this story) is explicitly NOT to learn the difference between good and evil! What could be more ridiculous? How could anyone propose such a stupid policy? Why would anyone (even someone as stupid as a cleric) want people to be unaware of the difference between good and evil? For my part, I want even house pets to know the difference, e.g., not to make messes in the house!

Or is it, I wonder, that only the clerics are to know the difference between good and evil? Are they staking their territory, here, making a professional claim? If only an architect is to design buildings, if only an engineer is to manage construction, if only a dentist is to pull teeth, if only a doctor is to perform operations, if only a plumber is to fix toilets,... then is it only the clerics who are to know the difference between good and evil. Is that how they propose to get away with charging their outrageous “professional fees”?

And what's with the snake? Apparently (according to this story), snakes originally not only knew how to talk but also (according to this "divine revelation") they were amazingly intelligent, knowing not only the ways of humans but also the ways of the gods! And to punish the snake for "tricking" Eve, what did God do to the snake? We mere humans might have thought that, as punishment, God would have withdrawn the snake's ability to talk! Thus, one might have expected to read in the story some semi-reasonable explanation in His proclamation, such as:

"Listen to me all you snakes, for I am the LORD your God, God of all snakes. Henceforth your brains will be too small to comprehend language, you will lose the use of your voice box, and I will sever and then eliminate the major nerve that controls the motion of your tongue to form words. Henceforth, you'll only be able to hiss!"

Instead, apparently snakes can still talk (?!), and all God did was remove their legs – or whatever else snakes used to stand on (besides sound logic).

It's strange, too, that the savage who concocted this story (and then the clerics who repeated the stories for their own benefit – of course "suitably adjusting" the content of the stories into forms that most benefited the clerics) decided that snakes were "cursed" to be without legs. In contrast, in my experience, snakes seem to get along amazingly well without them!

But more significantly, Dear, I hope you noticed that, in fact (or, at least according to this myth) it was the serpent that told the truth and it was God who lied! Thus, according to *The New English Bible*, God said:

...*on the day* [italics added] that you eat from it [i.e., of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil], you will certainly die.

In *The King James Version* (KJV), God's warning is essentially identical: "*for in the day* [italics added] that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Similarly, the author of the Mormon's *Pearl of Great Price* (who was undoubtedly Sidney Rigdon) once again copied the KJV, putting in God's mouth the same words: "*for in the day* [italics added] thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die".

But, Dear, upon eating the fruit, obviously the two kids (Adam and Eve) didn't die "on (or in) the day". Instead, what occurred is exactly what the serpent said would happen:

Of course you will not die. God knows that as soon as you eat it [the fruit of the tree of knowledge], your eyes will be opened and you will be like gods, knowing both good and evil.

Which then means that the clerics' God (or the clerics?) lied.

And by the way, Dear (as I'll show you more, shortly), you can get yourself into quite a philosophical quandary, if you allow the possibility that God can lie. But then, you get yourself into another quandary if God can't lie – cause then, doncha know, there's something that the allegedly all-powerful god can't do!

But before considering that, consider what Ingersoll described so well:

If the account given in *Genesis* were really true, ought we not, after all, thank this serpent? He was the first schoolmaster, the first advocate of learning, the first enemy of ignorance, the first to whisper in human ears the sacred word 'liberty', the creator of ambition, the author of modesty, of inquiry, of doubt, of investigation, of progress and of civilization.

That, of course, isn't accepted by the clerics – who also, of course, have never accepted the possibility that God lied.

Actually, Dear, if one can maintain an appropriate perspective (which I admit I have difficulty doing), one can find the predicament of the clerics (stuck in a religious quagmire of their own making) totally hilarious. The first gang of clerics (those who wrote this story) apparently didn't realize that there was quicksand on the trail they were blazing. They didn't realize it, probably because they managed to miss stepping in it. But later clerics saw it: they realized that, to protect their parasitic existence, they must maintain the ruse that God can't lie. Otherwise, they and their entire speculative scheme succumb to the quicksand: whatever they claim that their god advocates could immediately be challenged as just another lie. But here, on the third page of their "holy book", subsequent clerical fools find themselves with the only obvious way out of the quagmire being to admit that God lied.

Therefore, later clerics sought a non-obvious way out of their predicament (never underestimate the sliminess of slippery con artists). As I'll be showing you (time and time again!), the clerics chose to claim that their god didn't mean what he clearly said (i.e., what early clerics had clearly written). Instead, they claim that, by "on the day that you eat from it, you will certainly die", God meant, "on the day... you will know death".

Stated differently, the clerics claim that God was saying that, for the kid's "sin" (of disobeying God), then "on that day" they would realize that they would die. According to the clerics, God doesn't lie – but of course they admit that sometimes it's hard to interpret correctly (and easy to misinterpret) what He means. Therefore, of course it's necessary to pay the clerics appropriately, not only to pay for their professional skills in distinguishing good from evil but also as the only "approved interpreters" of God's "revealed truths".

Nonetheless, it doesn't mean (according to this silly story) that people would have lived forever, just because they wouldn't have known death: we would have died, the clerics argue, but we wouldn't realize that we would die. Thus, as God later explains (*Genesis 3, 22*), to live forever not only would humans need to learn right from wrong, we would also need to eat the fruit from another tree. Explicitly, God states:

"The man has become like one of us [gods, i.e., apparently God is in frequent communication with many other gods], knowing good and evil; what if he now reaches out his hand and takes fruit from the tree of life also, eats it, and lives forever?"

That is, Dear, the clerics claim that if Adam and Eve hadn't disobeyed God, then we humans would be similar to those animals that don't realize they'll die – but yet, eventually, they do die. Stated differently, by learning the meaning of good and evil, humans learned that to live was good and to die was evil.

There is, however, an absolute absurdity – and a horrible policy – being promoted in this story. Dear, please think about it. We're told that, originally, these two innocent youngsters were like two little bunny rabbits, totally oblivious to the difference between right and wrong, whose prime job was multiply – like "good" little bunny rabbits still do! For now, let's accept the story teller's version that these two innocent kids didn't even know that the good was to live – although all rabbits that I've met in the desert seem

acutely aware of that “good”! Then what? Well, then this alleged God tells these two bunny-rabbit-like humans not to eat a particular bunch of carrots, or clump of clover, or whatever. What would they be expected to do?

Dear, we’ve been told that these first two humans didn’t know the difference between right and wrong. Somebody (God) supposedly tells these two bunny-rabbit humans to do or not to do something. So what? The kids don’t know that they’re “supposed to do” what somebody tells them to do! That’s a value judgment. If they don’t know the difference between good and bad, then it’s just as good (or just as bad) to obey as disobey. Let me put it this way: Dear, if you ever put a bunch of carrots in front of two hungry bunnies (and bunny rabbits always seem to be hungry) and if you tell them not to eat the carrots, then guess what!

That is, Dear, God excluded the kids from knowing that “the good” was to obey. So then what? According to the crazy clerics who concocted this nonsense, God punished them for disobeying! But it was neither good nor bad of the kids to eat the fruit, for again, God excluded them from knowing the difference between good and evil. Therefore, this rotten god punished the kids for doing nothing wrong – because they were totally incapable of doing anything either right or wrong, because such concepts were forced by God to be beyond their comprehension. Would you punish those bunnies for eating the carrots? When they ate the carrots, would you then teach them what death is?

Let me put it another way. If this hideous god didn’t want the kids to eat the fruit from a particular tree, then why in hell did he put the damn thing there in the first place? And the obvious answer is rather astounding: He wanted bunny-rabbit-like pets who knew only three things: 1) how to reproduce (bunny rabbits are still very good at that!), 2) how to “till... and care” for his garden (bunny rabbits were exempt from this requirement), and 3) how to obey orders. But God made a slight mistake: he never got around to telling the kids that “the good” was to obey; specifically, that they were to obey his orders. In fact (according to this stupid story), he specifically excluded them from knowing that the good was to obey, by withholding from them the knowledge of good (to obey) and evil (to disobey) – and then the damnable god punishes the innocent kids for HIS stupid mistake!!

Further, Dear, please think about a more general aspect of the hideous policy being advocated here, on the first few pages of the Bible. Humans are to

obey without understanding?! We're to obey without knowing what's right or wrong?! We're just to obey orders?! We're to become like perfect little Nazis, but instead of saluting "Heil Hitler!", salute "Heil Yahweh!" or "Hail Jehovah!" or "Hail Allah!" or "Hail God!"? What sort of hideous, heinous policy statement is this?!!

In fact, Dear, this is the fundamental policy promoted in the entire Bible (and therefore by all clerics in all the principal religions of our culture). If you don't immediately see it, Dear, please consider again how to cut all the fluff in the Bible down to its essential message. Cut all the commandments down to a single word. I hope you see that the single word that comes closest to summarizing the entire Bible is "Obey!" It's the message right here at its start, in *Genesis*: never mind understanding, never mind what's right and wrong... just obey. In contrast, Dear, how I hope you'll gain the understanding and the strength to respond to any and all clerics of the world: "Blow it out your ear!"

Further, Dear, later in the Bible [in the New Testament (NT)], it's claimed that this eating of the fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil is the "original sin" of humans and that Jesus died to relieve us of this original sin! This is "Saint" Paul's crazy idea. Crazy compounded by stupidity!

Originally, the two kids did nothing wrong (for God didn't let them know the difference between right and wrong); so, how could theirs be "the original sin"? And even if the kids had done something wrong (which they didn't), what craziness to punish later humans for something that earlier humans did. And then, as the basis of all Christianity (and Mormonism), how about the utter stupidity of the concept of punishing someone presented as the epitome of "good" (i.e., the clerics' Jesus) to "absolve" all humans of the guilt of this "original sin"?

Following that sort of "reasoning", if I do something wrong, my daughter is guilty until my granddaughter is punished?! Gimme a break. Punish the innocent to absolve the guilty?! That's not only stupid and crazy, it's evil. As Nietzsche wrote about the community of clerics who wrote the NT:

...an absurd problem came to the surface: "How COULD God permit that [i.e., the crucifixion of Jesus]!" ...the deranged reason of the little community [of clerics] found quite a frightfully absurd answer: God gave his Son for forgiveness, as a SACRIFICE... The SACRIFICE FOR GUILT, and just in its most repugnant and barbarous form – *the sacrifice of the innocent for the sins of the guilty!*

Dear: are you following the story line? According to the crazy cleric who wrote this crap (and the crazy clerics who still promote it), a horrible god demands obedience without knowledge. Then, when he doesn't get the desired obedience from two little bunny rabbits (who were specifically excluded from knowing that "the good" was to obey), this giant Jabberwock in the sky (who doesn't have a clue about justice) sentences them to death for "disobedience" – and also sentences all future humans to the same death penalty. But later (according to a later story in the Bible), apparently this supernatural "judge" reconsiders his punishment for all people (for the non-sin of the original two), presumably sees his error (for the original kids could, by definition, do no wrong), and therefore (!) he kills his own son to "atone" for his own error! What sort of madness is this? It's bizarre! It's evil. It's the Bible.

Meanwhile, there's more stupidity in God's stated punishments of Adam and Eve. Eve did nothing wrong (by definition, since "wrong" wasn't even in her vocabulary), but this stupid God's punishment (also for all subsequent women!!) was not only a death sentence (to be carried out later) but "you shall be eager [i.e., feel a sexual urge] for your husband". Well I should hope so, you stupid God: as with all animals, what better way to "be fruitful and multiply" (as you demanded) except by having females choose when and with whom to mate?! Are you proposing that a better way is for men to just rape women? And further, you hideous God, why do you plan to punish all future women for the alleged "wrong" of one?

Clearly the clerics who concocted this crap are promoting male chauvinism. In punishment for her "sin" of learning the difference between good and evil, the clerics have their god tell Eve (*Genesis* 3, 16):

"I will increase your labor and your groaning, and in labor you shall bear children. You shall be eager for your husband, and he shall be your master."

So, Dear, in case you had any doubt, God HIMself told each and every wife that "your husband... *shall be your master.*" Marriage is not a marriage of equals; marriage means the man becomes a master. Wives are not their husband's partners, they become their husband's property. This isn't my policy position, Dear, it's the clerics. It was stated by God Almighty HIMself. Who am I to...?

Yes, Dear, I agree it's sick. And in case you didn't notice it here, you'll see many more examples in what follows: tyrants (such as this god invented by the clerics for their own benefit) rule by pain and torture, similar to the pain women are to experience during childbirth. But maybe already you see, Dear, why the author Massey (to be referenced later) urged his readers:

Do but think what [women have] suffered from the belief – the foul and foolish calumny – that she was the cause of the fall of the human race! She ought never to forgive it. She ought to wake up and work, and sleep no more, until that lying libel is dead and damned, and the whole system of false teaching to which it belongs is swept out of the world forever.

How could anyone promote the evil described even in the first few pages of the Bible? How could any sane person preach such crap?? Who in his or her right mind would “believe” such nonsense??? People who say they “believe” that “the Bible is God's holy truth” need psychiatric help.

And then there's God's “punishment” for all men – because of the non-sin of the original man: before their death sentence is executed, men will be required to work. How can anyone go from incredible stupidity to even more stupidity? To be able to work, to produce, to shape the world, to improve our lot, to take control of our own destinies is one of the greatest pleasures available to humans!

So this stupid god's punishment for humans was actually two things that humans can enjoy: work and sex! This God is bananas. As Ayn Rand wrote:

[The Doctrine of Original Sin] declares that [man] ate the fruit of the tree of knowledge – he acquired a mind and became a rational being. It was the knowledge of good and evil – he became a moral being. He was sentenced to earn his bread by his labor – he became a productive being. He was sentenced to experience desire – he acquired the capacity of sexual enjoyment. The evils for which [the clerics] damn him are reason, morality, creativeness, joy – all the cardinal values of his existence.

But being damned is one thing. Why bar the kids from Eden? Well, according to the crazy clerics who wrote this junk, God HIMSELF said it was to keep them from living forever! A really nice guy, this god. With a god like him, who needs the devil?!

Yet, that's not all. If you want to stare craziness in its face, Dear, consider this. The fundamental quackery promoted by all Christian, Muslim, and

Mormon clerics is their claim that, if you'll not think for yourself but just do whatever they say (of course including paying them for telling you what to do!), then you'll live forever in "eternal bliss in paradise." But right here at the start of the Bible (claimed to be the "revealed word" of God, on which all of Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Mormonism is based), God explicitly stated his concern:

"...what if he [Adam] now reaches out his hand and takes fruit from the tree of life also, eats it, and lives forever?"

So he kicks the kids out of paradise; he prevents them from living forever. Obviously, then, he doesn't want people to live forever. But then, what about the con game promoted by the clerics?! Their boss said he didn't want people to live forever, and yet they promise... Weird? Bizarre? Crazy!

Actually, though, I rather expect that God kicked the kids out to protect his monopoly on power: only the gods were to know the difference between good and evil. And actually, now that I think of it, it's rather a pity that this God, Himself, doesn't eat some fruit from his damn tree to learn the difference between good and evil! For everything in this story points to the obvious assessment that this God is evil! Supreme evil.

He's also supremely stupid. For example, according to this story, God apparently thinks that there's a "tree of the knowledge of good and evil", as if "good and evil" were absolute concepts, hanging like fruit on some giant tree. And because the first thing that the naked kids reportedly did, after eating from the tree, was to cover their wonderful body parts that permitted them to continue to live and to reproduce (as they were told to do), then obviously according to this "divine revelation", one of the fruits of this tree apparently had written on it: "It's evil to be seen naked (even by your spouse)!" Which then prompts me to write a note to this stupid God.

Hey there – wait a minute God. You kept telling us what was "good": light, plants, stars, and so on. You told us what to do: "be fruitful and multiply". We then could agree that your creations were "good" relative to your assigned objective to "be fruitful and multiply". And now, when the kids finally learn what's "good", their body parts that permit them to execute your prime directive are not "good" but "bad"? Did I miss something in the translation? Are you having trouble communicating? Are you sure your head's screwed on the right way? How did "the good"

so quickly turn bad? What then is good? Oh, sorry, now I see it: the “good” is “to till and care” for the garden! And then there’s “the good” that I guess is written on one of those apples that the kids weren’t to touch: “The good is to obey!”

But meanwhile, you stupid God, pray tell what’s “evil” about being seen naked? Is it that old fogeys like you and the clerics don’t want your old bodies compared to the bodies of youngsters?! If you want evil, think about lying to a couple of innocent kids; think about putting a couple of innocent kids in a no-win situation; think about... And, God, if there’s a possibility that you can think, think about the asinine concept of some absolute good and evil? In that tree do you also have an apple on which it’s written that it’ll be evil, 2500 years in the future, to make a U-turn in your car on Broadway?

And if all of this is too much for you to comprehend, idiot God, then let me give you a hint: “good” and “evil” are meaningless concepts unless they’re related to an objective. And because the only purpose you proposed for the kids was to have sex and to pull weeds in your damn garden, then only those things that contributed to or distracted from that purpose could be identified as “good” or “evil”. Eating some particular fruit was irrelevant to the prescribed goal, so God, to coin a phrase: “Blow it out your ear!”

Further, God, pray tell what in hell is all the stuff later in your book about eternal life in heaven or hell? I mean: up front in this stupid book, you say that you don’t want humans to become “like one of us”... and live forever – either in heaven or hell. You explicitly threaten us, nice guy that you are, that you’ll turn us all back to dust. So, pray tell, just what kind of shell game are you playing? Now you get it, now you don’t?

In contrast to all this craziness and stupidity, Dear, please consider reality. In contrast to all the crazy myths concocted “to explain” why people die (e.g., the crazy idea that people die because Adam and Eve ate some forbidden fruit) and “to explain” what happens when we die (e.g., the crazy stuff in the New Testament, which was later copied into the Koran and the Book of Mormon, about a day of Judgment and then a sentence for eternity!), all data suggest that, when we die, all material in our bodies return to the universe from which it came.

Further (and as I've already written), the only "souls" that continue are 1) the (modified) DNA codes that we pass on to any children that we might have had, and 2) any ideas that we have had that other people might continue to use. As for the question "why do we die?", I've also addressed that question in an earlier chapter. The essence of the answer is: because there's substantial survival value to any species if individual members have only a finite lifetime.

But let me go into that answer in a little more detail, because knowing it is critical to clearing up a terrible confusion that permeates all the "holy books" of our culture. I want to mention two aspects of this idea that there's survival value for the species if individuals have only a finite lifetime. Both aspects deal with adaptation to change: one with changes in the physical environment; the other with changes in the biological environment.

Thus first, from only a few examples, it's amazing that Darwin clearly saw the general principle that natural changes in the physical environment would lead to survival advantages for offspring with appropriately modified characteristics (e.g., if the climate became colder, then animals with more hair would have a survival advantage), which then would be favored in their own offspring. We can now see how Darwin's principle of "natural selection" (or evolution) can be used to answer a huge number of questions, from why giraffes developed long necks, to why cacti developed thorns, and from why huge mammals such as whales returned to the sea, to why people preferentially had black skin and large brains. In some cases, the original species might have become extinct – but new species evolved, because individual members had only a finite lifetime.

To see the other mentioned advantage of individuals having only a finite lifetime (namely, to adapt to the biological environment), let me remind you of the principle I mentioned in an earlier chapter: successful systems attract parasites. In particular, Dear, the survival advantage to a species whose members have only a finite lifetime is that successful living systems (viz., species) do attract parasites. To illustrate, consider what is arguably far-and-away the most successful living system, namely, plants.

Plants are astounding. They take inert elements from the soil, add some water and carbon dioxide, and with only the Sun's light, they manage to build enormously complex hydrocarbon molecules. They do that courtesy the absolutely amazing chlorophyll molecule. It uses photons from the sun

to free electrons. These freed electrons then break hydrogen free from water molecules. The hydrogen then joins with carbon (from carbon dioxide) to form hydrocarbons. But unfortunately for such an astounding successful system, plants attracted parasites such as insects and animals, e.g., humans!

Meanwhile, though, we animals are also quite successful systems. Thereby, we have attracted our own set of parasites: not only clerics but also a huge variety of bacteria and viruses. Now, Dear, my background in biology is embarrassingly weak, but as you can see even from your dictionary, bacteria are typically “one-celled microorganisms that have no chlorophyll, multiply by simple division, and can cause diseases such as pneumonia, tuberculosis, and anthrax.” Basically, all that bacteria need to survive is a host environment on which they can “munch”. In contrast, viruses are “capable of multiplying only in connection with living cells and are regarded both as living organisms and as complex proteins...”. They cause illnesses in humans from measles to polio, and from some cancers to AIDS.

And my point in going through all of that was just to say this: there is enormous survival advantage for any species to frequently replace individual members with “fresh” (parasite-free) new members, with new “codes” for their DNA and for creating proteins, while casting aside old members who succumb to the species’ parasites, such as the various bacteria and viruses – and, for that matter, those who succumb to various clerics!

In summary, Dear, there are enormous survival advantages to any species if individual members of the species have finite lifetimes. These advantages are the abilities to adapt to changes in both the physical and biological environment. Therefore, “the good” (for the survival of the species) is, in fact, for individual members to die. Death is good! Yet, Dear, I trust that you wouldn’t mind if I tried to delay my own for a little while – because, in fact, it’s also “good” if each of us has a chance to live for awhile, e.g., to pass on “words of wisdom” to our grandchildren!

As an example, Dear, let me try to pass on the following “words of wisdom” – while wishing I could do it so forcefully that you’d never forget them. Dear, in their incredible stupidity, the ancient clerics who wrote the “holy books” of our culture, as well as all current clerics of all organized religions, are totally wrong. Death is not the enemy. The enemy is stupidity. The God idea is incredibly stupid. Therefore, the God idea is the enemy.

Therefore, Dear, please live your life as best you can. Try to help these human genes go on. Help intelligence to continue and to expand. And while you're at it, if you'll evaluate the data for yourself, I'm sure that you'll come to the intelligent realization that one of the ways that all humans help these human genes go on is by dying – in due course.

With this knowledge of death, Dear, how I wish you'd see that the whole of Christianity, Islam, and Mormonism (and all such stupid religions) implode in their stupidities. The premiss is wrong; therefore, all subsequent statements are wrong. In the Bible, the first few pages display the false premiss that death of the individual is bad and that continued life of the individual is good. This premiss is shown to be false by a billion years worth of data showing that death of the individual is good for the survival of the species. Consequently, all of the Bible's (Koran's, Book of Mormon's, ...) subsequent statements, relying on the faulty premiss about death, will be similarly stupid.

“So,” a certain grandchild might be thinking, “if the rest of the Bible is wrong, why not skip going through it?” Well, Dear, you can bet that I'm sorely tempted to avoid slogging my way through all the mud and guck and quicksand in the quagmire of “revealed religions”, but I really should continue. In part, I should show you some details of how the original error is compounded, but more significantly, as incredible as it may seem, the Bible (and the other “holy books” of our culture) propose and promote even more pathetic policies that those already identified – on the first few pages of the first such “holy book”!

But in view of the length to which this chapter has grown (and the height to which my emotions have grown) and because this is a convenient point to take a break from the Bible, let me set aside comments on the rest of *Genesis* until the next chapter. Here, let me just add a few summary comments about this first story, about the fictitious first-two humans. And I say “fictitious”, of course, because in reality (according to an enormous body of data) humans evolved from less intelligent animals – although, given the intelligence of the average cleric, I'm not prepared to argue too forcefully against the intelligence of “lower” animals.

To start my summary, I suppose I should apologize for my “emotive writing”, even though I warned you that it would appear. I'm sorry for it, Dear, but again, stupidity such as the Bible's really “gets to me”: the

stupidity of this god, the stupidity of the fools who created these myths, and worst, the stupidity of all the damnable clerics who have perpetuated and perpetrated this junk during the past multi-thousands of years. Maybe at least you're beginning to understand my summary assessment: "Belief in god (any god) is silly science and pathetic policy – sad personal policy and sick public policy."

As for my summary assessment of this first story in *Genesis* (the story of Adam and Eve), I'd say that, without doubt, it's the worst story told in the history of the Western World. It's been the worst possible virus, far worse than the AIDS virus, causing the worst plague that our culture has ever suffered. If I could have only one wish, I would be severely tempted to wish that all record and memory of the story of Adam and Eve (and of the entire chapter entitled *Genesis*, and for that matter, the entire Bible, and for that matter, all "holy books"!)) would be totally obliterated – save for illustrating the evils that result when clerical stupidity is supplemented with power.

Yet, I would also want to wish that everyone would see that, except for the enormous economic power that the clerics have gained from gullible people, fundamentally, the clerics are powerless. The only power that the clerics have is given to them by the people – because the clerics managed to capture the people's imagination (especially about what happens to people after they die). To see this, Dear, and more importantly to begin to free the people from the clerics, perhaps the best thing to do is laugh at their stupidities.

If people would begin to see through the clerics' con games, and start to laugh at all their absurdities, I expect that the first thing the clerics will do is use their economic clout to feed the people more propaganda. But if the people would continue to ridicule the parasitic clerics, they would need to use their money to feed their own parasitic existence. And when their wealth finally vanishes, then too, so would all the damnable clerics. It would be like some giant sterilization process for the whole world, ridding humanity of all parasitic clerics.

But that's enough for now. Now it's time for you to take a break, get some exercise, do your homework, do your work at home... and when you find some time, please read more of the Bible, up to and including *Genesis 15* (i.e., up to about page 15). Thank you.