

Qx3 – Policies in Genesis – 2

Dear: For this chapter, I plan to continue to slog through the mud and guck of *Genesis*. As I struggle through, I'll continue to add notes to quotations [in brackets such as these], with the quotes taken mostly from the New English Bible. In the previous chapter, I left off with Adam and Eve fully clothed, hiding their shameful body-parts that permitted them to execute God's prime directive (i.e., to have sex). In their "profession", clerics don't need logic.

Eventually, though, Adam and Eve discarded their loincloths (probably in the dark, even though light was claimed to be "good"), fulfilled God's prime directive (to have sex), and in due course, Eve gave birth first to Cain and then to Abel. Subsequently, so the story goes (*Genesis 4, 3–7*):

Abel was a shepherd and Cain a tiller of the soil. [And so, Cain was apparently a good guy – because God never said anything about doing any shepherding, explicitly giving humans only the specific tasks of making babies, tilling the soil, and caring for gardens.] **The day came when Cain brought some of the produce of the soil as a gift to the Lord** [though why he did so isn't stated; perhaps he was working as a tenant farmer, only leasing his acreage from the great land-Lord in the sky, doncha know]; **and Abel brought some of the first-born of his flock, the fat portion of them. The Lord received Abel and his gift with favor; but Cain and his gift he did not receive. Cain was very angry and his face fell. Then the Lord said to Cain, "Why are you so angry and cast down? If you do well, you are accepted; if not, sin is a demon crouching at the door. It shall be eager for you, and you will be mastered by it."**

What incredible idiocy! And what an idiotic and damnable god – or better, what idiotic and damnable clerics who concocted this god.

In outline, this story tells of two brothers who gave to their god the best presents they could produce. And what does this damnable god do? He shows favoritism! Worse, the favoritism he shows is not to Cain, the brother who did what God had directed (till and care for the garden), but to Abel, the brother who gave God some high-cholesterol fat from his flock of sheep.

This twisted tale could probably be used as ingredients for another myth, to "explain" why most kids like fatty foods more than their vegetables! But in case God has forgotten (*Genesis 1*), people were supposed to be vegetarians. Or did he make humans in his image (a fat-food junky) and he just wanted more than his share? A greedy fat-food junky?

THE YAHOO YAHWEH

But more to the point, this god (Yahweh) is a real yahoo (“a rude, noisy, or violent person”). The story is that he just finished punishing Adam and Eve (and all humanity) for not obeying orders (even though he neglected to tell them that it was “good” to obey his orders), with his punishment (for not obeying orders that he didn’t explain) being death – for everyone! And now, inconsistent as hell, this fat-food junky rejects the gift from the kid who did obey orders (i.e., Cain), the one who did till and care for the garden (as God told people to do). And continuing his inconsistency, this wonky god didn’t punish the kid who disobeyed (i.e., Abel), who not only apparently refused to be a vegetarian and refused to till and care for the garden (as God had directed), but instead, took off into the hills and did who-knows-what with his sheep. Such idiocy stimulates me to question:

What’s it to be, God? Are humans to be punished and rejected for disobeying or for obeying your incomprehensible orders?!

Further, clearly this damnable god has zero class. Bad enough that this barbaric god displayed the boorishness of favoring one kid’s present over the other, but then this stupid god makes the incredibly idiotic statement: “**If you do well, you are accepted...**” The nincompoop god is clearly hung-up on absolutes: not only does he think that there’s some absolute “good and evil” (like fruit on some giant tree), but now he reveals his asinine opinion that there’s some absolute “doing well”—which stimulates me to respond:

Hey, goonish god: “doing well” is a judgment call. In Cain’s opinion, he did well; it’s only in your twisted mind that he didn’t do well – giving you the benefit of considerable doubt that you have a mind. Further, what you judge as “done well” is only from your perspective as a fat-food junky!

And then there’s this god’s oafish suggestion that Cain would be rejected for not doing well! Please, Dear, think about the messages both contained in and missing from this myth:

- If Cain hadn’t tried and if God then reprimanded Cain for not trying, that would be different. The myth could then be used to promote the policy: “**Do the best you can with what you have.**”
- But Cain wasn’t reprimanded by this damnable god for not failing to try (although, I don’t see why Cain tried in the first place), and

- Cain wasn't reprimanded by this asinine god for not failing to do what he was told (for apparently, he did do what he was told, i.e., till and care for the garden).
- Instead, Cain was reprimanded for not succeeding in pleasing the unstated desires of the fat-food-junky Yahweh, who like a little child, didn't want to eat his vegetables.

This god, whom the clerics concocted out of (and in) thin air, is a tyrant, with the social development of a two year old. Recall “the terrible twos”. And an obvious message in this myth is that it's never adequate to do what a childish tyrant demands: you can never satisfy a tyrant's unspecified desires. Instead, people are to cringe and grovel and, no matter what, try to keep the tyrant happy: don't do what you think is right, do what the dictator says is right. Well, my response to this god and all similar tyrants is:

I'll use my gun to be sure there's a big enough hole to blow it out your ear.

And although you may find it hard to imagine, Dear, there's even more ignorance – more evil – in this myth. The clerics who concocted it have their god saying to Cain:

“Why are you so angry and cast down? If you do well, you are accepted; if not, sin is a demon crouching at the door. It shall be eager for you, and you will be mastered by it.”

With that little line, “**sin is a demon crouching at the door**”, these myopic myth makers, the damnable clerical authors, parasitic perpetrators of evil, have done something truly horrible: they've totally twisted the concept of being “**cast down**” (i.e., being dissatisfied with your performance), turning a “good” into an “evil” (“**a demon crouching at the door**”). Thus:

- To say that “**if you do well, you are accepted**” is shallow. In contrast, I hope that you, Dear, won't “accept” your doing well – if you know that you could have done better.
- But to say “**if not [i.e., if you don't do well]... you will be mastered by [sin]**” is horrible. In contrast, Dear, never mind if you don't do well relative to some external standard, so long as you did the best you could.
- But worse: to suggest that not doing well (when you did your best) has anything whatsoever to do with sin is pure unadulterated evil.

Dear, there may be nothing about humans better than our being dissatisfied with our performance. As Brian Hayward wrote:

There is no sin. It is an invention to shame people into believing fantasies. We are the only animals known to desire to act differently (often better) than we do. This is a glorious quality, and provides optimism that we will eventually improve ourselves. We should be proud of it, not ashamed.

Poor Cain! Would that he could have seen that his dissatisfaction was a sign of his glorious human quality to try to succeed. Once again the real demon crouching at the door was a cleric!

Dear: Please think more about the twisted concepts of sin that are being advocated by the clerics who wrote this horrible book called the Bible – concepts still being preached by the idiot clerics of our culture. First is the suggestion that eating the fruit “from the tree of knowledge” was a sin. This is doubly horrible: on the one hand, suggesting that humans aren’t to become knowledgeable about the difference between good and evil, and on the other hand, advocating punishment for gaining such knowledge. And then the damnable clerics who wrote and promote this crap add insult to that double injury: promoting the idiocy that the first two humans were punished for not obeying – when they were excluded from knowing whether obeying was good or evil! And now, in this crazy story about Cain and Abel, the damnable clerics suggest that remorse for not doing so well as we hoped is “sin” – that it’s “**a demon crouching at the door**”! Damn all clerics of the world to their concocted hell.

THE CAIN CONSPIRACY

In addition, I should admit my suspicions that this silly myth about Cain and Abel contains additional, partially hidden messages. My suspicions arise when I see that God’s favored kid (Abel) was a shepherd (as were the Hebrews), whereas the rejected kid (Cain) was a farmer (whom the Hebrew shepherds no doubt saw as the wave of the future, passing them by, and an industry probably dominated by women and therefore obviously “evil”). Viewed differently, we’re left with a picture of shepherds deciding (surprise, surprise) that their god favors shepherds – just as the Pygmies decided... Talk about sick policies.

My suspicions about hidden messages in the myth increase when the shepherds’ clerics give absolutely zero reason for the farmer (Cain) to kill the shepherd (Abel). Instead, Cain had ample reason to kill God – and would that he would have: thereby, Cain could have saved humanity

uncountable horrors. But having the farmer kill the shepherd certainly was a great way for the clerics to stimulate and perpetuate hate between two groups of people, i.e., between shepherds and farmers.

Further, consider the punishment the clerics claim was meted out to the first farmer, who (they claim) killed the first shepherd. It's described in *Genesis* 4, 12–13, where they have their partisan god say:

“When you till the ground, it will no longer yield you its wealth. You shall be a vagrant and a wanderer on earth.”

Dear, think about the crazy concepts of justice being advocated here. Suppose that the first farmer, Cain, did kill the first shepherd, Abel. Then, when the clerics had a chance (when they concocted this story), why didn't they promote some justice? What sort of justice is it to sentence two innocent kids (Adam and Eve) to death for gaining understanding? What sort of justice is it to punish all future humans (with the death penalty, no less!) because of an alleged error of two innocent kids? And now, what sort of justice is being promoted if someone identified as a killer is set free, to be “a vagrant and a wander on earth” – exactly as the old shepherds were!

The clerics' messages seem clear. There's no significant punishment for killing another human, especially if that human belongs to a different class (farmer vs. herder). Just obey orders, don't learn the difference between right and wrong, and no matter what else you do, placate the clerics and their god. I wonder if “modern” Jewish clerics ever wonder where the Nazis got their ideas. Heil Yahweh!

But the shepherds' clerics didn't let the farmer off totally free for killing the herder. They had their God put “a mark” on Cain. Two innocent kids (Adam and Eve) get the death sentence for doing nothing wrong; all humanity is to suffer because we're related to the first two (innocent) kids. And now, a murderer is set free – save for a mark? What sort of mark? What craziness did the clerics contrive in this story of Cain?

Well, Dear, the craziness of the clerics seems unlimited. Just as they assigned the death sentence to all future generation (because of a non-sin of the first two people), the crazy clerics assigned “the mark of Cain” to all future people who had “the mark” – with “the mark” defined to be anything that subsequent clerics decided!

It must have been, in the clerics' view, a perfect way to promote hatred among different classes and different races, wherein all the clerics need do is conveniently identify "the mark of Cain" to be skin color, nose shape, eye formation, or whatever. In particular, as you well know, the perpetrators of the madness called Mormonism decided that "the mark of Cain" was having black skin – until the civil-rights movement of the 1960s finally forced the Mormon maniacs to abandon such idiocy.

But instead, the original clerics had God HIMself clearly state why he "marked" Cain. Cain was whining (*Genesis 4, 14*):

My punishment is heavier than I can bear; thou [God] hast driven me today from the land... I shall be a vagrant and a wanderer on earth, and anyone who meets me can kill me.

And the rest of the story is this:

The Lord answered him, "No: if anyone kills Cain, Cain shall be avenged sevenfold." So the Lord put a mark on Cain, in order that anyone meeting him should NOT kill him [emphasis added].

So, Dear, "the mark of Cain" was a "good" mark: it was put there to protect a murderer from harm! And so you see, in obedience to their God, subsequent crazy clerics didn't advocate killing black people, just enslaving them – no doubt solely to keep them from being killed. [Sorry, Dear, sometimes I have trouble constraining my sarcasm.] And, Dear, in case it's not clear how Cain's death could be "avenged sevenfold", the clerics attempt to explain it in *Genesis 4, 14*, with a little lyric by Lamech:

I kill a man for wounding me
A young man for a blow.
Cain may be avenged seven times,
But Lamech seventy-seven.

Thus, see what the clerics cooked-up for Cain? The "mark of Cain" meant that if someone killed Cain, then, e.g., seven of the killer's tribe would be killed. Thereby, the clerics continue to paint a picture of their crazy ideas of justice: not only to set a murderer free but also to provide him with the most amazing amount of "police protection" that the world has ever known!

Any yet, among all the horrors in this stupid little story about Cain and Abel, there's also a little humor. For example, after allegedly slaying his brother and succumbing to God's twisted ideas of justice:

Then Cain went out from the Lord's presence and settled in the land of Nod to the east of Eden.

Hello? Almighty God, HIMself, just finished telling Cain that he was to be "a vagrant and a wanderer on earth." So then what happened to Cain? He "settled" ...!?! Is it a misprint? Apparently not, because next we're told:

Then Cain lay with his wife; and she conceived and bore Enoch. Cain was then building a city...

Cain found a wife? Cain built a city?? Cain was sentenced to be "a vagrant and a wanderer"??? Surely anyone who demands at least a little logic (clerics don't) asks:

Hey, wait a minute: where did Cain's wife come from?

We've just been told that the only two people on Earth (Adam and Eve) had two sons (Cain and Able). Therefore, whereas the Earth's population was now only three people (with Able dead), where did Cain find a wife? Was his wife also his mother, Eve?! Are the crazy clerics now promoting incest – when even "lowly" animals avoid it? And what kind of "city" was the "vagrant and wander", Cain, "building", when there were now (according to the Bible) only four people on Earth [Adam, Eve, Cain, and his son, Enoch]? Some city! Some story!! Some craziness!!!

But at least the craziness in the story is consistent with the quality of its messages. The sheep-herding clerics managed to convey a message to instill group loyalty, in the herders, through class hatred. The message is: bad farmers kill good herders and then move to cities! And the same clerics managed to fortify their parasitic positions by instilling fear of clerics within their tribe, for they were the personal representatives of a tyrannical god, whose idea of justice was a joke: He sentences innocent kids to death, plans to punish all future generations for alleged crimes of the first parents, sets murderers free, provides them with police protection, and promotes incest! But, Dear, don't burn your Bible yet, because you're only on page 5, and the craziness continues for another 1500-or-so pages (☹).

GOD ADMITS HE MAKES MISTAKES!

Dear, in the previous chapter, I showed you that God lied: he said that **on** [or “in”] **the day** Adam and Eve ate fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, they would **certainly die**. That was a lie; we’re later told (at *Genesis* 5, 5) that Adam lived “**nine hundred and thirty years, and then he died**.” In the previous chapter, I also mentioned at least a little of the humor of watching subsequent clerics attempt to squirm out of the fact that God lied – and squirm they feel they must, since if God is a known liar, then the entire Bible (and the clerics’ con games!) are exposed as unreliable: any advocated policy can be labeled as “just another of God’s lies”!

Yet, a defense that the clerics might attempt (although I’ve never seen it done) is to say that lying isn’t necessarily wrong (or “sinful”). Thus, Dear, and as you know, sometimes it’s acceptable to lie. For example, do tell your mother that you really liked the dinner (realizing how much effort she invested in being kind to you). As your grandmother says: **Maybe it’s okay to lie when the intended beneficiary isn’t yourself**. So, clerics could argue:

Okay, God lied, but he wasn’t ‘sinful’, because he said what he did to try to help Adam and Eve (to avoid knowledge of their death).

But now in the Bible, at *Genesis* 6, the clerical authors inform us that God makes mistakes – and as I’ll try to show you, the seriousness of that “revelation” dwarfs even the seriousness of the fact that God lies. First, though, have a look at the following “revelation” that God makes mistakes (from *Genesis* 6, 1–7). I’ve added some “running comments”, to expose the idiocy of the story, even though the comments aren’t relevant to my main point (about the “fact” that God makes mistakes).

When mankind began to increase and to spread all over the earth and daughters were born to them, the sons of the gods [So, not only are there many gods, there are sons of the many gods. Was Jesus one of them?!] **saw that the daughters of men were beautiful; so they took for themselves such women as they chose...** [And so, apparently, if you’re the son of a god, you can just take any woman you choose. And how to judge which women to take (according to the sons of gods)? Well, not by their personality, perseverance, mental abilities, artistic talents, or some other capabilities that might help you survive (such as being able to cook or knowing how to fix a turbocharged 300Z) but instead, by their “beauty”...! Was that God’s criterion for choosing Mary? Do you mean that she couldn’t fix my Z? Well, then, I sure in hell ain’t gonna keep asking her for help!]

In those days, when the sons of the gods had intercourse with the daughters of men [So there you have it, from the “holy Bible” itself, God’s “holy words” themselves: true to the bit about being “made in god’s image”, the sons of the gods have appropriate and appropriate-size “equipment” to rape human females – and thereby, by the way, it’s obviously “good” for male gods to want sex, but as God ordained for Eve, it’s “evil” for women to want sex)] **and got children by them, the Nephilim were on Earth. They were the heroes of old, men of renown...** [“Heroes”? “Men of renown” resulted from the sons of the gods raping female humans? That’s what it takes to be a hero and to be renown? Just have a god for a grandfather? I know that grandfathers are... but tell me, is there any chance that more significant determinants were each kid’s personality, perseverance, courage, intelligence, and so on? Who would have thought?! – And the answer is: certainly not the conniving clerics who polluted humanity with this garbage.]

When the Lord saw that man had done much evil on Earth [“Man” did evil?! What about those sons of the gods?! The men were “heroes” and “men of renown.” In contrast, the sons of gods were sons-of-bitches – and sons of horribly “evil” gods (not only for their stupid ideas about justice and “doing well”, but for letting their sons rape human females!)] **and that his [man’s] thoughts and inclinations were always evil** [For cryin’ out loud, at their worst, the men were just following examples set by the sons of the sons-of-bastards called “gods”!] **he was sorry that he had made man on Earth and he was grieved at heart. He said, “This race of men whom I have created, I will wipe them off the face of the Earth – man and beast, reptiles and birds. I am sorry that I ever made them.”**

I’m sorry for all the “notes”, Dear, but as you might have already noticed, such idiocy really “gets to me”. And there’s still more idiocy, which I’ll mention even before I get to my main point (about God making mistakes).

Thus, according to his own words (if anyone is foolish enough to “believe” this crap), this all-powerful (‘omnipotent’) god isn’t very powerful. Oh, sure, he was credited with being able to snap his fingers (or whatever) to create “**heaven and earth**”, but apparently influencing time (the Greek god *Cronus*) was too much for him. That is, if this god were dissatisfied with what he had done, why didn’t he just push the “rerun button”? Alternatively, if had made the mistake of not including a “rerun button” in his design, then if he had watched a few episodes of *Star Trek*, surely he would have seen how to use space warps to go backwards in time...

But my main point is that, by his own admission, God makes mistakes. Thus, not only did this all-powerful (‘omnipotent’) god not have enough power to push the rewind button (or have the foresight to include one), but this all-knowing (‘omniscient’) god doesn’t know enough to avoid mistakes.

Specifically, we learn (from his own admission of his feelings of remorse) that what he did was a mistake:

...he was sorry that he had made man on Earth and he was grieved at heart.

Dear: please consider some of the repercussions of this “revelation” (that God makes mistakes). The repercussions reverberate through the rest of the Bible and throughout all the “Abrahamic religions” (Judaism, Christianity, Islam, Mormonism...).

According to his own admission, God makes mistakes; therefore, anything God said or will yet say could be another mistake:

“Go forth and multiply – whoops, my mistake; your husband... shall be your master – whoops, another mistake; the Commandments are – whoops, sorry, some mistakes must have crept in there; masturbation and homosexuality are abominations – whoops, my bad; I told Paul that women should be silent – whoops, a bit of a slip there; I told Muhammad kill the unbelievers – whoops, a whopper of a mistake there; I told Joseph Smith – damn, I can’t even remember all the mistakes I relayed to him.”

Thus, Dear, with the “revelation” that God makes mistakes, all “revealed religions” collapse in absurdities. They’re preposterous. Whatever policy or purpose they propose can be (and should be!) dismissed as just another of God’s lies or mistakes!

Dear, please think about it, because it’s a quicksand quagmire of the clerics’ own making, into which they fell – and out from which they can’t extricate themselves!

Thus, if the clerics’ God makes mistakes (as we know he does, not only because he forgot to tell Adam and Eve that it was “good” to obey but also because even God admits he made a mistake by creating humans), then we have no way of knowing if anything that God says is “right”: it could be just another of God’s mistakes! Consequently, no “morality” allegedly dictated by God can be accepted as “right”, all clerical claims of defining morality can be dismissed (and should be dismissed) as just more of God’s mistakes, and therefore, humans have no choice but to do what “unbelievers” have always declared:

Humans, by themselves, must define morality.

Again: clerics might be able to weasel out of the embarrassment that God lies (claiming that he didn't, claiming that he did so to benefit humans, or whatever), but they can't weasel out of the more serious charge that their God makes mistakes, because he admitted it. Therefore, given that anything God states could be another mistake, the con games in which all clerics engage collapse in absurdities.

And then, in view of God's admission that he made a mistake, what does God propose to do, to rectify or make amends? Well, he states it clearly:

He said, "This race of men whom I have created, I will wipe them off the face of the Earth – man and beast, reptiles and birds."

But, but, but... why kill off all the "beast(s), reptiles, and birds"? A wholesale slaughter of everything? What did the little birdies do wrong? What was their "sin"?

Talk about sinning, maybe God should consider his own assessment, which he allegedly used to reprimand Cain:

"If you do well, you are accepted; if not, sin is a demon crouching at the door. It shall be eager for you, and you will be mastered by it."

So, since God admits that he didn't do well, and since he said "sin... is a demon crouching at the door. It shall be eager for you, and you will be mastered by it", it follows that sin... mastered God!!

Moreover, God's plan to kill everything sound like another of his mistakes – and a very serious one! It reminds me of a line from the creator of the Star Trek series (Gene Roddenberry):

We must question the story logic of having an all-knowing all-powerful God, who creates faulty humans and then blames them for his own mistakes.

But it's not only that he "blames" humans for his mistakes, he punishes us for his mistakes (with death!), and it's not only that he punishes just humans, he "wipes [everything] off the face of the Earth – man and beast, reptiles and birds." God's not an ordinary sinner; he's the most hideous mass murderer in the history of the world.

THE NO-ACCOUNT NOAH

Yet, I'll move on – even though the horror of this horror story only gets worse. Thus, next we're introduced to Noah (*Genesis* 6, 9):

Noah was a righteous man, the one blameless man of his time; he walked with God.

According to the clerical authors of this crap, Noah not only “walked with God”, apparently he talked with God – or at least, the clerics' god talked to Noah (*Genesis* 6, 13-14):

God said to Noah, “The loathsomeness of all mankind has become plain to me, for through them the Earth is full of violence. I intend to destroy them, and the earth with them...”

So exactly what was this god's complaint? He said: “through them [that is, humans] the Earth is full of violence.” So, this god doesn't approve of violence. Great. Peace at last! Thank God Almighty, peace at last!! The Lord be praised!!!

Yet, what does this god plan to do about it? Promote kindness? Promote love among humans? Establish a counsel of secular humanists to promote application of the sciences to solve human problems. Oh, no! That would be a rational scheme, conceived by a god who loved justice, kindness, mercy, and mankind. Instead, this god's scheme to combat violence is entirely different. He combats violence by becoming unbelievably violent:

“I intend to destroy them, and the Earth with them...”!

Maybe that's what's meant by making man in this god's image: “violent and loathsome” (God's description of humans) seems to be apt adjectives to describe this god – although appropriate additional adjectives seem to be: dumb, stupid, idiotic, ghoulish, and similar. How are humans to deal with such asinine clerics who concocted such an ass of a god?

Fortunately, as I'll now show you, the Bible gives us an answer to that question, in *Genesis* 8, 18–22. This incident allegedly occurs after God finishes killing every living thing, save for the few lives that Noah was able to save.

So Noah came out with his sons, his wife, and his sons' wives [And notice, Dear, the bit of male chauvinism slipped in there: list first the father, then the sons, and then assorted, lower-class wives... and as for daughters and granddaughters, well, they're not even worth mentioning, right? Riiiiiiight.] Every wild animal, all cattle, every bird, and every reptile that moves on the ground came out of the ark by families. [Oh, that "families" bit is cute: "Howdy do. I'm Saurid, a member of the Megalosauridae family of dinosaurs, and my wife, here, Spinny, is from the Spinosauridae family..."]

Then Noah built an altar to the Lord. He took ritually clean beasts and birds of every kind [though we weren't told what "ritually clean" means, cause (doncha know) that isn't defined until after another few thousand years, by Moses!] and offered whole-offerings on the altar. [Did Noah burn animals that he had just saved from the flood? What a waste! Saurid and Spinny too? You mean it was Noah, himself, who did-in the dinosaurs?! Did he load them in the boat just to burn them?!] When the Lord smelt the soothing odor, he said within himself, "Never again will I curse the ground because of man, however evil his inclinations may be from his youth upwards. I will never again kill every living creature, as I have just done..."

Dear, I hope you're unconcerned if you're having trouble conceiving of such nonsense. Who knows what the clerics were smoking when they concocted this idiocy. Yet, please try to get a clear view of the picture the clerics are painting:

- First, they have their omnipotent, omniscient god murder essentially everyone, kill essentially all life, by drowning: men, women, children, infants (as well as all the innocent animals) screaming pitifully, as each struggled to stay above the rising waters, trying to avoid a horrible death by drowning. And all of this because God admitted that HE had made a mistake, that HE had "sinned" – and then concluded that others should pay for HIS mistakes with their lives!
- Then (so we're told), the result of god's hideousness won't be (as one might have hoped) some "cleansing" of humans, so that future humans will be nonviolent. Oh, no: humans (and all animals?) weren't purified in some giant baptismal ceremony. Instead, these idiot clerics have their god saying: "Never again will I curse the ground because of man, however evil his inclinations..." Surely-to-Satan anyone with any sanity asks:

Then what in hell was the point?!

- And the only available answer is staring one in the face: "When the Lord smelt the soothing odor..." The fate of humanity depends on what a fat-food junky smells? Yes, Dear, I agree: it smells of lunacy!

But even that is not the end of this idiocy (*Genesis* 9, 12–16):

God said, “This is the sign of the covenant I establish between myself and you and every living creature with you, to endless generations: My [rain]bow I set in the cloud, sign of the covenant between myself and earth. When I cloud the sky over the Earth, the [rain]bow shall be seen in the cloud. Then will I remember the covenant I have made between myself and you and living things of every kind. Never again shall the waters become a flood to destroy all living creatures...”

Great! I mean, it’s all very well to have such a nice neat “explanation” for rainbows. Never mind the refraction of light (because of wavelength-dependent differences in indices of refraction of air and water) as the light enters the curved surfaces of water drops, then each color’s specular reflection at the far side of each drop, and finally the second refraction as the separated wavelengths travel from water back to air, with the different colors emerging spread in a rainbow around approximately 57°, defining the angle at which rainbows are seen. Instead, the ignorant clerics who concocted this nonsense decided that no less than the omnipotent, omniscient creator of the universe has such a crummy memory that he needs a rainbow to remind him not to flood the place again?!

It’s kinda scary to have a loose nut like that at the controls!

And though it’s hard to imagine, it gets worse. Starting over again with Noah and his family, the clerics have their god once again defining the prime purpose of humans (*Genesis 9, 1*): “**Be fruitful and increase, and fill the earth.**” In a word, Dear, once again it’s: sex. Yes, Dear, according to God Almighty HIMself, your prime purpose is to have sex. Forget about trying to be kind to others, ignore the sufferings of other humans, never mind studying so much, dismiss ideas about trying to solve the world’s problems... God HIMself says sex, sex, and more sex. Party ‘til you drop!

But, Dear, before you head off to your next party, may I remind you, please, that your old grandfather with the beard considers this God to be a fool, a buffoon, an idiot, a hideous demon, a horrible concept invented by clerics for their own profit, the worst calamity that humanity has ever suffered... and that, instead, Dear, I suggest that you decide for yourself what’s best for you to do. And how I hope that you’ll at least consider the possibility that your prime goal is not to have sex but to pursue your trio of survival goals (of yourself, of humanity, and of your values).

But let me get back to the basics of the Bible. After sex, it appears that the prime concern of the clown clerics who wrote this crap is nakedness, which is rather closely related to sex. An earlier view of the clerics' warped ideas about nakedness was in *Genesis 3, 7*, which relates that, after eating the fruit from “**the tree of the knowledge of good and evil**”, Adam and Eve

...discovered that they were naked; so they stitched fig-leaves together and made themselves loincloths.

What craziness to suggest that husband and wife should feel some unease about seeing each other naked! This is “knowledge of good and evil”? Nakedness is evil, but obeying orders you don't understand is good? As a certain grandchild would say:

Gimme a break!

Then, the neurotic nakedness theme is revealed again in *Genesis 9, 20–25*:

Noah, a man of the soil, began the planting of vineyards. He drank some of the wine, became drunk, and lay naked inside his tent. When Ham, father of Canaan, saw his father naked, he told his two brothers outside. So [Ham's two brothers] Shem and Japheth took a cloak, put it on their shoulders and walked backwards, and so covered their father's naked body; their faces were turned the other way, so that they did not see their father naked. When Noah woke from his drunken sleep, he learnt what his youngest son had done to him, and said: “Cursed be Canaan [the son of Ham, not Ham himself!], slave of slaves shall he be to his brothers.”

What mind-boggling idiocy! Please, Dear, consider the message in this story. Noah was “**a righteous man, the one blameless man of his time.**” Noah's son, Ham, accidentally saw his drunken father, Noah, naked. [What's the harm in that? What's with the clerics' hang-up with nakedness? Did the shepherds clothe their sheep? If there were any wrong, here, it's that the drunken old Noah couldn't hold his liquor!] As a result, the drunken (righteous?!) Noah laid a curse, not on his son (who accidentally saw his drunken father naked), but laid a curse on his son's child, Noah's grandson, Canaan (presumably the subsequent father of all the Canaanites). The message: an old drunk (blameless in the eyes of the Lord) punishes his perfectly innocent grandchild for the “sin” of his father?!

But even this ignorance – this evil – is surpassed by the evil of the rest. What was the innocent kid’s punishment to be? To become a “**slave of slaves**”! God condones slavery?!

We have, here, God’s view of a “**righteous**” human?? Nudity is evil, but punishing a son for the “sins” of the father and promoting slavery is “righteous”?? The god of these damnable clerics is bonkers! He is deeply concerned about nudity, but doesn’t give a damn about a drunken lout advocating slavery for a grandson?! I’m sure glad that, throughout the entire history of the world, never has a single person taken this crap seriously!!

I’m sorry, Dear: sarcasm again. I know I get carried away. But, Dear, my grandchildren have been fed this junk since they were babies. This horrible stuff has been fed to humanity by the clerics for thousands of years. Like leeches, the parasitic clerics have used this “holy book” to drain humanity of what sane humans call ‘decency’. I can’t – I won’t – I don’t want to constrain my hatred of this stupidity. What clerics preach is stupid; put into practice, their policies are evil.

BABBLE ABOUT THE TOWER OF BABEL

But maybe that venting of my emotion has calmed me enough to continue. So, now I’ll try to pick up the story with the silly tale about the Tower of Babel (*Genesis 11*, 5–8):

Then the Lord came down to see the city and tower which mortal men had built, and he said, “Here they are, one people with a single language, and now they have started to do this [build a city and tower]; henceforward nothing they have a mind to do will be beyond their reach. Come, let us go down there and confuse their speech, so that they will not understand what they say to one another.”

About this quote, I first wonder: to whom is this god saying, “**Come, let us go down there.**” Maybe he’s again talking to the “other gods” (as in the myth about Adam and Eve); maybe he doesn’t like doing his dirty work alone. More significantly, though, I’m disgusted with the suggestion, here, that humans aren’t to develop. Apparently another illustration of this god’s concept of evil is that “**henceforward nothing they have a mind to do will be beyond their reach.**” I should hope so!

Also, I can't help wondering: What was in the minds of these ignorant clerics when they created their god? Why did they decide that the reason for different people speaking different languages was that their god didn't want progress? Was it the perception by the old shepherds that progress (courtesy agriculture, probably led by women) was passing them by; so, they created their god to help them oppose progress? Is this why the clerics stimulated the shepherds to hate farmers and city dwellers? I expect so – for reasons I mentioned in the “excursion” **Ix** and will go into in more detail in the excursion **Yx**, where I'll dig into a little of history of this horrible book called “the holy Bible”.

But glossing over that question for now, consider some possible messages in this story. “The good” is that humans don't understand one another? Translators are evil? Learning a foreign language is evil? Learning to communicate is evil? Teachers are evil? The good is to be a deaf and dumb mute, who also doesn't know the difference between good and evil? We're just to obey?

Why is it that the closer the god of the shepherd's clerics gets to describing the ideal human (deaf, dumb, no knowledge of good and evil, just obey), the closer the description becomes, not of humans, but of sheep? The clerics who dreamt up this god decided that, in the beginning, humans were like sheep and then, in our evil, we began to think?

The essence of the Bible is that God doesn't want humans to think, just obey? Clerics promote this junk? People believe this garbage? People tortured and murdered those who didn't believe it? People still kill people who don't believe it? Wars are still being fought over it? I am to pay extra taxes to support children being indoctrinated with this poison? How could a single book promote so much evil?

Let me try to summarize my reaction to this garbage (in only the first 12 pages of the Bible!) with an open letter to God:

God: Let me see if I've got it straight.

For want of something better to do, you created humans. Were you bored? Do you just like to watch? Is that why you described light as “good”? We call such behavior ‘voyeurism’.

So anyway, you put a couple of kids in a garden to have sex (while you watched) and pull weeds (was it marijuana?). Then, you played a few of the old apple tricks on them – now you see it; now you don't. Was that “good” for you?

By-and-by, you didn't like what you saw, you decided you had made a mistake (in your word, that you had ‘sinned’), so you killed all life, save for a few representatives in an rickety old boat. You then decided that, even if humans behaved the same way, next time around, you wouldn't kill them again.

This means that you think that you made another mistake, by killing them. That is (using your word) you ‘sinned’ again. Personally, I think that the bigger sin was murdering essentially every living thing.

And then, when people began to put their lives together again (e.g., building cities with towers), you start jerking them around again, tearing down what they built. Does that about summarize it so far?

Now, I'm sorry, but I'm gonna need to speak to your father. And sure, I understand that you claim to be the father up there, but down here, I'm the grandfather, and I need to speak to the grandfather up there – that is, to the boss god-father.

We grandfathers know about you young whipper-snappers: you who think you're all-knowing – but mostly know just how to screw things up.

And let me tell you: I've had enough of your bungling. Some accountability is needed up there. I'm gonna take it up with your dad, and you're gonna pay the price.

And I'll tell you right now what the price is gonna be: we're gonna shut down your entire operation; you're finished playing with people on this planet; you're out of the voyeur business. Oh, sure, maybe you think that you can talk your dad into letting you play with some other animals on some other planet – but I sure expect that he'll see what a brat you've become, and soon, you'll be busy just pulling your own weeds.

But maybe it's too soon to send such a letter. So far, I've only gone through the first 12 pages of the Bible!

THE ABOMINABLE ABRAHAM

Next in this “glorious holy book” there's the story about Abram, later called Abraham. And by the way, Dear, during this phase of their history, the Hebrews were “into magic”, and one of their “magic tricks” was to change their names when it was convenient – to bring them “luck”, to give them “a new lease on life”, to get away from their past, to protect the guilty, whatever.

* Go to other chapters *via*

Anyway, Abram (or Abraham) is claimed to be “the father” (or “the patriarch”) of the Jewish people – and subsequently, he’s claimed to be “father” of all the “Abrahamic religions” (including Judaism, Christianity, Islam, and Mormonism). As a consequence, we might expect that in this Jewish book (in fact, in the holiest of their holy books) Abraham’s image would shine with splendor. Instead, though, as I’ll now begin to show you, we find that the image promoted is of a trickster and deceiver, someone who lies for his own profit – a perfect role model for the clerics.

The stories about Abraham start in *Genesis 12*, 1–3 with:

The Lord said to Abram, “Leave your country, your kinsmen, and your father’s house, and go to a country that I will show you. I will make you into a great nation. I will bless you and make your name so great that it shall be used in blessings: Those that bless you I will bless, those that curse you, I will execrate. All the families on earth will pray to be blessed as you are blessed.”

This “blessing” and this “prophecy” (that “**all the families on earth will pray to be blessed as you are blessed**”) are claimed to be the direct quotes from God Almighty HIMself. The claim is made by author(s) who, as I’ll show you later, wrote this in about 450 BCE, about 1,400 years after Abraham had died (if he ever existed). And clerics living in modern times (my writing “modern clerics” would be an oxymoron) still promote this idiocy?!

Dear: please consider this “blessing” and this “prophecy”. It would be understandable for a barbaric tribesman, such as Abraham (or Abram), to imagine that his tribe would have its god promoting his tribe’s interest. As I suggested in **Ix** and will show you more in **Yx**, all tribes (and all cities) had their little gods, just as Abraham’s little tribe of Hebrews had theirs. But clerics today preach that the Hebrew’s tribal god was actually the ruler of the universe – and yet promotes the well-being of a particular little tribe?

Further, Dear, think of the stupid policy being promoted. The ruler of the universe has special representatives on Earth? Are these special people the Hebrews or the Pygmies? Who says so: the Hebrews or the Pygmies? Surely somebody’s joking! And surely at least one cleric in modern times sees that there’s almost nothing further from truth than this god’s “prophecy” that “**all the families on earth will pray to be blessed as you are blessed.**” Closer to the truth would be:

Someday, all families on earth will give thanks to thinkers for never having been cursed with the stupid concept of a god such as the god of Abraham!

But let me continue with the story (at *Genesis 12, 7*), which tells of Abraham and his family reaching Canaan (near and containing modern-day Israel).

At that time the Canaanites lived in this land. There the Lord appeared to Abram [Abraham] and said, “I give this land to your descendants.”

Now, Dear, I trust that I don’t need to caution you never to follow Abraham’s example. If ever you come across any property that belongs to someone else (as the land belonged to the Canaanites), I trust you realize that, should you hear some voice that tells you the property belongs to you and your descendants, you should seek psychiatric assistance to help you dismiss the notion as an idle (and potentially dangerous) speculation – unless the voice also tells you that, first, you’ll need to discuss purchasing the property from its rightful owners. Otherwise it’s called theft, and a civilized society will decide that you belong in a mental hospital or in jail!

The writers of the Bible, however, apparently had no idea of the concept of a civilized society, as the Bible continues to demonstrate (*Genesis 12, 9*):

There came a famine in the land, so severe that Abram went down to Egypt to live there for a while. When he was approaching Egypt, he said to his wife Sarai [later called Sarah], “I know very well that you are a beautiful woman, and that when the Egyptians see you, they will say, ‘She is his wife’; then they will kill me but let you live. Tell them that you are my sister, so that all may go well with me because of you and my life may be spared on your account.”

Dear, please consider carefully the “policy message” in the above paragraph. Someday some child (maybe your own) may ask you if sometimes it’s okay to lie. In response, you might want to mention what I already showed you that your grandmother suggested: **Maybe it’s okay to lie when the intended beneficiary isn’t yourself.** In contrast, notice that the intended beneficiary of Abraham’s lie is Abraham: “**Tell them... [a lie], so that all may go well [for] me.**” When a child asks you if sometimes it’s okay to lie, in addition to mentioning your grandmother’s assessment, maybe you would want to add:

Whatever you do, don’t do what the patriarch of the Jewish people did, which was to tell a lie to help himself.

But the miserable messages in this story about Abraham (stealing the property of others, because a voice told him to do so, and promoting a lie for his own benefit) have only just begun. Thus, in *Genesis 12, 14* there is:

When Abram arrived in Egypt, the Egyptians saw that she [Abraham's or Abram's wife, Sarai or Sarah] was indeed [or how about "in reality"?] very beautiful. Pharaoh's courtiers saw her and praised her to Pharaoh, and she was taken into Pharaoh's household. [In the next paragraph, we're told that the Pharaoh married Sarah.] He treated Abram well because of her, and Abram came to possess sheep and cattle and asses, male and female slaves, she-asses, and camels.

The "policy message", here, is quite clear and well known: **pimping one's wife as a prostitute can be profitable**. In those days, pimping could apparently even get you "**male and female slaves**" – for as we already saw, God approves of slavery (only relatively recently have more moral people disapproved of God's ways).

Yet, Dear, I'd encourage you to tell any child who asks, that Abraham's behavior (stealing, lying, and pimping one's wife in prostitution) is NOT an appropriate role model – no matter what the Bible says (*Genesis 12, 17*):

But the Lord struck Pharaoh and his household with grave diseases on account of Abram's wife Sarai. [Probably caused by syphilis or some other sexually transmitted disease, caused by who knows how many times Abraham had pimped his wife.] Pharaoh summoned Abram and said to him, "Why have you treated me like this? Why did you not tell me that she is your wife? Why did you say that she was your sister, so that I took her as a wife? Here she is: take her and be gone." Then Pharaoh gave his men orders, and they sent Abram away with his wife and all that he had...

Somebody's gotta be kidding! The policy messages in the above paragraph are appropriate only for maniacs:

- For one, the message in this story is that the patriarch of the Jewish people (a lying, pimping thief) is caught by the Pharaoh (the leader of the greatest nation on Earth at the time), and the clerics would have us believe that this good for nothing Abraham would profit from his deception? It's "good" to lie and to pimp your wife? Why? Because the Egyptian leader was a moron? That the Hebrews were too smart for the Egyptians?
- That's seems to be part of the message, but the explicit message is because "**the Lord struck Pharaoh and his household... on account of Abram's wife Sarai.**" Hello? What did the Pharaoh do wrong? He married Sarah. He didn't know that she was already married!

Surely anyone in his or her right mind can see that it was the lying, stealing, pimping Abraham who was in the wrong. God didn't see this?

Where is the error in my logic? Oh, there it is: the premiss about God being in his or her right mind. This god is bonkers – or better, the clerics who wrote this crap are crazy!

And so what happened?

Abram went up from Egypt into the Negeb, he and his wife and all that he had, and Lot went with him. Abram was now very rich in cattle and in silver and gold...

Dear, please reconsider some of the policy messages in this story:

- Abraham, the “god father” of the twelve tribes of Israel and the one whom the Jewish god “blessed”, got his wealth (including “male and female slaves”) from theft, deceitfulness, and treating his wife (who was also his half-sister) as a piece of property and a prostitute. That's some moral!
- And what about the message for all women? Similar to Sarah, obey your husband? No matter your own value judgments, no matter your husband's moral character (a thief, a liar, a pimp), do whatever it takes to protect him? No matter anything else, increase your husband's cache of silver and gold and cattle and slaves? Lying, cheating, and prostituting for him is perfectly okay – even promoted by God – so long as you obey?

Dear: if ever you hear someone preach such hideousness, scream “**NO!!!!**”

On the other hand, Dear, surely one should ask: if Abraham's god was of any value, why didn't Abraham stay home and have his god help him overcome the famine, rather than prey on the Pharaoh? Why didn't Abraham pray for a little rain rather than prey on the Pharaoh? Or why didn't Abraham stand up like a man, face the famine, and beat it himself? Why did the clerics paint the hero of the Hebrews, the founder of the twelve tribes of Israel, as a lazy, lying, thieving, cowardly pimp?

Noah is a drunken slave trader, Abraham is a lazy, lying, thieving, cowardly pimp, and clerics force-feed children this putrefying crap as food for thought about how heroes act, as examples of “righteousness”? Surely somewhere, somehow, somebody is mistaken!

“Ah, but no,” sayeth the clerics, “for you have missed the message: Noah and Abraham were the most righteous of all men, for they feared the Lord.” [“And fear of the Lord,” the clerics fail to add, “is extremely profitable for us, if we’re to continue our parasitic existence.”]

But let me try to get past the putrefying guck about the “righteous” Abraham getting rich from pimping his wife, and see what muck is in store in *Genesis 15*. At its start, it seems not too bad:

After this, the word of the Lord came to Abram in a vision. He [God] said, “Do not be afraid, Abram, I am giving you a very great reward.” Abram replied, “Lord God, what canst thou give me... Thou hast given me no children...” Then came the word of the Lord to him: “...your heir shall be a child of your own body.”

I wrote “it seems not too bad”, Dear, but be careful – because there’s slime just below the surface. Thus, remember from back in *Genesis 1*, where we’re told that our prime purpose was prescribed to be reproduction. Now if some sanity prevailed, it might have been thought that God would have provided all bunny-rabbits and bunny-like humans with the necessary equipment, procedures, practices, and authority to discharge the primary responsibility assigned to them: “**be fruitful and increase**” or “**be fruitful and multiply**”. I mean, surely to God (even surely to this hideous god of the little Hebrew tribe) everyone knows that the fundamental rule of any successful enterprise is:

Authority must be commensurate with responsibility.

But now we’re told that, after all his be-fruitful-and-multiply orders, God still controls all reproduction. We have the responsibility but not the authority! But, but, but...

Anyway, the story continues (*Genesis 15, 6*):

Abram put his faith in the Lord, and the Lord counted that faith to him as righteousness; he said to him, “I am the Lord who brought you out from Ur of the Chaldees to give you this land to occupy.” Abram said, “O Lord God, how can I be sure that I shall occupy it [when this land obviously belongs to the Canaanites]”? The Lord answered, “Bring me a heifer three years old, a she-goat three year old, a ram three years old, a turtle-dove, and a fledgling.” He brought him all these, halved the animals down the middle and placed each piece opposite its corresponding piece, but he did not halve the birds. [Exactly why this god likes dead and mutilated animals isn’t explained.]

When the birds of prey swooped down on the carcasses, Abram scared them away. Then, as the sun was going down, a trance came over Abram and great fear came upon him. The Lord said to Abram, “Know this for certain, that your descendants will be aliens living in a land [Egypt] that is not theirs; they will be slaves, and will be held in oppression there for four hundred years. But I will punish that nation whose slaves they are, and after that they shall come out with great possessions. [For their god wants his people to have “great possessions” – no scruples, mind you, but “great possessions”!] You yourself shall join your fathers in peace and be buried in a good old age; and the fourth generation shall return here, for the Amorites will not be ripe for punishment till then.” The sun went down and it was dusk, and there appeared a smoking brazier and a flaming torch passing between the divided pieces. [The significance of this little bit of magic wasn’t explained, but no doubt the clerics found that a little bit of sulfur or other compound was received with appropriate ‘oohs’ and ‘aahs’.] That very day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, and he said, “To your descendants I give this land from the River of Egypt [the Nile] to the Great River, the river Euphrates...”

I quoted all the above, Dear, because it reveals a lot about the damnable clerics who wrote this crap, more than 1,000 years after Abraham had died. Yet, until I show you details later in this **Qx** and in **Yx**, I won’t be able to justify some items in the following outline of what the above quotation reveals. Nonetheless, let me at least suggest hints to you (with the following list) that there’s quicksand on this trail.

- The main message of the clerics (no doubt repeated at least a thousand times throughout the Bible) is: “**The Lord counted that faith to him as righteousness.**” That is, Dear, drunkenness, slave trading, stealing, lying, cheating, pimping, whatever, is of no concern compared with the “righteousness” of obeying the Lord – and in his absence (and he’s always absent!), then of course the people are to obey his spokesmen, i.e., the clerics. As policy, that’s about as sick as it gets.
- Fundamentally, this Hebrew Lord is a landlord and a warlord. He passes out land as he sees fit (i.e., as the clerics see fit), not only the Canaanites land but also the land from the Nile to the Euphrates, and when the Hebrew’s enemies are “**ripe for punishment**”, he’ll punish them. Never mind property rights, never mind who owns anything, the great landlord-warlord in the sky dispenses property and punishes people as he pleases – and it pleases him to punish people when they’re “**ripe**” for punishment (whatever that means) and to dispense land to those who obey him (and his spokesmen, the clerics). Talk about sick policies!
- These “policy positions” weren’t written, however, until approximately 1500 years after the events took place! As I’ll be showing you later, the statement “**I am the Lord who brought you out from Ur of the Chaldees**” couldn’t have been written sooner than ~1,000 years after Abraham died, because there were no “Chaldees” until then!

To say that Abraham came from the Ur of the Chaldees would be similar to saying that, when he was in England, Julius Caesar visited the Tower of London.

- In fact, Dear, even the Bible gives substantial evidence (which I'll show you later) that it was the clerics of Ezra's time (~450 BCE) who wrote all this crap. Therefore, it contains not a scrap of "prophecy". For example, the alleged prophecy here, in *Genesis 15*: "Know this for certain, that your descendants will be aliens living in a land [Egypt] that is not theirs; they will be slaves, and will be held in oppression there for four hundred years..." certainly could be a safe "prophecy", because the clerics wrote this statement ~1,000 years after the events resembling these had occurred!
- Another example of such silliness is at *Genesis 36, 31*, where as part of huge listing of descendants, the clerics wrote: "These are the kings who ruled over Edom before there were kings in Israel..." Please think about that statement, Dear: it would be rather difficult to write it, unless the writer already knows that, ~1,000 years later, there would be a nation called "Israel" and it would be ruled by kings! The author might as well have written: "These are the kings who ruled over Edom before President Kennedy was assassinated."
- Equally fictitious, of course, was any value Abraham derived from any of the quackery or sorcery (with the slaughtered animals and birds) – although falling into a trance is a possibility, especially after standing in the hot sun all day, swatting flies, and shooing birds. But, as I began to show you in **M1** and will show you more in **Yx**, all such mystical magic and alleged communications with the supernatural were part and parcel of the clerics' con game, practiced, promoted, and "perfected" in Ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia and learned by the Jewish clerics from the Egyptian and Mesopotamian clerics, long after Abraham was dead.
- We are seeing here first hints of what will develop into an absolutely horrible public policy, developed into the full depth of its depravity later in the Bible, when the clerics write their fictions about the devil, Jesus, and Hell. The hint is: "the Amorites will not be ripe for punishment till then." The horrible public policy is the failure to see that punishment should be used only as a deterrent. Even animals know that! Lionesses don't wait until their cubs are "ripe for punishment" to swat them: as soon as the cub makes a mistake, the lioness uses punishment to deter their cubs from making additional mistakes. Here, instead, we see the hint that the clerics' God has no plans to deter wayward people, but just sit back and wait until their "sins" are sufficient to punish them brutally – I suppose because he has fun watching ant-like people suffer. It's a pity that the clerics didn't make their policy a little more explicit by having their God say to his fellow gods: "Happiness is roasting Amorites in Hell, but let's wait until they're sufficiently rotten to roast."

And as for the promise and/or prophecy, "To your descendants I give this land from the River of Egypt to the Great River, the river Euphrates...", I'll just respond:

It never occurred, and it never will occur; it's just another megalomaniacal dream of power-mongering clerics.

But enough for now. If you get a chance before reading the next chapter, please read more of *Genesis*, at least up to and including *Genesis 12*. And let me add, Dear, that if or when you do read it, try not to get as upset as your old grandfather. It's not good for your health. Better by far is to get some exercise!