

Qx7 – Policies in *Exodus* – 3

Dear: In the previous chapter, I commented on the first four of the Ten Commandments; the first four deal with having only one god (and therefore only one set of clerics with their collection plates) and with keeping the Sabbath “holy”, i.e., the day set aside for the clerics to fill their collection plates! Because the remaining six commandments aren’t so obviously written for the benefit of the clerics, you might expect that I’d have less criticism and be more likely to “keep my cool”. But actually, Dear, I do have major difficulties with the rest of the Commandments, for reasons that I’ll try to explain.

First, a general complaint: as I encouraged you to consider in an earlier chapter, again I would have you consider the single word that best summarizes the entire Bible. As you know, my opinion is that the word (or injunction) is: “Obey!” In particular, I trust you agree that the summarizing principle of all the clerics’ commandments is: “Obey!” (And actually, Dear, there aren’t just Ten Commandments; as you’ll see, there are hundreds of them; I think I recall reading that there are 613 of them.) Meanwhile, and although my success may not match my hopes, I hope you conclude that the main imperative of this book is: “Evaluate!” Therefore, Dear, my general complaint against all commandments (e.g., those created by the stupid clerics of the world) is that they want people to obey rather than evaluate.

Now, for some details: just as I started to do in an earlier chapter (**M2**), in the remainder of this chapter, I plan to go through each of the remainder of the Ten Commandments, *evaluating* each. Then, more than I did in the **M**-chapters, I’ll begin *evaluating* some of the rest of the multi-hundreds of commandments, some of which are even more stupid than the first Ten – in some cases to the point of being absolutely ludicrous and absolutely horrible. In the resulting details, I trust that you’ll see my specific complaints with each. At the outset, I’ll summarize with the statement that, if there truly were a God as depicted by the crazy clerics, then this God should be brought before an International Tribunal and charged with crimes against humanity – a crime punishable by banishment from the universe!

So now, Dear, let me turn to the clerics’ Commandment # 5. As given at *Exodus 20, 12*, this commandment seems not too bad (certainly it has a lot more going for it than the first four!):

“Honor your father and your mother, that you may live long in the land which the Lord your God is giving you [over the murdered bodies of the current, peaceful inhabitants of what (there is no doubt) is their land].”

Actually, the part that I added in the “square brackets” isn’t explained to the reader until later in the Bible, but it seems relevant to include it here, to remind readers of the crazy ideas that the clerics are promoting.

Now, Dear, of course the clerics promoted (and still promote) this Commandment as if were direct from God, HIMself (and therefore the quotation marks in the quote). You, Dear, are to “obey!” In contrast, Dear, please don’t obey, evaluate: use your brains as best you can – which includes basing your decisions on the best available data. Therefore, Dear, I ask you to evaluate “God’s” commandment that all people should honor their parents.

Dear: doesn’t it depend on the data? What if a parent is a drunken louse, similar to Noah – who also condemned his grandson to slavery? What if a father pimps his wife, as Abraham did, and then blackmails whomever he can for sleeping with his wife? What if a father cheats his brother out of inheritance, similar to Jacob/Israel, and then attempts to regain his “honor” via bribery? What if a mother own slaves (e.g., Abraham’s wife Sarah and one of Israel’s wives, Rachel), and then arranges for her husband to rape her slaves? What if a father enslaves an entire nation, like Joseph – save of course for enslaving the priests? What if a father is a murderer, like Moses, who then flees from justice? Such parents are to be “honored”?!

Please, Dear, be careful. Most clerics seem to have “on-off switches” rather than brains: they love to deal with “absolutes”. But there’s no “absolute” that children should honor their parents: children (and all people) should award “honor” only when and where it’s due. Certainly parenting, itself, if no “badge of honor”: any animal with the necessary “equipment” can have offspring. Parents are people. Honor only those people whom you decide deserve honor. Evaluate!

But actually, Dear, when the stupid clerics were trying to find absolutes (while they were writing this junk), here they missed one of the few opportunities to wisely command “obey”! The clerics have their god tell the children “honor your father and mother” (or “honor thy parents”). But what

the clerics could have wisely commanded young children to do was: “Obey your father and mother”!

Why? Well, first, small children don’t know what ‘honor’ means! Honor is a “judgment call”, best made when people have sufficient experience to understand the many factors influencing decisions and actions. And second, given that young children have insufficient experience and that generally no one will ever try to protect a child more than its parents, then (for their own survival and well being) young children must obey their parents: if a parent yells “Stop!”, then never mind the child “honoring” the parent (or even understanding the parent), just obey – or be hit by the oncoming truck.

Meanwhile, Dear, as you gain sufficient experience and understanding, please take care when you evaluate your parents, in the process of your deciding how much to honor them. Until you have children of your own, you probably won’t appreciate the difficulties of rearing children. And until you have sufficient experience, I expect you won’t know the stresses that parents must try to endure – and sometimes aren’t successful. And, too, don’t overlook the influence that their parents had on your parents’ own development: if you identify some “dishonor”, then perhaps you want to investigate its cause. On the other hand, Dear, don’t dig too deeply, for after all, there is an “absolute” (with which surely no one could possibly have any objection) dealing with honoring grandfathers. (☺)

And I should add, Dear, that when you try to evaluate statements, please be careful to check the possibility of misinterpretations. In the present case, for example, maybe the interpretation of “honor your parents” that the clerics promote is to “bring honor to your parents, by your behavior”. That was the recommendation of Confucius. But if that’s the interpretation that the clerics desire, then for me, the commandment “honor thy parents” still doesn’t wash, because it leaves “honor” open to interpretation.

For example, no doubt Mormon clerics would conclude that your father’s devotion to church doctrines brought great honor to his parents. Meanwhile, though, I expect that you know my interpretation. And for contrast, there’s my daughter, of whom I couldn’t be more proud, in part because of the honor she does me by telling all clerics: blow it out your ears!

Anyway, next is the clerics’ Commandment # 6, which you might think that even your old grandfather couldn’t possibly complain about:

* Go to other chapters *via*

“You shall not commit murder [except in those cases when I will have you murder everyone who stands in your way, including women and children – for what right have they to protect themselves from your plans to rob and murder them?!]

But as you might already have gained the hint from my “addendum” in square brackets, I do have great difficulty with this commandment: it displays, once again, the stupidity of the clerics who wrote this stuff.

First, though, let me commend the clerics who changed the wording of this commandment from the Bible’s King James Version (KJV), which is what Sidney Rigdon wrote and Joseph Smith copied into the Book of Mormon (BOM) at *Mosiah 13, 21*, namely: “Thou shalt not kill.” Instead, in the New English Bible (which I’ve been using), the wording is “You shall not commit murder”. I’ll comment on the difference, shortly.

First though, consider the KJV’s or the BOM’s “Thou shalt not kill” from both a personal- and public-policy perspective. From both perspectives, it’s asinine. Thus, Dear, if anyone should attempt to kill you, I trust that you’ll need no urging from me to do whatever is necessary to stop the attacker, including killing him. And as a public policy “Thou shalt not kill” is equally asinine: similar to the case for an individual, if an enemy attacks a group of people, to survive the group must do whatever is necessary to stop the aggressor. If you have some doubts about the morality of killing aggressors, Dear, then I suggest that you think about it in a manner similar to what I suggested in an earlier chapter (when you were assumed to be one of only two people on Earth). Thus, either consider the moral code “everyone has an equal right to claim one’s own existence” and realize that the aggressor has violated this code, or consider that Nature has taught us all that “the good” is to live and realize that the aggressor has abandoned Nature’s teaching.

Now, consider the change in wording from “Thou shalt not kill” to “You shall not murder”. My praise for the change is tempered by my skepticism that the clerics saw the stupidity of the first version and saw only the threat to their con game. Thus, probably the problem the clerics saw was that many foolish people considered the Bible to be “God’s holy, unerring words” and therefore refused to fight in the clerics’ (and the politicians’) “holy wars”. These “pacifists” were then a threat to the clerics’ own survival; therefore, the clerics corrected God’s “unerring” words!

But, Dear, I have almost as much trouble with the new phrasing of this commandment as the old. In essence, my problem is that “You shall not murder” conveys no information. Thus, whereas “murder” means “unjustified killing”, then when the clerics claim that God said “You shall not kill without justification”, ordinary people will respond: “Yah, but when is killing ‘justified’?” This question then opens a huge Pandora’s box that each society must dig through, item by item.

For a primitive society such as the Ancient Israelites leaving Egypt, the choices made for what constitutes “justified killing” were what modern people consider barbaric. As I’ll show you soon, “justified killing” included killing sons who wouldn’t obey their parents, killing people who didn’t believe in the clerics’ god, killing men, women, and children who were peacefully living on land that the Israelites planned to occupy, and so on. For modern western societies, you know what the people have decided (via our justice system) to be “justified killing”, especially including self-defense and now, in some more enlightened states, the desire of old people to die.

But these details aside, Dear, I trust you see the point I’m trying to make. As either a public or private policy, “You shall not murder” is meaningless until the people decide what “murder” means, i.e., what killing is justified. And let me add that no modern people accept the clerics’ claim that God’s killing of all first-born Egyptians was justified. No modern court would accept the defense of killing people for sport. No one but a maniac would consider the killing of all first-born Egyptians (so that the Israelites would have a story to tell) to be anything but murder.

And as I’ll be showing you below, the damnable clerics who wrote the Bible have their hideous God promote additional horrible murders. Because their God is jealous, say the clerics, this “justifies” the Israelites killing those who refuse to pay the clerics for worshiping their god. Because their God is giving another people’s land to the Israelites, say the clerics, this “justifies” the Israelites killing men, women, and children living peacefully in Canaan.

Meanwhile, the Ancient Israelites would probably have argued that they weren’t murderers, because they were “just obeying orders.” But as the Nazis learned at the International War Tribunal in Nuremberg, modern people reject that “obeying orders” is an adequate justification for killing people. And surely this includes cases not only for obeying orders from

* Go to other chapters *via*

Hitler but also for obeying orders claimed to be from the Hitler-like God described in the Bible. That is, Dear, again: don't obey (including obeying either to kill or not to kill); instead, evaluate. Use your brain as best you can, which necessarily includes basing your decisions on best available data.

But enough of that stupid commandment; now I'll turn to #7:

“You shall not commit adultery.”

My response to this “commandment”, Dear, is that in general the concept has merit, but as for the details, I would respond to the clerics (both on the topic of “adultery” and the topic of “fornication”, which they also love to talk about): “Mind your own god-damn and damnable-god business!”

Dear, as a part of my urging you to use your brain as best you can, I urge you to dig into trying to uncover purposes. What's the purpose of marriage? What's the purpose of sex? What are your objectives? What are the objectives of the clerics? And so on. And while you're at it, consider how and why the clerics managed to get involved in people's sex lives and marriages, which they're pleased to call the state of “holy” matrimony.

Now, Dear, the associated policy issues (both personal and public) are too extensive and complicated for me to try to squeeze them into a few paragraphs (especially here, where I'm trying to go through the “Commandments”). I went through some of these “policy issues” in earlier chapters (in **N** and **P**) and will return to them again in **X** and **Y**. Here, in part to save you from chasing those references, I'll just summarize my opinions with the following list.

- For obvious reasons, our DNA molecules have programmed us to reproduce, but because new life needs nurturing and because over-population has become probably the most serious problem facing humanity, therefore both as private and public policies, we should use our brains as best we can, including using our brains to “over-write” our DNA's “computer program” (“mind over molecule!”) so that the purpose of sex is no longer just procreation.
- But because procreation is obviously essential for the survival of all species, because sex is a fundamental urge of all animals, and because for humans, emotions associated with sex influence a substantial portion of

most people's lives, therefore, Dear, be careful with sexual relations with others, because such relations can stimulate many emotions, both in you and your partner.

- In addition to being emotionally stimulating, sex has many other potential consequences, from pregnancy to contracting some horrible sexually transmitted disease (STDs). Therefore, Dear, you must be careful not only with emotions associated with sex but also with preventing any unwanted pregnancies (by using the pill or other contraceptives) and with avoiding STDs (through the use of condoms and through use of your brain, i.e., suitably taking into account the data that show approximately 25% (!) of the people in this country are carriers of incurable STDs, from herpes to AIDS.
- A major part of most marriages is a commitment not to engage in sex with anyone else except your spouse. If you make this commitment freely (i.e., if you make this commitment to your potential spouse without interference from the clerics, such as their demand to refuse to conduct the marriage ceremony unless you make this commitment) and if you later think of breaking this trust with your partner, then be prepared to suffer the consequences of violating a trust between the person who is probably the most important person in your life.
- On the other hand, if you and your spouse decide to engage in some other relationships, then that decision is up to the two of you (although the decision can also influence those with whom you are related, especially any children). But in general, sex between two consulting adults is no one else's business – unless, again, there is another person (your spouse) with whom you have made a commitment.
- “Fornication”, on the other hand, is a word created by some crazy clerics in an attempt to extend their power over the people. Otherwise, there is no such thing as “fornication”, only the perfectly normal sexual desires – which, however, I strongly recommend that you control sufficiently so that you proceed with sufficient caution to protect your emotions, your health, and against unwanted pregnancies.

In general, Dear, for modern people to abide by rules on sex developed by some crazy clerics who lived thousands of years ago, or even hundreds of years ago, or even who are now living (in their dream worlds) is ridiculous.

Instead, use your brain as best you can – which of course includes examining all relevant and reliable data. And because I know it can be difficult to study relevant data when your hormones are raging, Dear, I strongly recommend that you set aside some time (say a week or so), when your hormones aren't raging, to study the matter and to establish your own policies for your own sexuality. Should you decide to explore your own sexuality before you marry, then please go out, immediately, and obtain appropriate contraceptives, to protect yourself both against SIDs and unwanted pregnancies. And if anyone but anyone should interfere in this action, tell them to blow it out their ears, for it's no one's business but your own.

Next is the stupidity of clerics' Commandment #8:

“You shall not steal [except in the aforementioned cases, when you may steal other people's land and everything on it...]”

Of course it wasn't the clerics who added the “exception” outlined in the square brackets; I added it to emphasize the clerics' hypocrisy, which as I'll be showing you, is rampant throughout the Bible. But rather than showing you those details now, let me address the stupidity in their “commandment” not to steal.

By “stealing”, one normally means taking someone else's property (or possessions), including “intellectual property” (e.g., stealing someone's ideas or writings or similar). Therefore, it's rather silly to say anything about stealing before saying something about “morally correct” ways to acquire property and then about “rights” to maintain ownership of this acquired property. For example, suppose someone were as “shrewd” as Joseph was alleged to have been, who first taxed the Egyptians to get a portion of their crops and then sold it back to the people during a multi-year famine, continuing until he had reduced them to slavery. In such a case, who but a power-crazed cleric would say to an Egyptian with a starving child: “You shall not steal [food for your starving child]”?

Similar evaluations are need in such cases as when someone as evil as Abraham pimped his wife and then blackmailed others to acquire a huge amount of property. Then, the first question to address is: How did the person who claims ownership of the property acquire it? If someone

immorally acquires property from you, i.e., without granting you an equal claim on your own existence, then you would be foolish to grant that equal right to the person who stole your property.

Further, Dear, you should use your brain as best you can to decide what to do about the theft of your property. Let me give you an example with which I'm more familiar. When I was a kid, I was indoctrinated with "thou shalt not steal" by Catholic clerics, who collectively still sit on at least a trillion dollars of the people's money, acquired by their fraudulent con game. Commonly after listening to the priest's pious preaching (and then of course changing from our "Sunday bests"), my nearest-age brother and I would go out and steal food for our Sunday dinner (and for dinners during the rest of the week). At the right time of the year, we could bring home "quite a haul": corn on the cob, apples in season, cherries, carrots, potatoes, and sometimes some beautifully sweet peas in their pods – and it still bothers me to see certain grandchildren refuse to eat their peas!

Now, Dear, you tell me which was right and which was wrong (and all shades in between). That a society should condone and even promote Catholic con artists collecting piles of money in their collection plates (to add to their trillion dollars of property that they had already stolen by their fraud) or that two hungry kids stole some food? Sure, we could have been caught and punished – and the punishment in Islamic nations today is so barbaric that it's almost unimaginable: a kid stealing food can have his hand cut off! At least we would have only been sent to a juvenile home – and there, receive free food! But that's beside the point. The point, the question, is: what's wrong with a society in which con-artist clerics sit on a pile of money while children are so hungry they steal food?

As an example closer to your home, Dear, what do you think would be better: to try to recover the property that Mormon clerics conned from you and your parents (via a fraudulent con game in which they claim to be spokesmen for Jesus) or to put the entire episode behind you as one of the more expensive lessons you had to learn in life? And let me add, Dear, that if you choose to file a class-action lawsuit, on behalf of humanity, against all clerics (to attempt to recover the literally trillions of dollars that they've stolen from the people throughout the world by their frauds), then I certainly would heartily support you in your efforts!

But my main point, Dear, is the stupidity of the clerics who promote such crap. Thus, Dear, I hope you see that the clerics' commandment "Thou shalt not steal" is as stupid an "absolute" as their "Thou shalt not murder": one means "Thou shalt not kill unjustifiably", but fails to explain what killings are unjustified; the other means "Thou shalt not acquire property unjustifiably", but fails to describe unjustifiable methods of acquiring property. Both "absolutes" are therefore absolutely stupid: designed by primitive clerics and still promoted by primitive clerics for infantile people. And I say "infantile" rather than "childish", Dear, because even when I was a child I knew that "Thou shalt not steal" was dumb.

So, Dear, once again I urge you not to "obey" but to "evaluate": use your brain as best you can, e.g., in the case of the clerics' Commandment # 9:

"You shall not give false evidence against your neighbor [although I made exceptions for Abraham and his son Isaac, both of whom pimped their wives, saying that they were their sisters, and of course you can do anything you want if it promotes your stealing other people's land]."

In the above quotation, once again I added a few remarks, in an attempt to more accurately reflect the apparent intentions of the ruler of the universe.

And at the outset of my short response to the stupidity of this commandment, let me mention my amazement that any modern Jewish person would promote such nonsense as "You shall not give false evidence against your neighbor." I would hope that any intelligent Jewish person would think of those people who tried to protect the Jews during Nazi horrors. Would the Jewish clerics have the people who tried to protect Anne Frank respond to the SS Troopers: "Well, whereas G_d has commanded that I not give false evidence against my neighbor, therefore I must admit that a little Jewish girl is hiding upstairs." Is that what the crazy clerics would have us do? Surely-even-to-their-stupid God that couldn't be so! And therefore, Dear, my amazement: I don't understand why every modern Jewish person doesn't take up a personal crusade to discredit the Old Testament – even try to see it burned (except for historical studies) – to try to stomp out the stupid policies that it advocates.

But, Dear, back to you. Please don't obey the commandment not to give false evidence. Use your brain as best you can. Evaluate! If a potential murderer asks you to tell him where his intended victim is hiding, then do what you think best to give "false evidence" – while protecting your own

safety. If the only way you have to fight an immoral law is to give false evidence, then weigh the risks and benefits to you as best you can, and if you so decide, then by all means supply hideous authorities (such as the clerics) with the best falsification of the evidence that you can contrive. It is for you, Dear, to measure the morality of your actions; let the clerics promote their stupidities on people who are as stupid as they are.

Finally in this list of stupidities, the clerics promote Commandment #10:

“You shall not covet your neighbor’s house; you shall not covet your neighbor’s wife, his slave, his slave-girl, his ox, his ass, or anything the belongs to him [don’t covet them, just take them and murder the rightful owner].”

And let me add a comment (in addition to what I put in square brackets) about the silliness of telling people who were wandering in the desert about coveting someone else’s “house” and about the horror that the clerics continued to promote slavery. But more generally, Dear, this commandment reeks of stupidity.

First, “coveting” (i.e., “to want ardently; long for with envy”) is an emotion, and if anyone ever proposes a (left-brain) “commandment” in an attempt to control your (right-brain) emotion, such as the stupid commandment “Love thy God with all thy heart and all thy soul”, then tell the commander to blow it out his ear. Second, Dear, there’s absolutely nothing wrong with coveting something. As I’ve mentioned before: if you were wandering in the desert and hadn’t had a drink of water in three days, and if you then see someone with water, I absolutely guarantee you that you will covet that water – and you will be perfectly right to covet it, as defined by Nature’s morality that “the good” is to live. Therefore, Dear, there’s nothing wrong with coveting.

The important concept, a concept totally missed by the stupid clerics who wrote and now promote such stupidity, is not that people “covet”, but what actions they take in response to their perfectly natural emotions. If the person that you met in the desert was also dying of thirst, save for the last few drops of water that he was saving, to try to reach safety, then I trust you’d think at least twice about what actions you should take in response to your coveting. Similarly for all other actions – and I for one would covet the Israelites’ slaves – so I could set them free.

Now, Dear, as you might expect, I'm becoming very weary of wading through the mud and guck that the clerics concocted. I expect that you, too, are becoming weary. But please bear with me for a little longer, while I struggle through just a bit more of this muck, and then I'll get out of it. In fact, before I start struggling through some more, first let me kick some of the guck off my boots.

Thus, Dear, although I've got a lot of guck on my boots from struggling through the first Ten Commandments, actually, as general guidance for how to live, the final six of these commandments aren't too bad (especially if they're slightly modified): generally show your elders appropriate respect, unjustified killing isn't justified (!), constrain your sex life, be careful with lying, and coveting something doesn't justify your stealing it. I encountered most of the mud and guck in the first four commandments (dealing with the clerics' god).

But I encountered more when the clerics promoted that the final six "laws" have anything whatsoever to do with any god – rather than being just reasonable guidance for members of the group to get along, guidance that essentially every group has concluded, ever since humans first gathered in groups. Let me summarize this way. Dear: whenever some idiot (such as any cleric) start blabbering away about "moral absolutes" in the Bible (or in any "holy book"), how I wish you'd have the strength of character to tell them (figuratively) to blow it out their ears. Dear, their absolutes aren't! The nearest to any "moral absolute" that I know is: "Use your brain as best as you can."

Anyway, with some of the guck now kicked off my boots, let me try tromping through some of the rest of the commandments, starting with the hint of some truly horrible stuff located at the end of the Ten Commandments, at *Exodus 20*, 18:

When all the people saw how it thundered and the lightning flashed, when they heard the trumpet sound and saw the mountain smoking [recall that the clerics proposed that God lives on Mount Sinai, which the clerical authors are now depicting as erupting – and of course they add the trumpets, to provide some flourish for their fantasy!], they [the people] trembled and stood at a distance. "Speak to us yourself," they said to Moses, "and we will listen; but if God speaks to us, we shall die." Moses answered, "Do not be afraid. God has come only to test you, so that the fear of him may remain with you and keep you from sin."

At first, Dear, this crazy stuff may seem bewildering, but when you dig deeper, you can see hints of something truly horrible.

First, the bewilderment. Surely there was at least one sane Israelite in the crowd who yelled back:

“Hey Moses, wait a minute. What’s it to be? First you tell us ‘Don’t be afraid.’ Okay, Moses, old buddy, I’m glad you said that. Now, I’m not afraid anymore. Let that old mountain god huff and puff as much as he wants. He doesn’t scare me. Right now I’m feelin’ nice and cozy and comfortable. We’re in roses with Moses!

“But, then Moses old boy, how about checkin’ to see if your head’s screwed on right. You tell us: ‘God has come... to test you, so that the fear of him may remain with you and keep you from sin.’ So, what’s it to be? You just told me not to be afraid, and I’m no longer afraid. And now you tell me that God put fear in me (the fear that you successfully took away) to keep me from sin?

“What’s it to be? Were you supposed to do that? I mean, now that I’m not afraid, am I gonna sin? But if I sin, won’t God get mad? So am I supposed to be unafraid (as you want) or am I supposed to be scared (as God wants) or am I supposed to sin (as apparently you want) or what?”

But beneath that bewilderment (and that stupidity), Dear, there’s something here that’s truly evil. Here, the hideous clerics are announcing a horrible policy, practiced by every dictator who ever fouled the Earth: the immoral choice to rule by fear. In fact, the full policy being developed by these damnable Hebrew clerics (modeled after the Egyptian and Mesopotamian clerics, and practiced by every cleric every since, including Christian, Islamic, and Mormon clerics) is to rule the people by using the twin cattle-prods of fear and greed. In the case of the Israelites, again and again throughout the Bible, the clerics use the twin prods of “fear of the Lord” and hope for a “promised land” (which the Israelites didn’t deserve), i.e., the twin cattle prods of fear and greed. In the case of Christian, Islamic, and Mormon clerics, as you well know, the twin prods are fear of hell and hope for heaven, i.e., again, fear and greed.

In contrast to Moses and all clerics, Dear, think of some leaders who deserve praise. Think of such people as Confucius, Buddha, Socrates, Aristotle,

* Go to other chapters *via*

Epicurus, Archimedes, Marcus Aurelius, Galileo, Newton, Jefferson, Einstein, Churchill, Gandhi, Martin Luther King... They led by some unique mixture of intelligence, courage, oratory, faith in themselves and their principles, and so on, with their principal fear being of their own failure and their principal hope being that they could help humanity. And now for contrast, Dear, think of the choice made by this damnable Moses (and all subsequent clerics and all subsequent dictators, such as Hitler, Stalin, and Mao): not to lead by example, but through a policy of capitalizing on the people's fear and greed.

To be sure, capitalizing on people's fear and greed can be an effective policy, and if you'll be alert, Dear, you'll see many if not most politicians using it today. In our country, it's used by many Democratic politicians, especially by using poor people's fear of the rich – and their greed for gaining some of that richness. Meanwhile, though, many if not most Republicans use the same policy, but focus on the fears of those who have gained some wealth that they'll be robbed by the poor (via increased taxes) and on the greed of the rich to retain undeserved power.

But regardless of its effectiveness, it's a damnable way to lead people – and I damn any self-styled Moses (either cleric or politician) who makes the immoral choice of leading or ruling by manipulating the people's fear and greed. And of the two prongs of the cattle prod that clerics use to rule people, clerics have time and again demonstrated that fear works best, as I'll be showing you below

But before I show you details of that, let me get on to some of the rest of the “commandments”. I'll introduce them by saying that, in contrast to a few of the First Ten that might seem appropriate for the mentality of a child, some of the rest are so crazy – and some are so horrible – that I don't imagine even a child can tolerate such stupidity.

A good example is the one of the first of this “supplementary list” of commandments that the people are to obey. This one is buried at the end of *Exodus 20*, in which the clerics' God is allegedly describing how his altar is to be made. I'll almost totally ignore the stupidity of “you must not build it of hewn stones, for if you use a chisel on it, you will profane it” (let's assume that such stupidity is a misprint or a mistranslation, or that the clerics were smoking some special herb), and jump to the astoundingly important commandment at *Exodus 20, 26*:

* Go to other chapters *via*

“You must not mount up to my altar by steps, in case your private parts be exposed on it.”

Hello? This is the kind of commandment that the creator of the universe wishes to convey to us?

Hasn't the omniscient ruler of the universe ever heard of underwear? Is it really so dreadful in the sight of the ruler of the universe to see a little ant-like person's "private parts"? If He doesn't like them, then why in hell did He make them?! Does He want us to put diapers on all the animals? How about a different idea: how about if all clerics in the world are reassigned to a more useful occupation, namely, making underwear for all the animals in the world? Sorry, Dear, but the stupidity of this stuff boggles my mind.

But then, I soon recover – with jolts of pure, unadulterated evil. These appear in Commandments #12 through about #60, described in *Exodus 21-23*. I don't plan to retype them all, here, but I'll list a few, with comments and organized into the groups shown below. As I expect you'll find, some of these "supplementary commandments" aren't too bad, simply amplifying or illustrating the First Ten (and I use this feature to guide the groupings below), but as I expect you'll also agree, some of these commandments advocate absolutely horrible policies.

ADDENDUM TO COMMANDMENTS 1-10

Groups 1-4 (Related to Commandments #1-4)

Amplification of Clerical Policies re. Religious Intolerance, Support of the Dictatorship, Payment to the Priests, & Keeping the clerics Fat and Happy

Exodus 22, 18: “You shall not allow a witch to live.” [A witch being someone, I suppose, whose “magic” competes with the clerics’ magic.]

Exodus 22, 20: “Whoever sacrifices to any god but the Lord shall be put to death under solemn ban.” [What “solemn ban” means, I don't know, but what I do know is that this policy of religious intolerance is evil, even if it's totally understandable that the clerics would choose to enforce this policy, to maintain their grasp on power (and on the people's purses).]

Exodus 22, 28: “You shall not revile God, nor curse a chief of your own people [because we have, here, the beginning of a power structure – and we plan to keep hold of our power]....”

Exodus 22, 29: “You shall not hold back the first of your harvest, whether corn or wine. You shall give me [viz., the priests] your first-born sons. You shall do the same with your oxen and your sheep...”

Exodus 23, 13: “Be attentive to every word of mine. You shall not invoke other gods: your lips shall not speak their names.” [This god is apparently really hung up on his standing within the hierarchy of gods.]

Exodus 23, 16: “No one shall come into my presence [i.e., into the presence of the priests] empty-handed...” [How could these damnable clerical parasites be so blatant!]

Exodus 23, 19: “You shall bring the choices first-fruits of your soil to the house of the Lord...” [We get nothing but the best!]

Exodus 23, 23: “My angel will go before you and bring you to the Amorites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites [i.e., all the people peacefully living on their land, working hard, trying to survive, doing nobody any harm] and I will make an end of them [murder them all]. You are not to bow down to their gods, nor worship them, nor observe their rites, but you shall tear down all their images and smash their sacred pillars [because, of all things we clerics can’t stand, the worst is competition from other clerics]...”

Exodus 29, 39-42: “This is what you shall offer on the altar: two yearling rams *regularly every day* [italics added, and note this is one of GOD’s commandments!]. You shall offer the one ram at dawn, and the second between dusk and dark [the clerics like to eat regularly!], a tenth of an ephah of flour mixed with a quarter of a hin of pure oil of pounded olives, and a drink-offering of a quarter of a hin of wine for the first ram. You shall offer the second ram between dusk and dark [the clerics aren’t about to wait for their dinner!], and with it the same grain-offering and drink-offering as at dawn, for a soothing odor...” [It’s a wonder the clerics didn’t order some music and some dancing girls! And it’s a wonder some of the Israelites didn’t see through this ruse – although maybe they did, but they decided that they would prefer to keep their mouths shut rather than their heads severed by the Levites].

Exodus 30, 12-14: “Each man shall give a ransom for his life to the Lord, to avert plague... [How’s that for medical insurance! What a protection racket!] [H]e shall give half a shekel by the sacred standard (twenty gerahs to the shekel) as a contribution to the Lord. Everyone from twenty years old and upwards... shall give a contribution to the Lord...” [“Shall” as in “must”! That’s similar to the familiar choice: “You, you, and you are volunteers.”]

Exodus 35, 4-5: “This is the command the Lord has given: each of you set aside a contribution to the Lord...: gold, silver, copper; violet, purple, and scarlet yarn...” [Now that the priests are fat and happy, they gotta have nice clothes!]

Group 5 (Related to Commandment #5)

Amplification of Clerical Policy re. Honoring Parents

Exodus 21, 15: “Whoever strikes his father or mother shall be put to death.” [That’s absurd! Instead, how about spanking the child, or sending him to bed without dinner, or denying him TV privileges? – whoops, I forgot, no TV permitted under Yahweh’s (aka Moses’) second law!]

Exodus 21, 17: “Whoever reviles his father or mother shall be put to death. [To “revile”, Dear, is to regard as vile or “to use abusive or contemptuous language in speaking to or about.” For example, Dear, when I describe my own father as a drunk and a “dead beat” (i.e., refusing to take financial responsibility for his children), then I revile my father. Apparently the clerics maintain that, though my description of my father is accurate, I’m to be put to death. I imagine you can guess my response to the damnable clerics.]

Group 6 (Related to Commandment #6)

Amplification of Clerical Policies re. Murder and Other Mayhem

Exodus 21, 12-14: “Whoever strikes another man and kills him [e.g., as Moses did] shall be put to death. But if he did not act with intent... [not applicable to Moses], the slayer may flee to a place which I [God] will appoint for you. [So how come Moses got away with murder? Oh, maybe that’s it: Moses’ laws aren’t binding on Moses; maybe such laws aren’t binding on any clerics; how very clever – as in treacherous – of them!] But if a man has the presumption to kill another by treachery [like tricking people into invading innocent people?] you shall take him even from my altar to be put to death.”

Exodus 21, 16: “Whoever kidnaps a man shall be put to death, whether he has sold him, or the man is found in his possession. [What about virgin girls? How come it’s okay to kidnap them?]

Exodus 21, 23: “Whenever hurt is done, you shall give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burn for burn, bruise for bruise, wound for wound.” [As I showed you in **M1**, Dear, this bit of barbarianism was borrowed from the Laws of Hammurabi, which were “published” (on stone monuments) about 500 years before Moses polluted the world with his commandments, his priesthood, and his god. But don’t worry about this crazy commandment, Dear, because any modern society has abandoned its stupidity. For example, if you ever do accidentally put out someone’s eye (as I once did, when I was about eight years old), you’ll not need to forfeit one of your own.]

Exodus 22, 4: “If a burglar is caught in the act and is fatally injured, it is not murder; but (or “except”) if [the burglar] breaks in after sunrise [i.e., during daylight] and is fatally injured, then it is murder. [It’s not explained what happens to the murderer.]

Group 7 (Related to Commandment #7)

Amplification of Clerical Policy re. Adultery and Fornication

Exodus 22, 16: “When a man seduces a virgin who is not yet betrothed, he shall pay the bride-price for her to be his wife. [Otherwise, no penalty for rape?] If her father refuses to give her to him, the seducer shall pay in silver a sum equal to the bride-price for virgins.” [So, neither the daughter nor the father gets any say in the matter, for there is no justice in such matters!]

Exodus 22, 19: “Whoever has unnatural connection with a beast shall be put to death.” [Although I’m glad to see that the clerics showed some concern for animals, I’m distressed that they didn’t apply Hammurabi’s “eye-for-an-eye principle” to discern a more fitting punishment for the crime. The death penalty is extreme.]

Group 8 (Related to Commandment #8)

Amplification of Clerical Policy re. Theft

Exodus 22, 1: “When a man steals an ox or a sheep and slaughters or sells it, he shall repay five beasts for the ox and four sheep for the sheep. He shall pay in full; if he has no means, he shall be sold to pay for the theft. But if the animal is found alive in his possession, be it ox, ass, or sheep, he shall repay two.” [Except for the fact that this commandment (or law) advocates slavery, it might not seem too bad. But, Dear, it’s a law biased in favor of the rich and against the poor. In the unlikely event that a rich person steals a sheep or an ox, here he’s given a way to buy his way out of his predicament. But suppose a desperately poor man steals a sheep to feed his starving family. Then he’s to be sold into slavery?! What then of his family? And how did the victim of the theft acquire his property in the first place? Similar to Abraham, did he trap an innocent person in an affair with a woman he later learned was the trickster’s wife? Or similar to Jacob, did he trick his brother out of his inheritance, and then, was it his brother who stole the sheep? That is, Dear, before deciding on the punishment for a crime, how about if we investigate the causes and circumstances of the crime?]

Group 9 (Related to Commandment #9)

Amplification of Clerical Policy re. Giving Evidence, etc.

Exodus 23, 1: “You shall not spread a baseless rumor.” [Like the “baseless rumor” that God exists and that the clerics are His earthly representatives?]

Exodus 23, 6: “You shall not deprive the poor man of justice in his suit. Avoid all lies, and do not cause the death of the innocent and the guiltless... You shall not accept a bribe, for bribery makes the discerning man blind and the just man give a crooked answer.” [Well, if he was “just”, he wouldn’t have taken the bribe in the first place!]

Group 10 (Related to Commandment #10)

Amplification of Clerical Policy re. Coveting, Slavery, Etc.

Exodus 21, 2: “When you buy a Hebrew slave [i.e., special treatment for your slaves who are Hebrews, but no comment on the concept of slavery itself]...”

Exodus 21, 7: “When a man sells his daughter into slavery[!], she shall not go free as a male slave may [i.e., even worse treatment for female slaves than for male slaves]. If her master has not had intercourse with her [it was permitted?!] and she does not please him [is she a slave or a prostitute?], he shall let her be ransomed[!]... If he assigns her to his son[!]...”

Exodus 21, 20: “When a man strikes his slave or his slave-girl with a stick [Isn’t it amazing that the creator of the universe busies HIMself with details about how to beat your slave?] and the slave dies on the spot, he [who? the slave?!] must be punished. [So don’t beat your slave quite to instantaneous death!] But he shall not be punished if the slave survives for one day or two. [So, just beat your slave unconscious, and don’t worry if he or she dies on the third day], because... the slave is worth money to his master [and Lord knows that the few coins of silver you gave for your slave is more important than the life you beat out of your slave]...”

Exodus 21, 26: “If the ox gores a slave or slave-girl, its owner shall pay thirty shekels of silver to their master, and the ox shall be stoned.” [This is one of god’s rules that never seems to have received the press it deserves!]

The above, Dear, is just about as far as I can get through this guck. For me, the straw that broke this camel’s back was when I read “When a man sells his daughter into slavery...” With that, I knew that no policy advocated in this Bible is of any relevance to me. Let me explain.

Just for the sake of argument, Dear, even though there’s not a shred of evidence to support the idea, suppose some God did create this universe. Then, Dear, I’d be more than willing to stake my eternity on the gamble that the God who created the universe isn’t the God that the damnable clerics describe in the Bible. I would agree with the Gnostics’ Jesus who advocated (as I’ll show you later) that the God of the Bible is the evil god. Rather than align myself with such an evil God, I would pledge allegiance to the equally fictitious Satan. I’d be pleased to suffer the terrors and tortures of the clerics’ imagined and fictitious hell rather than align myself with this God who would tell me how to sell my daughter into slavery, because by aligning

* Go to other chapters *via*

myself with the clerics' fictitious Satan, I would assume that someday I would have a chance to kill their imagined God.

That is, not only am I confident that any International Court of Justice would conclude that killing this God is justified (assuming the jurors are sufficiently intelligent to base their decision on data) but also, I don't really care about the conclusions of the jury. That is, I've seen enough evidence of this god's evil to be convinced that humanity would be far better off I were convicted of killing him, for that would provide humanity with one more suggestion that he doesn't exist.

Yet, there's still much more evidence of this god's evil – or better, the evil of the clerics who concocted him, so I'll try to continue for still a little longer. With *Exodus 24*, the clerics would have us believe that Moses wrote down all the laws, killed some cattle and collected the blood, and while spraying the people with the blood, yelled out (*Exodus 24, 8*):

This is the blood of the covenant [rather than the blood of cattle!] which the Lord has made with you on the terms of this book.

Later, he (and of course seventy of the elders, because anything to do with “seven” is magical) climbed God's mountain, where God reportedly said (*Exodus 24, 12*):

“Let me give you the tablets of stone, the law and the commandment, which I have written down that you may teach them.”

The clerics don't explain why Moses didn't respond: “Thanks, anyway, God old fellow, but I already wrote the rules in my neat little book, here, and it's a hell of a lot easier to carry around than your bulky old stone tablets.”

Then, in *Exodus 25*, the clerics begin in earnest to describe the extent of their greed and the nature of their con game. They have their God say (*Exodus 25, 1*):

“Tell the Israelites to set aside a contribution for me; you shall accept whatever contribution each man shall freely offer. [But, if it's not enough, then in methods that I'll detail later, kill them.] This is what you shall accept [even though I just finished saying that you'll accept whatever they offer]: gold, silver, copper, violet, purple, and scarlet yarn; fine linen and goats' hair; tanned rams' skins, porpoise-hides, and acacia-wood... [and so on, including: Cadillacs, BMWs, Mercedes, jet aircraft, cruise ships, etc.] Make me a sanctuary... [in every city, with each building to be the most

beautiful in the city, plus various special temples, with associated houses for my priests that have all modern conveniences, which of course includes saunas, swimming pools, and so on.]”

This astounding description of the largess and ritual demanded by the damnable clerics continues for pages.

Incidentally, Dear, if your puzzled by how the Israelites (just escaping from “slavery” in Egypt) managed to have not only their own slaves but also what would be equivalent (in today’s currency) to billions of dollars worth of gold, silver, and so on (which was being demanded by the clerics), then let me mention a little (of the poorly-known) history, more details of which I’ll show you in later paragraphs.

First and foremost, don’t believe the Bible! The clerics wrote this garbage when they were sitting comfortably amidst the wealth (and as allies) of the Persians, in Babylon, ~800 years after Moses had died (if he ever lived). Then, they truly “cooked the books” (i.e., fabricated the stories) to satisfy their greedy hearts’ desires. In addition, possibly because even the clerics were worried that no one would believe that the Israelites had so much wealth, the clerics doctored the earlier part of the story, saying that the Egyptians were so pleased to be rid of the Israelites that the Egyptians supplied them with enormous wealth. In reality, if any of this story has even a hint of what actually occurred, I expect that as the Egyptian army was pushing the Hyksos back to Palestine, Egyptian civilians were probably plundered by the Hyksos (and their Hebrew allies).

Anyway, according to *Exodus 32*, after God had finished describing to Moses how he wanted his BMW outfitted and had given Moses all the rules and regulation on “the two tablets of the Tokens, tablets of stone written with the finger of God” [containing all the information of roughly 13 pages of fine print in the Bible, which of course God had no difficulty putting on only two stone tablets, because God’s finger is very small and therefore his finger produces very fine print (but imagine the trouble Moses had reading it! – a problem he solved by improvising, as he moved his fingernail along cracks that he could only feel)], the clerics then tell us a story that must have strained even their own crazy consciousness.

Thus, at *Exodus 32*, 1, the clerics would have us believe the following:

When the people saw that Moses was so long in coming down from the mountain, they confronted Aaron [Moses' brother and his spokesman, especially when Moses started to stutter] and said to him, "Come [the Israelites loved to say "come"], make us gods to go ahead of us. As for this fellow Moses, who brought us up from Egypt, we do not know what has become of him." [Then, without hesitation] Aaron answered them "Strip the gold rings [which you robbed from the Egyptians] from the ears of your wives and daughters, and bring them [presumably the gold, not the wives and daughters – or their ears!] to me." [And maybe you notice, Dear, how close the word "gold" is to the word "god"; you see, with the addition of "L", the clerics managed to turn their god into gold!] So [without hesitation, even though they had robbed the Egyptians at considerable risk to themselves] all the people stripped themselves of their gold earrings and brought them to Aaron. He took them out of their hands [although it might have been quicker to have the 600,000 men just dump the gold earrings in a pot, especially if each set of earrings weighed at least an ounce, and if each man contributed at least one set, then that's 600,000 ounces (roughly 20 tons of gold!), of current value of roughly \$400 million], cast the metal in a mould, and made it into the image of a bull-calf. "These," he said, "are your gods, O Israel, that brought you up from Egypt [and I assume he said "these are your gods" rather than "this is your god", because he soon realized that a single 20 ton gold bull-calf was too big for him to handle]."

The Israelites then commenced to party, which the clerics claim caught God's attention, I guess because, at heart, God's a party animal. That is, apparently God is oblivious to even generations of moaning, but just get a party started, and he's there in a flash!

But before I get to God's party-pooing reaction, Dear, please think for a moment about the stupidity of this story. The Hebrews had just finished witnessing (at least, so the clerics would have us believe) the most astounding "miracles", the likes of which the world truly has never seen, from turning the Nile to blood to killing all the Egyptian first-born, and from parting the Red (or Reed) Sea to munching on manna that fell from the sky. Then, we're expected to swallow the story that, while sitting around munching manna at the base of a volcano waiting for Moses, the terrified Israelites said (in effect): "Ah, forget all this God crap; come, let's all pitch in our gold and have a bull session." A person would have to be as crazy as a cleric to believe that the Israelites could be this stupid!

But then, according to the clerics, good old Moses came to the rescue. God's reported party-pooing plan was the following (*Exodus* 32, 9):

"I [God] have considered this people, and I see that they are a stubborn people. [Well, God, you know, you apparently have a way of making people obstinate!]

Now, let me alone to vent my anger upon them [God is apparently required to ask Moses' permission!], so that I may put an end to them and make a great nation spring from you.' [God's two favorite sports seem to be killing people and then having them (watching them?) beget more people.]”

But fortunately for the Israelites (at least, so the clerics would have us believe), the high priest Moses intervened with God on behalf of the people [which, to this day, is the wonderful (alleged) contribution of all clerics]:

But Moses set himself to placate the Lord his God: “O Lord,” he said, “why shouldst thou vent thy anger upon thy people...? Turn from thy anger, and think better of the evil thou dost intend against thy people...” So the Lord relented, and spared his people the evil with which he had threatened them.

Amazing! Not that God planned to do more evil (cause, doncha know, he's famous for that), but that Moses would ask why – and that Moses dares to tell God that what he [God] plans to do is evil! Moses tells God to “think better”. And the omniscient, all-powerful ruler of the universe didn't vaporize Moses on the spot?

In fact, I find the above amazing in many ways. First, it amazes me that the clerics would dare to paint their God to be such a witless wimp – unless, of course, they're fully convinced that there is no god! Earlier, they pictured him similarly, when they had Abraham talk God out of destroying Sodom and Gomorrah (if there were a certain number of good people within), when they had Israel hold his own in an all-night wrestling match with God, and when Zipporah zapped God with her son's bloody foreskin. And here, meek little Moses outwits God? What a wimp this God is! Second, it amazes me that the clerics would think that anyone would fall for this stupid story. Who couldn't see that the clerics' ploy is to portray the priests as the protector of the people against God's wrath (and, therefore, as in any profitable protection racket, the people should pay plenty for the priests' services). And third, of course I find it absolutely astounding that in fact some people actually seem to believe this stupid stuff – to this day!!

But on with the story – because the complete policy position of the damnable priests has not quite been totally portrayed. After getting God to change his mind, Moses goes down the mountain and plays out his part. First he smashes the two tablets. Why he did so isn't explained. [And neither is it explained how anybody knew what had been written on the smashed tablets, i.e., where did all the above “supplementary

* Go to other chapters *via*

Commandments” come from? How do we know that some cleric in Babylon, about a thousand years later, didn’t cook them up from his frenzied imagination?!

Next, Moses smashes the statue, grinds the gold, mixes it with water, and has at least all 600,000 of the men drink the water (which, serving 10 per minute, took 60,000 minutes or 1000 hours, i.e., ~ 40 days, of course). And then, Moses then made a speech that will live in infamy so long as one Bible remains unburned (*Exodus* 32, 26):

He [Moses] took his place at the gate of the camp and said, “Who is on the Lord’s side? Come here to me”; and the Levites [the future Israelite clerics] all rallied to him. He said to them, “These are the words of the Lord the God of Israel [and although there are no reports that God actually said these words, it is of course I, Moses, who speaks for God]: ‘Arm yourselves, each of you, with his sword [Moses neglects to mention how the just-released Israelite slaves managed to have any swords]. Go through the camp from gate to gate and back again. [And with a population of ~3 million people plus cattle, this would be at least 10 miles each way.] Each of you kill his brother, his friend, his neighbor.’ [Never mind the commandment “Thou shalt not kill”; this is justified homicide, for I’m the one who makes it justified.] The Levites obeyed [for good people always obey the dictator], and about three thousand of the people died that day [i.e., roughly one person per thousand, which I guess means that the Levites didn’t have many brothers, friends, or neighbors]. Moses then said, “Today you have consecrated yourselves to the Lord completely, because you have turned each against his own son and his own brother and so have this day brought a blessing upon yourselves.”

Dear, any time you feel like screaming bloody murder, feel free. I did essentially the same – upon learning the clerics’ detailed description of how to sell my daughter into slavery. For me, from that point on, the Bible is just some horrid novel, not worth the paper it’s printed on. Maybe you feel similarly after reading how the clerics would have people “consecrate” themselves to the Lord: go through their community and kill “brothers, friends, and neighbors”, so that the survivors will live in fear, each turning against surviving family members. This slaughter brings a blessing on the killers?

Of course the clerics claim that it wasn’t murder. Why? Because the people were bad? Because the people thought for themselves? Because the people chose to worship a different god? Because if the people thought for themselves and worshipped another god, then the clerics wouldn’t be in control? Because then the clerics wouldn’t be able to capitalize on their con

* Go to other chapters *via*

game? Do the Jewish people truly wonder where Hitler got his ideas? Can't the Jewish people see that Hitler's Storm Troopers were modeled after their own Levites? Don't they see that Hitler's role model was Moses?

Then, to complete this horror story and to cement the clerics' policy position, the clerics wrote (*Exodus* 32, 30):

The next day Moses said to the people [not just to his murdering SS troopers, i.e., the Levites, but to the people], "You [terrible people, who dare to have your own opinions] have committed a great sin. [And this I know to be God's holy truth, not only because I speak for God but also because it's always the one who has the most loyal storm troopers who gets to define what 'sin' means.] I shall now go up to the Lord; perhaps I may be able to secure pardon for your sin."

And thus, Dear, the clerics' policy statement is fairly complete and, they trust, completely clear:

- We rule by fear (and, when appropriate, we spice the fear with a little of the people's greed),
- We decide what killing is justified, what wars are "holy", and in general, what's right vs. wrong,
- We define sins, and when we feel like it, we pardon sins – provided an appropriate price is paid (and, of course, we are the ones who decide what's appropriate).

And if, Dear, you wonder how you might effectively fight against the evil of all clerics, I would suggest that you explore how you might help any humanist organization.

Now, Dear, I don't know how much of the Old Testament (OT) you "should" read. Probably everyone in our society should read some of it, because it's part of our culture – but just enough so that they could confidently and comfortably describe it as a bunch of crap. With the indoctrination that you've had since you were a baby, I don't know how much you'll need to read before you reach that level of confidence and comfort. Meanwhile, for the rest of this chapter, let me just mention and illustrate a few more of clerics' horrible policies.

* Go to other chapters *via*

The rest of *Exodus* introduces the racist idea (which I'll show you in more detail later) that the Israelites are God's "chosen people", e.g., at *Exodus* 33, 16, Moses cons God into coming along with the Israelites, "So shall we be distinct, I and thy people, from all the peoples on earth." To which the racist clerics have their God respond "I will do this thing that you have asked." The clerics neglect to mention that what makes the Israelites distinct is that they now have been saddled with an Egyptian-style, but unique, priesthood. And incidentally, at *Exodus* 33, 34, it's seen that from his training as an Egyptian priest, Moses adopts the ideas, foreign to Ancient Hebrews (such as Abraham who had a nice little chat with God about Sodom and Gomorrah) and such as Israel (who had an all-night wrestling match with God), that "no mortal man may see me [God] and live." Meanwhile, the Egyptian priests had adopted this policy – because they had learned not to look at their principal god, i.e., the sun!

With his protection racket now firmly established (with the help of the swords of his faithful SS troopers), Moses then went about collecting his loot. It's perfectly lovely that at *Exodus* 35, 5 Moses states "Let all who wish bring a contribution to the Lord: gold, silver, copper..." and that at *Exodus* 35, 22 we find "Men and women alike came and freely brought clasps, earrings... gold ornaments of every kind..." Moses is second rate to no mafia godfather: of course the people freely gave their gold to Moses, for the ardent wish of the people was not to be murdered by Moses' hit men. The rest of *Exodus* is then devoted to describing the new mansion of this Mafia godfather.

But now, being tired, angry, and sad, I'm gonna take a break. I suggest that you do the same. And if someday you think that you can stomach still more of the horrid stuff in the Bible, please read through (or skim through) the next two "books" in the Bible, entitled Leviticus and Numbers. But, Dear, be sensible: before doing any of that, get some exercise!