

Qx24 – Ludicrous Ideas & Policies Promoted by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (LDS) – 4

Dear: As you know, Mormonism is described in about 1,000 pages of its “holy books”, namely the Book of Mormon (BoM), the Doctrine and Covenants (D&C), and the Pearl of Great Price (PGP), which contains the Book of Moses (BoMo) and the Book of Abraham (BoA). With the ~100 pages of the previous three chapters, I’ve managed to get through the BoM’s first six introductory pages plus a little of the BoMo and the BoA. So that means...

Actually, Dear, what it does mean (or “should mean”) is: be careful of “linear” (or “proportional”) projections. Just because some thing or person or process behaved or occurred in a certain way in the past, doesn’t mean the trend will continue. For example, a lifetime’s trend of waking each morning doesn’t mean we always will – and just because you’ve always been a Mormon, doesn’t mean...! As Alan Watts repeatedly wrote: “It’s not a linear world!” In particular, after taking three chapters to comment on ideas and policies advocated in the first six pages of the BoM, in this chapter I plan to dispense with the rest of the ~1,000 pages of LDS “holy scripture”!

There are three main reasons why I would maintain that my plan is not so outrageous as it might seem. First, although in the previous three chapters I’ve managed to get through only the first six pages of the BoM, already these contain many of the principal ideas and policies in the original version of Mormonism. Among these are:

- That black skin is a curse from God (i.e., white-supremacy filth)
- That Native Americans are descendants of the “missing” tribes of Israel (Get real!)
- That people should ignore data and just have faith – in the clerics (Gimme a break!)
- That testimonies are sufficient to establish the existence of miracles, angels, gods (and UFOs, little green men from Mars, whatever)

- That though the creator of the universe is omniscient, omnipotent, and omni-whatever, yet for some strange reason (known only by the clerics), he has great difficulty in communicating with people; therefore, every once and a while, he drops down to Earth and gives instructions to us via various murderers, mystics, maniacs, and con-artist manipulators, such as Moses, Jesus, “Saint” Paul, Muhammad, Joseph Smith, Brigham Young, et al. (although I won’t show you evidence that these Mormon leaders conspired to commit murder until the historical summary in **Yx**).

And although I also haven’t yet shown you details for the case of Mormonism and Islam, rest assured that, just as for all “revealed religions”, one of the most important messages that the creator of the universe has relayed to Earthlings via his con-artist spokesmen is that he rather desperately needs money; therefore, say they, we should pay them for the privilege of having them tell us how to live our lives. “Pray, pay, and obey,” say they; to which I recommend the response: “No way!”

Further, the second reason why I maintain that my plan for this chapter isn’t “outrageous” is because many Mormon ideas and policies are intimately associated with the history of Rigdon, the Smiths, and subsequent LDS leaders, and although I sketched only a little of this history in the previous three chapters (delaying the rest until the historical perspective of **Yx**), I would suggest that what I’ve already sketched does provide at least an outline of many Mormon ideas and policies. Illustrations of these historical sources of Mormon ideas and policies include the “curse” of black skin (derived from this country’s horrible history of slavery), the doctrinal peculiarities of the Disciple’s Church (with which the author of the BoM, Rigdon, was so enamored that he rigged a new religion), financial troubles of Rigdon, the Smiths, and the rest of the first Mormons (and therefore their experiment in communism, confiscating the property of converts), the “revelation” requiring polygamy (because Joseph Smith felt the need to “sanction” his adultery), the “revelation” repealing the revelation [☹] requiring polygamy (because LDS leaders wanted Utah to gain statehood), the “revelation” repealing the revelation about the “curse” of black skin (because LDS leaders were afraid of losing their church’s tax-exempt status via lawsuits derived from the 1960’s Civil Rights Act), and so on. Thereby, without realizing it, Rigdon, Smith, and subsequent LDS leaders revealed more about how religions carry out their con games than ever was revealed to them about policies advocated by some giant Jabberwock in the sky – but again, I’ll delay showing you details until **Yx**.

* Go to other chapters *via*

And the third reason (and the last of my listed reasons) that I would maintain that my plan isn't so outrageous as it first may seem is that, because of peculiar historical circumstances and events, there really aren't many additional ideas and policies in Mormonism (worth reviewing!) beyond those contained in the first six pages of the BoM! Now, of course it'll take me most of this chapter to try to justify that statement, but here, I'll try to summarize with the following assessments.

- Whereas ~80% of the BoM is a totally fictitious story about the origin of Native Americans (and therefore, the BoM contains few ideas and policies more than would be found in any other book of fiction) and whereas approximately half of the remaining ~20% of the BoM is just plagiarized from the King James Version of the Bible, therefore, when the BoM was concocted (probably by the Campbellite preacher Sidney Rigdon), the author or authors added few ideas and policies other than those silly doctrinal details peculiar to the offshoot of the Baptist Church called the Campbellites or the Disciples' Church (e.g., how and when people are to be baptized, who gets to be a priest and how, etc.) – none of which are worth reviewing!
- Whereas many of the principal “communications from God” recorded in the D&C (i.e., the rules and regulations that Rigdon, Smith, and later LDS leaders dictated – and that you, Dear, were forced to learn, e.g., about tithing and about what you must do to rule your own world after you die) have been changed so dramatically over the years (and even rescinded by subsequent LDS leaders, e.g., those dealing with communism, polygamy, and the curse of black skin) and whereas any of these “communications from God” can be modified or even rescinded by future leaders of the LDS Church, therefore, none of the remaining policies is worth reviewing – because none of them should be considered as “firm policies”: any of them can be changed when the next political wind is sufficiently strong to cause LDS leaders to claim that they've received a new “revelation”. Thereby, any or all of the current policies may be out of date before this book ever leaves this computer!
- Whereas the *Book of Abraham* (BoA) in the Pearl of Great Price (PGP) has been found (without a shadow of a doubt!) to be a total fabrication by Joseph Smith from a papyrus that contained instructions to the dead from the ancient Egyptian *Book of the Breathing*, therefore, the PGP isn't

worth the paper it's printed on – save to demonstrate that sometimes, if sufficient rope is supplied to con artists, eventually they'll hang themselves! And actually, given that the PGP's BoA is so unquestionably a hoax perpetrated by Smith, I wouldn't be surprised if LDS leaders will soon try to disown it – which will be an interesting spectacle to watch– to see if they've got enough rope to hang themselves as well!

Now, Dear, you might wonder something similar to: “If you feel that way, then why continue?” You might even wonder: “If you feel that way, how can you continue?” The answer to that last question is that I'll do what I can to free my grandchildren (and other children) from their indoctrination in Mormon madness. And as to “Why continue?": first, I feel the need to provide evidence supporting my assessments, and second, I hope you'll see that the Mormon “revelations” are actually amazingly revealing about all “revealed religions” – and thereby, I hope that you'll not jump from the frying pan of Mormon madness into the fire of religions that are just as insanelly void of data (such as Islam, Christianity, Judaism, or Hinduism).

That said (or at least “written”) it's time to “get on with it!” Immediately, however, let me repeat my reluctance to advise you to read the BoM, Dear, because the writing is so bad and the story is so boring. To support that statement, I'll quote a little from Chapter 16 of *Roughing It* by Mark Twain (the pseudonym of Samuel Clemens, 1835–1910). In what follows, I've added a few notes in square brackets and, for emphasis, the italics.

All men have heard of the Mormon Bible, but few except the ‘elect’ have seen it, or, at least, taken the trouble to read it. I brought away a copy from Salt Lake [during his trip to the West, “roughing it”]. The book is a curiosity to me, it is such a pretentious affair, and yet so ‘slow’, so sleepy, such an insipid mess of inspiration. *It is chloroform in print.* If Joseph Smith composed this book, the act was a miracle – *keeping awake while he did it was, at any rate...*

The book seems to be merely a prosy detail of imaginary history, with the Old Testament for a model; followed by a tedious plagiarism of the New Testament. The author labored to give his words and phrases the quaint, old-fashioned sound and structure of our King James's translation of the Scriptures; and the result is a mongrel – *half modern glibness, and half ancient simplicity and gravity.* The latter is awkward and constrained; the former natural, but grotesque by the contrast. Whenever he found his speech growing too modern – which was about every sentence or two – he ladled in a few such Scriptural phrases as “exceeding sore”, “and

it came to pass”, etc., and made things satisfactory again. “*And it came to pass*” was his pet. *If he had left that out, his Bible would have been only a pamphlet.*

The title page reads as follows: [Quoted, and then Twain adds:] “Hid up” is good. And so is “wherefore” – though why “wherefore”? Any other word would have answered as well – though in truth it would not have sounded so Scriptural.

Next comes: [Twain here quotes *The Testimony of Three Witnesses* and then adds:] Some people have to have a world of evidence before they can come anywhere in the neighborhood of believing anything; but for me, when a man tells me that he has “seen the engravings which are upon the plates”, and not only that, but an angel was there at the time, and saw him see them, and probably took his receipt for it, I am very far on the road to conviction, no matter whether I ever heard of that man before or not, and even if I do not know the name of the angel, or his nationality either.

Next is this: [Twain here quotes *The Testimony of Eight Witnesses* and then adds:] And when I am far on the road to conviction, and eight men, be they grammatical or otherwise, come forward and tell me that they have seen the plates too; and not only seen those plates but “hefted” them, I am convinced. *I could not feel more satisfied and at rest if the entire Whitmer family had testified.*

Twain’s cynical remarks continue for the rest of his chapter sixteen,¹ but then his cynicism stops at the very end of his chapter, with the following statement:

The Mormon Bible is rather stupid and tiresome to read, but there is nothing vicious in its teachings. Its code of morals is unobjectionable – it is “smouched” {Milton} [i.e., stolen] from the New Testament and no credit given.

But with some of that I disagree. Certainly I agree that the BoM is “rather stupid and tiresome to read”, that it’s “chloroform in print”, and that it’s “*smouched* from the New Testament”, but I disagree that it contains “nothing vicious in its teachings” and “its code of morals is unobjectionable” – for reasons that I’ll now begin to try to show you.

Yet, Dear, before I begin to review policies promoted with the text of the BoM, let me list some restrictions that I’ll be imposing on my review.

- Consistent with the “policy perspective” of this “excursion” **Qx**, I plan to restrict myself, first, to addressing the question: What policies are promoted in the BoM? Thereby, I’ll generally ignore its hundreds (if not

¹ Which you can find, Dear, at, e.g., http://www.mtwain.com/Roughing_It/17.html – even though you might expect that the number in that web address should be 16.html!

thousands) of archeological and scientific absurdities and its innumerable mistreatments of the English language.

- Second, I plan generally to ignore the policies in the BoM that the author just copied from the Bible. I've already spent enough time (too much time?) on such stupidity. I will, however, make an exception in the case of the author's rendition of Saint Paul's insanity about Jesus' alleged atonement for our sins – both because it's central to Mormon "theology" and because the author managed to make Saint Paul's stupidity appear even more ludicrous, as difficult as that must have been.
- Third, although it might upset the author of the BoM (if he were still alive) and current Mormon leaders (if they were to read any of this), I plan to omit from considerations all "policy issues" that the author (probably poor-old-deluded Sidney Rigdon) considered so important that he perpetrated the entire ruse in the first place (i.e., "remission of sins" by baptism, that infant baptism was unnecessary, how baptism is to be performed and by whom, the establishment and perpetuation of the priesthood, etc.). As I already showed you a little and will show you more in Yx, these policies (as given in the BoM) were established in and promoted by the Disciple's Church, which basically was a spin-off of the Baptist Church. All of these "policy issues" were apparently extremely important to the author of the BoM – so important that he perpetrated the hoax that now contaminates the lives of perhaps 10 million people. But my reaction to all such policies, Dear, is simply: "Whatever!" That it, they're all just rules and rituals associated with membership in some club, and if members are required to part their hair in a special way, tie their shoe laces in a special manner, or wear special underwear (as you know is the case), then I really don't care!

Stated differently, my plan for what follows is especially to emphasize policies in the BoM dealing with justice, morality, and similar social issues.

In some cases, these BoM policies may have been contained in the source of the "historical"/fictional portion of the BoM – which for definiteness I'll designate as "Spalding's original romantic novel" (or similar), even though that source can't be established with certainty. Thereby, by including these policies in the BoM, the author (whom I'll identify as Rigdon, for definiteness, even though this, also, can't be established with certainty) may have promoted policies in the BoM of which he was unaware!

For example, it seems highly likely that, to offer an explanation for why only “uncivilized savages” (i.e., the Native Americans) remained of the “lost tribes of Israel” (after they had allegedly immigrated to the Americas), Spalding apparently described (in his second novel) prolonged and pervasive wars among the remnants of the tribes. Presumably that served Spalding’s purpose sufficiently for his “romantic novel”, but when Rigdon adopted the same scheme and added the religious themes, the resulting BoM displayed a seriously stupid policy, that almost certainly Rigdon never realized: the main theme of the BoM is that, if people will follow the religious themes promoted in the BoM, then nothing will be left of the people except a record of their history buried in some hillside! If Rigdon had plagiarized less and thought more, surely he would have seen that the message that he had inadvertently adopted was exactly opposite from the message that he wanted to convey, i.e., if people follow the policies promoted in the BoM, then they’ll succeed!

Of course, Mormon leaders put a different spin on that. For example, in the Mormon magazine *Ensign* of January 2004, President James E. Faust (Second Counselor in the First Presidency) wrote in his article “The Keystone of Our Religion” [to which I’ve added some notes]:

One of the ultimate messages of the Book of Mormon, and indeed of the Old Testament and all human history, is that mankind cannot reach perfection on our own. [And you gotta know that Faust ain’t gonna define what he means by “perfection” – but you can bet that he’s gonna claim that, personally, he’s well on his way there, because in contrast to “imperfect” humans, he does what the Church commands!] There is another message that comes through loud and clear from its [the BoM’s] pages. It is the often unpopular and seemingly harsh injunction “Repent or perish.” When the Book of Mormon people listened to this prophetic message, they flourished. When they forgot the message, they perished. [And thus, Dear, the neat spin on Rigdon’s blunder: Rigdon didn’t make a mistake by copying Spalding’s theme, Rigdon wanted to demonstrate that all the good Nephites died out because they didn’t continue to be good-little Mormons – but that overlooks the obvious question: how come these people, who allegedly had a personal visit from Jesus, lost “faith”?]

To me it is inconceivable that Joseph Smith, without divine help, could have written this complex and profound book. [Which then gives the reader a fairly good indication of Faust’s intellectual capabilities!] There is no way that an unlearned young frontiersman could have fabricated the great truths contained in the book [Such as black skin is a curse?!], generated its great spiritual power [Such as that some giant Jabberwock in the sky made the universe and is now watching your every move?!], or

falsified the testimony of Christ that it contains. [The “testimony” – gimme a break! Read the Gnostic gospels. The crap that’s in the New Testament was cooked up by a bunch of crazed clerics and then just copied into the BoM!] The book itself testifies that it is the holy word of God. [Could any statement be more ludicrous?!]

References to teachings in the Old Testament and the New Testament are so numerous and overwhelming throughout the Book of Mormon that one can come to a definitive conclusion by logic that a human intellect could not have conceived of them all. [On the other hand, it would have been relatively easy for Sidney Rigdon to have just plagiarized the Bible!] But more important than logic is the confirmation by the Holy Spirit that the story of the Book of Mormon is true. [The “confirmation by the Holy Spirit”?! You moron, have you ever heard of the scientific method?!]

The Book of Mormon will encourage only righteousness. [What stupidity: the BoM encourages people to do what the clerics tell them to do, not to think for themselves! That’s not ‘righteousness’ it’s ‘wrongeousness’!] Why, then, has hostility been engendered against the book? [So then, why not consider your premiss, you idiot.] In part, no doubt, it may have come because the origin of the book was from golden plates delivered to Joseph Smith by an angel. [Gimme a break; that bit of nonsense doesn’t bother people nearly so much as the audacity of a bunch of fools leading other fools and polluting children’s minds with such stupidity.] These were seen and handled by selected witnesses [Riiiiiiight: selected by Smith, no doubt with the encouragement, “Who wants to make a fortune bilking fools?”] but not put on public display. [And don’t you even wonder a little about why? Have you at least considered the possibility that the whole concoction is one colossal and horrible hoax?] Perhaps hostility comes also because the book is claimed to be primarily the work of ancient prophets here on the American continent. [What a blithering idiot!]

Sorry, Dear, sometimes I get carried away. Let me try to get back to the path that I was on.

Until Spalding’s second manuscript is found and becomes available (it may have already been found and is now kept secret in one of the vaults of the LDS Church), it seems essentially impossible to distinguish between BoM policies that Spalding created vs. those promoted by Rigdon. But from the “policy perspective” of this **Qx**, the authorship of any policy is irrelevant. Whereas leaders of the LDS Church have adopted the BoM as their principal “holy book”, these leaders are thereby “sanctifying” all policies promoted in the BoM, whether the author of the policy is Spalding or Rigdon or someone else. Consequently, in what follows, generally I’ll not try to identify the author of the policies.

So, with those “introductory comments” finally out of the way, I’ll now “get on with it.” The first story in the BoM (testified to be “true” by no less than

“profit” Joe himself) relates that the patriarch of the Mormons, Lehi (whose youngest son was Nephi) had a dream in which he was instructed by his god to obtain certain records, which were in the possession of a fellow by the name of Laban. A summary is given at *1 Nephi 3, 3*:

For behold [Lehi said to his son Nephi, where (as commonly occurs in the BoM) ‘behold’ is used inappropriately. That is, according to my dictionary, ‘behold’ is “used to tell somebody to look at something or listen to something, especially something amazing or unexpected” – and behold (☺) that condition is rarely met in the BoM!], Laban hath the record of the Jews and also a genealogy of my forefathers and they are engraven upon plates of brass. Whereupon the Lord hath commanded me that thou [Nephi] and thy brothers should go unto the house of Laban, and seek the records...

And already from that first quotation, Dear, you might notice that one of the policies advocated in the BoM is that God communicates to people in their dreams – the same policy as was promoted in Homer’s books (written hundreds of years before the OT was written) and which continued until about 100 years ago, when people started to understand dreams.

But that aside, let me ask you to notice that, in the story about Lehi, not only is there no suggestion that anything immoral be done to obtain the engraved plates from Laban but also there’s no suggestion that Laban shouldn’t have the plates. How, where, and when Laban got the plates isn’t mentioned; later in the story, Lehi’s son Nephi offers Laban money for the plates, which thereby suggests that Nephi recognized that the plates were unquestionably Laban’s property. The story goes on to describe Laban’s refusal to give up or sell the plates – and then states that he later stole various property from Lehi’s sons and sent his servants to kill them. Before making judgment on that part of the story, however, I’d like to hear Laban’s version.

At any rate, Lehi’s youngest son (Nephi) returned to Laban’s residence, found him drunk, and according to *1 Nephi 4, 7-19*, murdered Laban (while he was lying drunk and helpless) and stole the plates:

I [Nephi] went forth, and as I came near unto the house of Laban, I beheld a man, and he had fallen to the earth before me, for we was drunken with wine. And when I came to him, I found that it was Laban. And I beheld his sword, and I drew it forth from the sheath thereof; and the hilt thereof was of pure gold, and the workmanship thereof was exceeding fine; and I saw the blade thereof was of most precious steel. Therefore I did obey the voice of the Spirit, and took Laban by the hair of the head, and I smote off his head with his own sword.

Incidentally, Dear, as Howe sarcastically pointed out in his 1834 book:²

This is the earliest account of steel to be found in history. Alexander the Great, who lived about three hundred years after the period here spoken of [~600 BCE], employed iron for points to his implements of war, as Josephus tells us; and the same author says that he [Alexander] complained that his weapons were so easily blunted; now, if steel had been in use, either at Rome, Jerusalem, or Damascus, at the time here spoken of, [then] in Alexander's time it would have been common, and he would have used it for his weapons instead of iron. Damascus was once famous for manufacturing swords, but it was long after the Christian era. A coarse kind of steel, or iron carbonated, was used in the days of Julius Caesar, about one hundred years before Christ.

But setting aside the silliness that Laban's sword was made of "most precious steel", we find some seriously evil policies being advocated in this first story in the BoM, including lying, theft, and murder – all supposedly "justified" by communications from God through visions and dreams. Thus, at *1 Nephi 4*, 19, the horror story continues as follows:

And after I [Nephi] had smitten off his head with his own sword [i.e., murdered him], I took the garments of Laban and put them upon mine own body [i.e., theft]... And after I had done this, I went forth unto the treasury of Laban. And as I went forth... behold [☺] I saw the servant of Laban who had the keys of the treasury. And I commanded him in the voice of Laban that he should go with me into the treasury. And he supposed me to be his master, Laban, for he beheld the garments, and also the sword girded about my loins. And he spake unto me concerning the elders of the Jews, he knowing that his master, Laban, had been out by night among them. And I spake unto him as if it had been Laban [i.e., he lied].

Meanwhile, Dear, notice that all of this was allegedly done by someone (Lehi) who was earlier described in the BoM as a "righteous man", by which is meant that he obeyed the "Laws of Moses" – which just happen to include: thou shall not kill, thou shalt not bear false witness, and thou shalt not covet (what belongs to someone else)! And yet in the 2004 *Ensign* article by Faust quoted above, he wrote: "The Book of Mormon will encourage only righteousness" – which then apparently means that Mormon 'righteousness' includes lying, stealing, and murdering!

² Available at <http://www.solomonspalding.com/docs/1834howb.htm#cont>.

But pushing those policy issues aside as “relatively insignificant”(!), I must insist, Dear, that you seriously consider another policy that’s being advocated in this “horror story”.

“Hello?” responded the grandchild, “What’s with the insistence?”

Okay – fair enough – I’ll respond to that question, but first, Dear, consider some details of this policy, details that I’ll group under the first of many “policy topics” to be listed below (all in bold-face type), starting with:

Intolerance

In the BoM, evidence for the policy of intolerance starts early with the claim that “believers” are “chosen” by God, e.g., at *1 Nephi 1*, 20:

But behold, I, Nephi, will show unto you that the tender mercies of the Lord are over all those whom he hath chosen, because of their faith, to make them mighty even unto the power of deliverance.

Thus, Dear:

- The Lord chooses certain people – and of course, happiness is being one of God’s “chosen people”.
- God chooses certain people not because they’ve found a cure for cancer, stopped an asteroid from hitting Earth, or whatever, and not even for being just “generally nice people”, but because they have “faith”, because they “believe” – what a bunch of con artists are hawking!
- When God chooses (i.e., those who are duped by the con artists), then his “tender mercies are over [them]”, so obviously those people who encounter difficulties in life weren’t chosen, because obviously, they didn’t have sufficient “faith” – a concept that’s really quite astounding: “Businesses may come and go, but religion will last forever, for in no other endeavor does the consumer blame himself for product failure!”³
- When God “chooses” these dupes, we might hope that he would make such people especially nice, especially productive (e.g., helping others),

³ Dear: In Aiken’s collection (which I’ve referenced before and which you can find on the internet), the attribution for this quotation is: *Harvard Lampoon*, “Doon” (paraphrase).

especially wise, or whatever, but instead he makes them “mighty, even unto the power of deliverance.”

And thus, Dear, in case you hadn't realized it before, God's chosen people are the warriors of the world – well, at least those who win the wars – cause (doncha know) “might makes right.”

And if you didn't get the message, Dear, it's rephrased at *1 Nephi 2, 19*:

And it came to pass [☺] that the Lord spake unto me, saying: Blessed are thou, Nephi, because of thy faith, for thou has sought me diligently, with lowliness of heart.

So Dear: get with the message; if you want to be “mighty”, then first get down and grovel before the clerics; “pray, pay, and obey!” What are you: one of those damn scientific humanists who are happy to have the chance of being alive and proud of your accomplishments? What this world needs is fewer such people and more grovelers!

Sorry, Dear. Meanwhile, in contrast to the “righteous” grovelers “chosen” by God, are the horrible people who are under the influence and even the control of the Devil. Some such horrible people apparently belong to a different church, as explained at *1 Nephi 13, 4*:

And it came to pass [☺] that I [Nephi] saw among the nations of the Gentiles the formation of a great church. [Probably Rigdon means the Catholic Church.] And the angel said unto me: “Behold the formation of a church which is most abominable above all other churches... and I saw the devil that he was the founder of it.”

More of the same intolerance of other religions is at *1 Nephi 14, 10*:

And he [an alleged angel who dropped into see Nephi – in a “vision”] said unto me [Nephi]: “Behold there are save two churches only; the one is the church of the Lamb of God [No doubt Rigdon's new church, i.e., the Mormon church] and the other is the church of the devil; wherefore, whoso belongeth not to the church of the Lamb of God belongeth to that great church, which is the mother of abominations [the ‘mother’ is undoubtedly the Catholic Church; maybe by ‘abominations’ Rigdon means all the Protestant denominations]; and she [the Catholic Church] is the whore of all the earth.”

In due course, such intolerance of other people's views leads to promoting the policy that these other people deserve to be destroyed, e.g., as at *1 Nephi 22, 15* and then at *3 Nephi 16, 15*:

“...for the day soon cometh that all the proud and they who do wickedly shall be as stubble; and the day cometh that they must be burned.”

“But if they will not turn unto me [Christ], and hearken unto my voice, I will suffer them, yea, I will suffer my people, O house of Israel, that they shall go through among them, and shall tread them down, and they shall be as salt hath lost its savor, which is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot...”

In turn, this intolerance leads to promoting the killing of people “for the glory of God”, e.g., going back to *1 Nephi 4*, 13, just before Nephi murders Laban:

Behold the Lord slayeth the wicked to bring forth his righteous purposes. *It is better that one man should perish than that a nation should dwindle and perish in unbelief.*

And here, Dear, is where I “must insist” that you give serious consideration: I want to know if you buy into that policy, Dear, because if you do, then I’m sorry, but I’ll need to request that you not visit me again!

Seriously, Dear: do you agree with the “righteous” policy that “it is better that one man should perish than that a nation should dwindle and perish in unbelief”? Let me try to explain my predicament. I’m doing my best to try to convince you – and anyone – to stop “believing” in the ridiculous, prehistoric model of the universe that contains the premiss (without a speck of data to support it) that the universe was created and is still controlled by some giant Jabberwock in the sky. I don’t know if there’s anything that I want more than to see that such stupidity “dwindle and perish” and be replaced with some sane science. Meanwhile, though, I’d like to know if you agree with the policy of the LDS Church that “It is better than one man [e.g., a certain grandfather!] should perish than that a nation should dwindle and perish in unbelief [in such stupidity]”, because if you do buy into that hideousness, Dear, if you adopt the policy that people should be killed because their opinion about the origin of the universe differ from yours, then it follows that you should proceed to kill me – and I trust that you therefore see why I might be reluctant to have you visit!

“Ah, grandfather,” added the grandchild, “don’t be silly. It’s just a single story. It doesn’t mean that I’m gonna try to kill you.”

“Oh really,” responded the grandfather, “then what’s with the long story about Korihor at *Alma 30*? Below, I’ll quote a little of it.

But it came to pass [“Old ‘came to pass’ has come to life again!”]... there came a man [Korihor] into the land... And after this manner did he preach, saying: “O ye that are bound down under a foolish and a vain hope, why do ye yoke yourselves with such foolish things...? For no man can know of anything which is to come. Behold, these things which ye call prophecies, which ye say are handed down by holy prophets, behold, they are foolish traditions of your fathers. How do ye know of their surety? Behold, ye cannot know of things which ye do not see... it is the effect of a frenzied mind; and this derangement of your minds comes because of the traditions of your fathers, which lead you away into a belief of things which are not so.” [To which I of course would add: “Right on, Korihor!”]

And many more such things did he [Korihor] say unto them, telling them that [there] could be no atonement made for the sins of men, but every man fared in this life according to the management of the creature; therefore, every man prospered according to his genius, and that every man conquered according to his strength... [The story adds that he said that “whatsoever a man did was no crime”, but that seems to be quite biased reporting, for it’s highly doubtful that anyone who saw so much so clearly, as Korihor did, would have made such a ridiculous statement.]

And thus he did preach unto them, leading away the hearts of many, causing them to lift up their heads in their wickedness [though, again, this part of the story is dubious, for it’s not wicked to “lift up” one’s head, and the additional statement “yea, leading away many women, and also men, to commit whoredomes” is even more doubtful, for ‘whoredome’ is definitely not a wise “management of the creature”] – telling them that when a man was dead, that was the end thereof... And it came to pass [☹] that the high priest said unto him: “Why do ye go about perverting the ways of the Lord...? Why do ye speak against all the prophecies of the holy prophets...?”

And Korihor said unto him: “Because I do not teach the foolish traditions of your fathers, and because I do not teach this people to bind themselves down under the foolish ordinances and performances which are laid down by ancient [and modern!] priests, to usurp power and authority over them, to keep them in ignorance, that they may not lift up their heads, but be brought down according to thy words. [This guy Korihor should have been the hero of the whole BoM!] Ye say that this people is a free people. Behold, I say they are in bondage. Ye say that those ancient prophecies are true. Behold, I say that ye do not know that they are true. Ye say that this people is a guilty and a fallen people, because of the transgression of a parent. Behold, I say that a child is not guilty because of its parents... [Right on!]

And thus ye lead away this people after the foolish traditions of your fathers, and according to your own desires; and ye keep them down, even as it were in bondage, that ye may glut yourselves with the labors of their hands, that they durst not look up with boldness, and that they durst not enjoy their rights and privileges. Yea, they durst not make use of that which is their own lest they should offend their priests, who do yoke them according to their desires, and have brought them to believe, by

their traditions and their dreams and their whims and their visions and their pretended mysteries, that they should, if they did not do according to their words, offend some unknown being, who they say is God – a being who never has been seen or known, who never was nor ever will be...” [Way to go, Korihor! I assume that Spalding wrote this narrative – and Rigdon neglected to cut it!]

And now Korihor said unto Alma [the high priest]: “If thou wilt show me a sign, that I may be convinced that there is a God, yea, show unto me that he hath power, and then will I be convinced of the truth of thy words.” [Show me the data!]

But Alma said unto him: “Thou hast had signs enough [Says who?!]; will ye tempt your God? [Your bloody rights!] Will ye say, Show unto me a sign, when ye have the testimony of all these thy brethren, and also all the hold prophets? [“Testimonies” that aren’t worth the words used to make them!] The scriptures are laid before thee, yea [and they’re not worth the paper they’re printed on!]; and all things denote there is a God [Riiiiight]; yea, even the earth, and all things that are upon the face of it, yea, and its motion, year, and also all the planets which move in their regular form do witness that there is a Supreme Creator [Get real! Do you mean that your “Supreme Creator” is gravity?!]. And yet do ye go about, leading away the hearts of this people [or, correcting their errors, depending on your point of view!], testifying unto them there is no God? [Which isn’t correct: no testimony was made; simply a statement of an opinion that the data don’t justify the supposition that any God exists.] And will ye deny against all these witnesses?” [Although witnesses of such matters have been notoriously unreliable!]

And he [Korihor] said: “Yea, I will deny, except ye shall show me a sign.” [What amazing strength of character! Again: way to go Korihor (and Spalding)!]

And now it came to pass [☺] that Alma said unto him: “Behold, I am grieved because of the hardness of your heart, yea, that ye will still resist the spirit of the truth [Riiiiight; the “truth”, no less] that thy soul may be destroyed. But behold, *it is better that thy soul should be lost than that thou shouldst be the means of bringing many souls down to destruction*, by thy lying and by thy flattering words [though Korihor neither lied nor flattered!]; therefore, if thou shalt deny again, behold God shall smite thee, that thou shalt become dumb, that thou shalt never open thy mouth any more, that thou shalt not deceive this people any more.”

Now Korihor said unto him: “I do not deny the existence of a God, but I do not believe that there is a God; and I say also, that ye do not know that there is a God; and except ye show me a sign, I will not believe.”

And the rest of the story? Of course (as Alma tells it) Korihor was struck dumb, and soon thereafter “behold, he was run upon [by the people] and trodden down, even until he was dead.” Meanwhile, the hideous moral of the story, the hideous policy being promoted? That whoever has the courage to be skeptical, to demand reliable data, to rely on his own best interpretation

of the data, and to resist the authority of the damnable power-mongering priests will be “struck dumb” and “trodden down, even until he [is] dead.”

This is the same damnable policy as was promoted by Moses (or at least by the clowns who wrote the Old Testament, e.g., the slaughter of all the “unbelievers” by the “Storm Troopers” loyal to Moses), the same damnable policy as advocated by the idiots who wrote the New Testament (e.g., the parable at *Luke 19*, 11, which ends with the king (God) saying: “As for those enemies of mine who do not want me for their king, bring them here and slaughter them in my presence”), and as I’ll show you in later **Qx** chapters, the same damnable policy as promoted by Muhammad (e.g., “Kill the infidels”). Kill those who don’t believe! Kill those who dare to think for themselves! Kill, kill, kill! And so, Dear, I assume you see why I “must insist”: I just ain’t that keen on being “trodden down, even until... dead” – even by you!

Now, Dear, from the above example (under the title **Intolerance**) maybe you see how I plan to review ideas and policies in the BoM and why I won’t be going through all of it, line-by-line. If you can proceed to read the rest of the BoM, then “go for it” – if nothing else, it’ll be an interesting test to see how much chloroform you can tolerate! I managed to get through the whole thing once, but I don’t know if I could do it all again – even for you. Therefore, for this chapter, my plan is to rely on my notes that I made during my first tramp through the BoM quagmire; I’ll put my notes in some semblance of order, organizing them under various topics. And at the outset, I should admit that there’s no particular order for these topics – except maybe they’re generally organized according to the order in which they first appear in the BoM (and then I show examples where they re-appear and are re-enforced, later in the BoM). All of which is my way of introducing my second “policy issue”, namely:

Hypocrisy and Duplicity

Sorry for that “title”, Dear; feel free to choose one that you think better fits the following illustrations. This “policy issue” first appears at *2 Nephi 9*, 34, where (after claiming that Nephi was “righteous” and yet demonstrating that he was a liar, thief, and murderer!) the author writes:

Wo unto the liar, for he shall be thrust down to hell. Wo unto the murderer who deliberately killeth, for he shall die.

* Go to other chapters *via*

If that's not an illustration of hypocrisy and duplicity, then I don't know what is – but many more illustrations are available.

For example, another is at *2 Nephi 31, 20*, where the writer informs us:

Wherefore, ye must press forward with a steadfastness in Christ, having a perfect brightness of hope, and a love of God and of all men.

“Love... of all men”? What “love” were shown to Laban and Korihor? Did Laban want his head chopped off? Did Korihor want to be trampled to death?

There are many more examples of this hypocrisy and duplicity. For example, at *3 Nephi 25, 1*, the author suggests that even Christ advocated murder – which is a bizarre way “to love one's enemy”:

“For behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly [e.g., those who do their thinking for themselves] shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up,” saith the Lord of Hosts... “But unto you that fear my name [preaching fear!] shall the Son of Righteousness [who gets to define what's right!] arise with healing in his wings [whatever that means!]; and ye shall go forth and grow up as calves in the stall [for those who want to be calves in a stall!]. And ye shall tread down the wicked [i.e., kill those who think differently]; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet...”

And yet elsewhere (*Ether 8, 19*), the author claims that murder is never permitted:

For the Lord worketh not in secret combinations, neither doth he will that man should shed blood, but in all things hath forbidden it, from the beginning of man.

Although that's certainly not the case described in the Bible (or in the BoM), where their hideous God promotes, approves, and assists in the killing of an enormous number of men, women, and children (save for virgins, whom God gives to the killers to rape).

Incidentally, Dear, if you should ever write a computer program that can identify any writer's style (or if you should have the opportunity to use one of the available programs that others have written), you might want to apply it to the text of each of the many cases of hypocrisy and duplicity in the BoM. I wouldn't be surprised if, thereby, you could identify two different authors, namely Spalding and Rigdon! But that possibility aside and

* Go to other chapters *via*

bypassing additional examples of such hypocrisy and duplicity, I'll now move on to another topic, namely:

Racism

The BoM's promotion of racism (or more accurately, "white-supremacy filth") starts somewhat subtly, describing the tree of life and the purity of whiteness (*1 Nephi 8*, 10-11) as seen in one of Lehi's dreams:

And it came to pass [☺] that I [Lehi] beheld a tree whose fruit was desirable to make one happy. And it came to pass [☺] that I did go forth and partake of the fruit thereof; and I beheld that it was most sweet, above all that I ever before tasted. Yea, and I beheld that the fruit thereof was white, to exceed all the whiteness that I had ever seen...

Nothing really wrong with that, but then strong hints of racism are added in one of Nephi's dreams (*1 Nephi 12*, 23):

And it came to pass [☺] that I beheld, after they had dwindled in unbelief, they became a dark, and loathsome, and a filthy people, full of idleness and all manner of abominations.

Later, the racism becomes more explicit (*1 Nephi 13*, 15):

And I [Nephi] beheld the Spirit of the Lord, that it was upon the Gentiles, and they did prosper and obtain the land for their inheritance; and I beheld that they were white, and exceedingly fair and beautiful...

By *2 Nephi 5*, 21, the white-supremacy filth becomes horrible:

And he [the Lord] had caused the cursing to come upon them, yea, even a sore cursing, because of their iniquity. For behold, they had hardened their hearts against him, that they had become like unto flint; wherefore as they were white, and exceedingly fair and delightsome, that they might not be enticing unto my people, the Lord God did cause a skin of blackness to come upon them...

And it continues, e.g., at *3 Nephi 3*, 15 and at *Mormon 9*, 6:

And their curse was taken from them, and their skin became white like unto the Nephites.

O then ye unbelieving, turn ye unto the Lord; cry mightily unto the Gatherer in the name of Jesus, that perhaps ye may be found spotless, pure, fair, and white...

* Go to other chapters *via*

Now, Dear, I'm not gonna belabor the above, because I know you don't buy into such idiocy. But then, Dear, notice what you're doing: you're rejecting a policy promoted in the BoM. Therefore... Way to go, kid! Leading me to

The Stupidity of it All!

Okay, so that title is pretty bad, but until you identify a better one, I'll use it to organize the following many illustrations of sheer stupidity.

For it to be wrong to have your own opinions, e.g., 1 Nephi 2, 11:

For behold they [Laman and Lemuel, Lehi's two oldest sons] did murmur in many things against their father, because he was a visionary man, and had led them out of the land of Jerusalem... And this they said he had done because of the foolish imaginations of his heart.

To be guided by faith rather than by data, e.g., 1 Nephi 2, 19:

And it came to pass [☺] that the Lord spake unto me, saying: Blessed art thou, Nephi, because of thy faith...

To obey rather than to think for yourself, e.g., 1 Nephi 2, 20:

And inasmuch as ye [Nephi] shall keep my [God's] commandments, ye shall prosper... And inasmuch as thy brethren shall rebel against thee, they shall be cut off from the presence of the Lord.

To be guided by dreams rather than data, e.g., 1 Nephi 3, 1:

And it came to pass [☺] that I, Nephi, returned from speaking with the Lord, to the tent of my father. And it came to pass [☺] that he spake unto me, saying: Behold [☺] I have dreamed a dream, in... which the Lord hath commanded me...

Not to question authority, e.g., 1 Nephi 3, 5:

And now, behold [☺] thy brothers murmur, saying it is a hard thing which I have required of them; but behold [☺] I have not required it of them, but it is a commandment of the Lord. Therefore go, my son, and thou shalt be favored of the Lord, because thou hast not murmured. And it came to pass [☺] that I, Nephi, said unto my father: I will go and do the things which the Lord hath commanded...

To refuse responsibility for your actions, e.g., 2 Nephi 1, 27:

And it must needs be that the power of God must be with him [would that the power of God would have been with the author – so he'd be kinder to the English language!]

even unto his commanding you that ye must obey. But behold [☺], it was not he, but it was the Spirit of the Lord which was in him, which opened his mouth to utterance that he could not shut it.

To listen to “voices” rather than to evaluate data, e.g., 2 Nephi 32, 3:

Angels speak by the power of the Holy Ghost; wherefore, they speak the words of Christ. Wherefore, I [Nephi] said unto you, feast upon the words of Christ; for behold, the words of Christ will tell you all things what ye should do.

To coerce others with fear to conform to your thoughts, e.g., 2 Nephi 33, 14:

And you that will not partake of the goodness of God, and respect the words of the Jews, and also my words, and the words which shall proceed forth out of the mouth of the Lamb of God, behold, I bid you an everlasting farewell, for these words shall condemn you at the last day. For what I seal on earth, shall be brought against you at the judgment bar; for thus hath the Lord commanded me, and I must obey.

There are many more examples that could be put in the category of “stupidity”, but if for no other reason than to give you a bit of a break, Dear, let me introduce a new title – and more subtitles:

Corruption, Injustices, and Immorality

Corruption of Natural Laws, e.g., 2 Nephi 27, 23 and Mormon 9, 17:

For behold, I am God; and I am a God of miracles... [Riiiiight]

Who shall say that it was not a miracle that by his [God’s] word the heaven and the earth should be; and by the power of his word man was created of the dust of the earth...

Who indeed? Certainly I would agree that those stunts would be quite some miracles, but kindly provide some data to support such speculations. And if not some data, then how about at least a little logic? I mean, who created God, how could he speak a “word” without air, what language did he use?!

Much more likely than the involvement of any god in the creation of the universe [as I suggested with the probability estimates in earlier chapters (**Ih** and **Ii**)] is that the universe created itself from a symmetry-breaking fluctuation in a total void [since as I suggested in the first chapter (**A**) and will show you more in the last chapter (**Z**)], data suggest that the total electrical charge, momentum, spin, energy, etc. in the universe still sum to

* Go to other chapters *via*

exactly zero, i.e., in total, there's nothing here] and much more likely than the involvement of any god in the creation of life on Earth is that it evolved after a molecule first stumbled onto the ability to reproduce itself.

Corruption of the Valuable Instinct to Survive, e.g., Alma 27, 28:

... and they never did look upon death with any degree of terror, for their hope and views of Christ and the resurrection; therefore, death was swallowed up to them by the victory of Christ over it. Therefore, they would suffer death in the most aggravating and distressing manner... And thus they were a zealous and beloved people, a highly favored people of the Lord

As religious leaders have found, such idiocy as that makes for great “terrorist”, but if you don't mind terribly, I'd prefer if my grandchildren choose to live!

Corruption of Human Productivity and Interactions, e.g., Mosiah 4, 17:

Perhaps thou shalt say: “the man [a beggar] has brought upon himself his misery; therefore I will stay my hand, and will not give unto him of my food, nor impart unto him of my substance that he many not suffer, for his punishments are just”... But I say unto you, “O man... behold, are we not all beggars? Do we not all depend upon the same Being, even God, for all the substance which we have...?”

The answers to those questions are **NO!** We're not all beggars, Dear, nor do we all depend on some giant Jabberwock in the sky for “all the substance which we have” – only con-artist clerics do that! Most of us rely on our productivity to survive; in contrast, professional beggars (e.g., all clerics) choose to leech off productive people.

Promotion of Communism, e.g., 4 Nephi 1, 3 and 4 Nephi 1, 24-25 (and, Dear, many more details are provided in D&C 119):

And they [both the Nephites and the Lamanites] had all things common among them...

... there began to be among them those who were lifted up in pride, such as the wearing of costly apparel, and all manner of fine pearls, and of the fine things of the world. And from that time forth they did have their goods and their substance no more common among them.

Dear: if the products of your labor belong to everyone and the products of everyone's labor belong to you, then how much would you labor? If all

property were to be held in common, then how much would you struggle to acquire a car, a home, a savings account...? Of course there's a possibility that you'd behave substantially differently from other people, but experiments in the USSR, Cuba, PRC, etc. demonstrated that under communism, the vast majority of people chose to "goof off" – like clerics!

Promotion of unjust relationships between punishment and crime, e.g., Alma 17, 33-36, describing the "righteous" murder of people for playing pranks:

And those men again stood to scatter [the King's] flocks [i.e., as a part of a prank]; but Ammon said unto his bretheren: "Encircle the flocks round about [although one might have expected that the word "encircle" would have been sufficient!] that they flee not; and I go and contend with these men who do scatter our flocks..." Ammon stood forth and began to cast stones at them with his sling; yea, with mighty power he did sling stones amongst them; and thus he slew a certain number of them...

And of course that's probably a parable – not describing Ammon's reaction to a prank: I expect that Rigdon was saying: those horrible humanists who "scatter [the King's] flocks", who try to show religious people that they've been had by con-artist clerics, should have stones "cast... at them... and thus he slew a certain number of them."

Promotion of the primitive concept that the gods are responsible for developing human laws, e.g., 2 Nephi 2, 5:

And men are instructed sufficiently that they know good from evil. And the law is given unto men...

Promotion of the archaic concept that children are responsible for the crimes of their parents, e.g., 2 Nephi 2, 21:

And the days of the children of men were prolonged, according to the will of God, that they might repent while in the flesh; wherefore, their state became a state of probation, and their time was lengthened, according to the commandments, which the Lord God gave unto the children of men. For he gave commandment that all men must repent; for he showed unto all men that they were lost, because of the transgression of their parents [i.e., the "transgression" of Adam and Eve].

Promotion of the horrible concepts of the torture of humans and that the innocent should be punished for the sins of the guilty, e.g., 2 Nephi 9, 20:

O the greatness of the mercy of our God, the Holy One of Israel! For he delivereth his saints from that awful monster the devil, and death, and hell, and that lake of fire

and brimstone, which is endless torment... And he cometh into the world [in the form of Christ] that he may save all men if they will harken unto his voice; for behold, he suffereth the pains of all men, yea, the pains of every living creature... [i.e., Christ, presumed to be innocent, suffers for the “sins” of the “guilty” – which is a hideous concept in any system of justice: “No, officer, don’t arrest me for breaking the law, arrest my granddaughter: she’s the innocent one!]

Promotion of the hideous “morality” of denigrating the learned, the wise, and those who are economically successful, e.g., 2 Nephi 9, 42:

And whoso knocketh, to him will he open; and the wise, and the learned, and they that are rich, who are puffed up because of their learning, and their wisdom, and their riches – yea, they are they whom he despiseth...

And of course there is more of such idiocy about “sin” in the BoM, e.g., that it’s “sinful” to learn the difference between good and evil and to refuse to obey some authority (even if the difference between right and wrong is unknown!) and that nakedness and sex are sinful. But I won’t list examples, Dear, because all such stupidities are just copied from the Bible. So let me move on to some examples of:

Inhumanity

Not to trust other humans, e.g., 2 Nephi 28, 31:

Cursed is he that putteth his trust in man...

Has any stupider statement – any more inhuman statement – ever been made? Our entire society – and every society – is based on trust among its members. Without trust in others, no one would marry. Without trust in others, people wouldn’t venture out of their fortresses without weapons. Without trust in others, any currency and any economy would immediately collapse. In contrast to the BoM’s stupidity, cursed is he who can’t put his trust in others!

Instead, to trust in God and his spokesmen, the damnable clerics, e.g., Alma 56, 47:

Now they never had fought, yet they did not fear death; and they did think more upon the liberty of their fathers than they did upon their lives; yea, they had been taught by their mothers that if they did not doubt, God would deliver them.

To credit God for the accomplishments of humans, e.g., 2 Nephi 10, 11-14 and Alma 58, 40:

And this land [America] shall be a land of liberty unto the Gentiles [thanks to people, not to any god!], and there shall be no kings upon the land [although Smith eventually had himself crowned king!]. . . For he that raiseth up a king against me shall perish, for I, the Lord, the king of heaven, will be their king. . . But behold, they have received many wounds; nevertheless they stand fast in that liberty wherewith God has made them free [Thank you very much, but as any Englishman would have told you, God was on their side!]. . .

To discredit human accomplishments and to discredit – even try to break – the human spirit, e.g., Mosiah 4, 5 and Moroni 6, 2:

For behold, if the knowledge of the goodness of God. . . has awakened you to a sense of your nothingness, and your worthless and fallen state. . . always retain in remembrance, the greatness of God, and your own nothingness and his goodness and long-suffering towards you, unworthy creatures, and humble yourselves even in the depths of humility. . .

Neither did they receive any unto baptism save they came forth with a broken heart and a contrite spirit. . .

To teach humans to be meek, like sheep, rather than to be bold, to strive to conquer nature, to accomplish all that is possible, to help intelligence go on, and to thank other humans for their accomplishments, e.g., Alma 7, 23:

And now I would that ye should be humble, and be submissive and gentle; easy to be entreated; full of patience and long-suffering; being temperate in all things; being diligent in keeping the commandments of God at all times; asking for whatsoever things ye stand in need, both spiritual and temporal; always returning thanks unto God for whatsoever things ye do receive.

To condemn human nature and to seek to turn adults into children, e.g., Mosiah 3, 19:

For the natural man is an enemy to God, and has been from the fall of Adam, and will be, forever and ever, unless he yields to the enticings of the Holy Spirit, and putteth off the natural man and becometh a saint through the atonement of Christ the Lord, and becometh as a child, submissive, meek, humble, patient, full of love, willing to submit to all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon him, even as a child doth submit to his father.

Sorry, Dear, but the best way to describe the above is to say: “It’s sick!”

Maybe, however, if you want to be generous to the idiot author, you would label much of it as just:

Misunderstandings

Misunderstanding of children, e.g., in the above quote from Mosiah 3, 19:

...becometh as a child, submissive, meek, humble, patient, full of love, willing to submit to all things which the Lord seeth fit to inflict upon him, even as a child doth submit to his father.

Whoever wrote such junk must have had next-to-zero experience with children: according to Webster, ‘meek’ means “1. patient and mild, not inclined to anger or resentment 2. too submissive, easily imposed on; spineless; spiritless”, and ‘humble’ means “1. having or showing a consciousness of one’s defects or shortcomings; not proud; not self-assertive; modest 2. low in condition, rank, or position; lowly; unpretentious.” Tell me, Dear, does that describe any child you’ve ever known?!

Misunderstanding of cause and effect, e.g., 2 Nephi 2, 22:

And now, behold, if Adam had not transgressed, he would not have fallen, but he would have remained in the garden of Eden. And all things which were created must have remained in the same state in which they were after they were created; and they must have remained forever, and had no end. [No! Things don’t change because of ‘transgressions’! If Adam had started to think and to work, he could have started fire, initiated tool making, cut down some trees, built some roads and bridges and dams, generated some electricity, developed computers, and whatever! But then, maybe there is some logic to the damnable clerics view: for humans to start thinking is a terrible ‘transgression’ – against clerical rule!]

Misunderstanding of happiness, e.g., 2 Nephi 2, 24:

But behold, all things have been done in the wisdom of him who knoweth all things. Adam fell that men might be; and men are, that they might have joy. [No! If Adam existed, he existed! If Eve existed, then Adam and Eve could have had children! And humans do not exist so that “they might have joy”! Joys are signals people get when they think that they’re making progress toward their goals.]

More misunderstanding of happiness, e.g., 2 Nephi 1, 13 & 2 Nephi 2, 12 (in which Rigdon is copying Saint Paul’s insanity, allegedly ~600 years before Paul lived!):

* Go to other chapters *via*

And if ye shall say there is no law, ye shall also say there is no sin. [You clown! Define your terms. There is a law (of nature) that says if I leave my thumb in the path of a descending hammer, I'm gonna get hurt! But there's no "sin" in hitting my thumb, in breaking "the law of the descending hammer". To be sure it's a painful and dumb mistake to violate this law of nature, but it's not a "sin" against some giant Jabberwock in the sky to smash your thumb.] If ye shall say there is no sin, ye shall also say there is no righteousness. [Again: define your terms! There is no "righteousness" in not violating the law of the descending hammer, but it's damn dumb to expose your thumb that way!] And if there be no righteousness there be no happiness. [No! Happiness isn't a signal telling you that you're (religiously) "righteous"! For otherwise, why would you be happy when you're skiing or riding motorcycles or eating chocolates, and so on? Happiness is a signal telling you that you think you're surviving – including those who are duped into thinking that they'll have eternal life if they're "righteous", because you con-artist clerics have convinced such stupid people that they're gonna get eternal survival.] And if there be no righteousness nor happiness there be no punishment nor misery. [Get real! Whether there's a god or not, there can be pleasure and pain, and each of us can define right and wrong!] And if these things are not there is no God. [What in hell has God got to do with it? Nature can handle the law of the descending hammer very well by herself, thank you very much!] And if there is no God [Right on!] we are not [Ah, gimme a break. There is zero data that support the concept that God created humans, whereas there is an enormous body of data that support the concept that humans created all gods!] neither the earth; for there could have been no creation of things, neither to act nor to be acted upon; wherefore, all things must have vanished away. [And I suppose you have no interest in hearing about any symmetry-breaking fluctuations in a total void...]

Misunderstanding of the value of death, e.g., 2 Nephi 9, 10:

O how great the goodness of our god, who prepareth a way for our escape from the grasp of this awful monster; yea, that monster, death and hell, which I call the death of the body, and also the death of the spirit. [No! Death of individuals is Nature's way of promoting the survival of the genes of each species! And as for "hell", it's fictitious as hell – used by conniving con artists such as you to manipulate the masses of unthinking people.]

Misunderstanding of the source of wealth, e.g., Helaman 6, 17:

For behold, the Lord had blessed them so long with the riches of the world that they had not been stirred up to anger, to wars, not to bloodshed; therefore [follow that "therefore"!] they began to set their hearts upon their riches; yea, they began to seek to get gain that they might be lifted up one above another [ridiculous!]; therefore [and follow this "therefore" too!] they began to commit secret murders, and to rob and to plunder, that they might get gain." [Whoever wrote that is crazy: $1+1 = 5$, $7 = 19$, therefore $x = 12!$]

Misunderstanding, therefore, of wealth, e.g., Helaman 13, 21:

Behold ye, the people of this great city, and hearken unto my words; yea, hearken unto the words which the Lord saith; for behold, he saith that ye are cursed because of your riches, and also are your riches cursed because ye have set your hearts upon them... [If you “set your heart” upon something, does it cause that something to be cursed?! What if some idiot “set [his] heart” upon God? Does that mean that God is cursed? Hmmm... interesting.]

Misunderstanding, therefore, of wealthy people, e.g., 2 Nephi 9, 30:

But woe unto the rich, who are rich as to the things of the world. For because they are rich they despise the poor and they persecute the meek, and their hearts are upon their treasures. [Rich people “despise” the poor? What data support your claim? Is that why the rich widow of the founder of MacDonald’s recently left so much money to the Salvation Army? Is that why Bill Gates gives away billions to fight diseases? Is that why... ah, never mind, you’re obviously oblivious to data.]

Anyway, Dear, the above demonstrates the author’s failure to understand that most people who accumulate wealth do so as rewards both for their accomplishments (i.e., their contributions to the welfare of others) and for their willingness to forgo spending their wealth on themselves. It also demonstrates the author’s failure to observe how many wealthy people use their wealth to help humanity. Further, the author of the BoM demonstrates

Misunderstanding of charity, e.g., Alma 34, 28:

And now behold... I say unto you, do not suppose that this [repentance] is all; for after ye have done all these things, if ye turn away the needy, and the naked, and visit not the sick and afflicted, and impart of your substance, if ye have, to those who stand in need – and I say unto you, if ye do not any of these things, behold, your prayer [for mercy] is vain, and availeth you nothing, and ye are as hypocrites who do deny the faith.

Ignoring the stupidity that “hypocrites... deny the faith” (as is demonstrated by the author of the BoM, all hypocrites don’t “deny the faith”!), consider the author’s lack of understanding of charity. The concept of charity being advocated here is the same stupid concept currently promoted by many school administrators and politicians, e.g., that children should serve soup – rather than study as hard as they can.

Think of it, Dear: is it better for you to take the time to serve soup or to study how you might be able to cure some illness, stop an asteroid from hitting the Earth, develop some labor-saving device, figure out how to defuse the population bomb, etc., etc. The “cheap charity” being advocated can undermine your ability to make major contributions to humanity. Let the clerics and politicians who promote such nonsense serve the soup – for them, such charity would probably represent their greatest contributions to humanity! But for you, Dear, such “cheap charity” is beneath your capabilities: be all you can be – help intelligence go on – thereby, you’ll serve humanity more. But let me get off that soapbox and move onto other examples of “misunderstandings”.

Misunderstandings of the Concepts of ‘Trust’ and ‘Truth’

An illustration of such misunderstanding is at *Helaman 8, 22*:

Our father Lehi was driven out of Jerusalem because he testified of these things [viz., provided hearsay evidence]. Nephi also testified of these things, and also almost all of our fathers, even down to this time; yea, they have testified of the coming of Christ, and have looked forward, and have rejoiced in his day which is to come. And behold, he is God, and he is with them, and he did manifest himself unto them, that they were redeemed by him; and they gave unto him glory, because of that which is to come. And now, seeing ye know these things [what a ridiculous use of the word ‘know’] and cannot deny them except ye shall lie [what a crazy statement!], therefore in this ye have sinned, for ye have rejected all these things, notwithstanding so many [hearsay!] evidences which ye have received; yea, even ye have received all things, both things in heaven, and all things which are in the earth, as a witness that they are true [the writer is bonkers!] But behold ye have rejected the truth...

Dear: To accept “hearsay evidence” as anything more than it is (i.e., no more reliable than the trustworthiness of the speaker and certainly insufficiently reliable to guide anyone in making choices for one’s life) doesn’t demonstrate “trust” it demonstrates gullibility! Similarly, the author apparently fails to realize that, in reality, “truth” is a meaningless concept (as I’ll show you in **T**, dealing with ‘Truth’): it has meaning only in closed systems. In reality, the best that humans can have are “useful working hypotheses” (i.e., those not falsified).

Misunderstandings about the value of death, e.g., Alma 34, 8-16:

8. And now, behold, I will testify unto you... that these things are true. [Riiiiight] Behold, I say unto you, that I do know [by application of the scientific method?] that Christ shall come among the children of men, to take upon him the transgressions of

his people, and that he shall atone for the sins of the world; for the Lord God hath spoken it [And I know that it was God’s voice, because the CIA did a voice analysis of his tape, and sure enough...]

9. For it is expedient [Rigdon loved Paul’s “it is expedient”, perhaps even more than Spalding’s “It came to pass”!] that an atonement would be made; for according to the great plan of the Eternal God [and I just happen to know his “great plan”], there must be an atonement made [for the “transgression” of Adam and Eve to learn of the difference between right and wrong], or else all mankind must unavoidably perish [although, just because people die doesn’t mean that humans perish!]; yea, all are hardened; yea, all are fallen and are lost, and must perish except it be through the atonement which it is expedient should be made. [And having said that, Alice stepped through the looking glass, and behold...]

10. For it is expedient that there should be a great and last sacrifice; yea, not a sacrifice of man, neither of beasts, neither of any manner of fowl; for it shall not be a human sacrifice; but it must be an infinite and eternal sacrifice [An “infinite and eternal sacrifice”? Jesus allegedly dies for three days and then goes floating off in a cloud to reside in some never-never land for eternity? That’s an “infinite and eternal sacrifice”? For contrast, let me tell you about the janitor who saved every penny to put his kid through college. Now we’re talking sacrifice? In fact, any janitor puts Jesus to shame!]

11. Now there is not any man that can sacrifice his own blood which will atone for the sins of another. [Good, at least Rigdon realized that!] Now, if a man murdereth, behold will our law, which is just [at least in some cases], take the life of his brother? I say unto you, Nay.

12. But the law requireth the life of him who hath murdered; therefore there can be nothing which is short of an infinite atonement which will suffice for the sins of the world. [Assuming that there was any sin, and assuming that your God’s laws are similar to ours!]

13. Therefore, it is expedient [☺] that there should be a great and last sacrifice, and then shall there be, or it is expedient there should be, a stop to the shedding of blood; then shall the law of Moses be fulfilled... [Although why a sacrifice of someone else, i.e., Christ, would “atone” for the sins of others, no explanation is provided!]

14. And behold [☺], this is the whole meaning of the law, every whit pointing to that great and last sacrifice; and that great and last sacrifice will be the Son of God, yea, infinite and eternal... [Although, if you think of it, it makes zero sense. Thus, suppose a group “sinned” against some powerful fellow, e.g., suppose a group ruined some powerful landlord’s irrigation canals. Then, to atone for the group’s “sins”, how about if the landlord killed his “only begotten son”? Sound fair to you?!]

15. And thus he [the murdered son] shall bring salvation to all those [who ruined the landlord's canals] who shall believe on his name [whatever that means!]; this being the intent of this last sacrifice, to bring about the bowels of mercy, which overpowereth justice... [i.e., mercy for the guilty at the expense of any justice for the innocent!]

16. And thus mercy can satisfy the demands of justice [In whose eyes? In the eyes of the guilty or in the eyes of the murdered son?!], and encircles them [the guilty] in the arms of safety, while he who exercises no faith unto repentance is exposed to the whole law of the demands of justice; therefore only unto him that has faith unto repentance is brought about the great and eternal plan of redemption... [Although one might expect that by-far-the-worse crime would be to agree that the murder of the son was acceptable – and one might expect it would be by-far-the-best policy to damn the father for allowing his son to be killed as a sacrifice, to buy off any sins of the guilty! What sort of hideous father is this? God kills an innocent to atone for the sins of the guilty? Pardon me if I suggest that your God is a devil – maybe even the devil! Although, maybe one shouldn't judge God too harshly, for obviously the whole thing was a ruse: Adam and Eve did nothing wrong (for, courtesy God, they didn't know what 'wrong' was!), and God's son death was a fake – cause shortly after the crowd left, he reportedly got up and went merrily on his way. So the whole thing was a ruse, a joke – although it's surprising how many people missed the punch line, namely: therefore, pay the priests for fabricating such a crazy story!]

Still more misunderstanding about justice Alma 42, 6-26:

6. But behold [☹], it was appointed unto man to die [because, actually, there is substantial survival value for the genes of any species if individuals serve only as a temporary host of the species' DNA molecule, to permit testing if slight revisions to the DNA code can lead to more prosperous individuals, in a changing environment, including attacks by new bacteria and viruses]...

7. And now, ye see by this that our first parents were cut off both temporally and spiritually from the presence of the Lord [No! Not if the Lord designed the DNA molecule!]...

8. Now behold, it was not expedient [☹] that man should be reclaimed from this temporal death, for that would destroy the great plan of happiness [Well, no, not really: the "expedient" reason was already mentioned, namely those related to the continuation of the DNA molecule].

9. Therefore [Rigdon loved to use the word "therefore"!], as the soul could never die [Hello? What's a soul?! If, as Aristotle defined it, the soul is the will to live, then the soul is, at most, encoding in one's DNA], and the fall had brought upon all mankind a spiritual death as well as temporal, that is, they were cut off from the presence of the Lord, it was expedient [☹] that mankind should be reclaimed from this spiritual death. [My, my, Rigdon, how you do ramble on in your meaningless mumblings.

Let's try to understand it in terms of your DNA molecule. If by "spiritual death" is meant being separated from one's goal, then so long as one still hosts one's DNA molecules, "spiritual death" doesn't occur.]

10. Therefore [here we go again!], as they had become carnal, sensual, and devilish, by nature [well, Rigdon, as for 'carnal' and 'sensual' – I should hope so! That's how the DNA molecule goes on. As for responding to 'devilish', I'll await your definition of your term – although, if it was all "by nature", then I would expect that, however you define 'devilish', you'll almost certainly have it wrong], this probationary state became as state for them to prepare; it became a preparatory state. [Happiness is preparing in a preparatory state!]

11. And now remember..., if it were not for the plan of redemption, (laying it aside) as soon as they were dead their souls were miserable, being cut off from the presence of the Lord. [Well, old Sidney, you're getting awfully lose with your words: if one's soul is one's will to live, then "as soon as they were dead" their souls weren't 'miserable' – they, too, were dead! As for "being cut off from the presence of the Lord", you have that right, provided that you see that the Lord of all human souls is some encoding of their DNA molecule, which their dead cells could no longer read.]

12. And now, there was no means to reclaim men from this fallen state [Well, that's not exactly right: using cloning techniques, the DNA molecule could have been revived!], which man had brought upon himself because of his own disobedience. [What disobedience? Adam and Eve didn't know that it was good to obey – some dumb God forget to program them to know the difference between right and wrong!]

13. Therefore [Oh, Rigdon, give it a rest!], according to justice [What justice? Whose justice?], the plan of redemption [cloning?] could not be brought about, only on conditions of repentance of men [For what? By design, Adam and Eve couldn't do anything wrong!] in this probationary state, yea, this preparatory state; for except it were for these conditions [you mean "set up"], mercy could not take effect ["Mercy" never "takes effect"; mercy is a human feeling; sometimes humans take actions based on a feeling of mercy] except it should destroy the work of justice ['Justice' doesn't 'work'; natural, personal, and interpersonal justice are terms we use to describe specific relations between causes and their effects; in the case of interpersonal justice, if we choose to apply feelings of mercy, then we modify what would otherwise be 'just' relations between cause and effect.] Now the works of justice could not be destroyed [What garbage! Justice isn't some esoteric thing flying around with the rest of the pink elephants; interpersonal justice is what we humans define to be appropriate relations between causes and effects; we can modify these ideas of justice as we see fit!]; if so [i.e., if the work of justice could be destroyed], God would cease to be God [Bingo! Guess what, Rigdon, you finally got one right!]

14. And thus we see that all mankind were fallen [Well, at least in so far as we all must die], and they were in the grasp of justice [Well, yes, in so far as natural justice dictates that all individuals will host these human DNA molecules only temporarily];

yea, the justice of God [Damn, I thought you saw that he ceased to exist!], which consigned them forever to be cut off from his presence [Interpretation: people die].

15. And now, the plan of mercy could not be brought about except an atonement should be made; therefore [I hope for the last time], God himself attoneth for the sins of the world [Well, in a way that's fitting: he caused the mess; it seems only fair that he should clean it up!], to bring about the plan of mercy [Well, how about just cleaning up the mess and skip with the mercy-bit, which you don't seem to understand], to appease the demands of justice [So, God almighty HIMSELF has to appease justice? That's interesting. Who's working for whom?!] that God might be a perfect, just God, and a merciful God also. [So, Sidney, you, too, have doubts about the assumed characteristics of this God fellow!]

16. Now, repentance could not come unto men except there were a punishment [Oh? Really? If I were to do something wrong, couldn't I just repent because I thought it was wrong? Even if someone else didn't think so? Even if there were no punishment? Maybe, Rigdon, you oughta think about that one again], which also was eternal as the life of the soul should be [Oh? Really? Not only punishment but "eternal" punishment? I wonder, Sidney, did you ever take one of those IQ tests? You know the kind where you try to beat your previous score of 10?], affixed opposite to the plan of happiness, which was as eternal also as the life of the soul [Sidney: you're going off the deep end. May I suggest a psychiatrist friend of mine who might be able to help you? Now you're proposing a plan for eternal punishment "affixed opposite" a plan for eternal happiness, all because your God forgot to tell two fictitious people (Adam and Eve) the difference between right and wrong (e.g., that it was right to obey his commands). What I'd say to your imagined God is: "Forget it, God, we all make mistakes; just try to do better on your next planet." The way I see it, Sidney, there's no need to talk about punishing God eternally just because he screwed up one little detail.]

17. Now, how could a man repent [Whoa, Sidney: it ain't man that needs to repent! It was God who screwed up!], except he should sin? [Oh, okay, that follows: so what do you propose that we do to sin, so that we could repent – although, for my part, I'd be inclined to skip over the whole scheme: no sin; no repentance!] How could he sin if there was no law? [Well, Sidney, although I've already suggested what man should do, I could respond to your question: it seems obvious that if man did want to sin, then he would need first to define some laws.] How could there be a law save there was a punishment? [Well, okay, Sidney, we can handle that one too: we can define laws that include punishments.]

22. But there is a law given [Really, that's nice; I assume it was given to us by earlier humans], and a punishment affixed [Well, Sidney, I granted you that we'd have punishment associated with the laws that we created], and a repentance granted [Okay, we can build that into our law – at least for some cases]; which repentance, mercy claimeth [Go easy, Sidney: don't go all flowery with your writing; just say that sometimes we humans will have mercy, e.g., on our gods]; otherwise, justice

claimeth the creature and executeth the law [Hey, Sidney, is there any chance that you could not only cut out the flowery stuff but maybe work on that lisp, as in “claimeth” and “executeth”!]; if not so, the works of justice would be destroyed, and God would cease to be God. [I thought we already agreed that he ceased to be God – although I’m not sure we need strip him of all his powers, just because he screwed up a little this time around. Although, maybe you have a point, Sidney. I’m not that overly happy about his design of the lower back – too much force for such a small area to cover – and come to think of it...]

But behold it came to pass that it was expedient that poor-old lisping Sidney totally lost it:

23-26. But God ceaseth not to be God, and mercy claimeth the penitent, and mercy cometh because of the atonement; and the atonement bringeth to pass the resurrection of the dead; and the resurrection of the dead bringeth back men into the presence of God; and thus they are restored into his presence, to be judged according to their works, according to the law and justice. For behold, justice exerciseth all his demands, and also mercy claimeth all which is her own; and thus, none but the truly penitent are saved. What, do ye suppose that mercy can rob justice? I say unto you, Nay; not one whit. If so, God would cease to be God. And thus God bringeth about his great and eternal purposes, which were prepared from the foundation of the world – and not a cover up for God’s sloppy workmanship in the first place!

Misunderstandings about the purpose of life, e.g., 3 Nephi 28, 1:

And it came to pass [☺] when Jesus had said these words, he spake unto his disciples, one by one, saying unto them: “What is that ye desire of me, after that I am gone to the Father?” And they all spake, save it were three, saying: “We desire that after we have lived unto the age of man... that we may speedily come unto thee in thy kingdom.” And he said unto them: “Blessed are ye because ye desired this thing of me; therefore, after that ye are seventy and two years old, ye shall come unto me in my kingdom; and with me ye shall find rest.”

Mind boggling! How could anyone be so naïve as to buy into this con game? How could people do it? Real people actually choose – as the prime purpose of their lives – to have their “soul” at “rest” with Jesus for eternity? An eternity of “rest”? Such people (who obviously never learned to think for themselves) are going to spend eternity “resting”? Incredible! As someone else asked: how could such people adopt such a goal when they don’t know what to do with themselves on a rainy Sunday afternoon?

Ah, but of course (at least according to the BoM at *Mormon 7, 7*), they could always sing:

* Go to other chapters *via*

And he [Christ] hath brought to pass the redemption of the world, whereby he that is found guiltless before him at the judgment day hath it given unto him to dwell in the presence of God in his kingdom, to sing ceaseless praises with the choirs above, unto the Father, and unto the Son, and unto the Holy Ghost, which are one God, in a state of happiness which hath no end.

Really, Dear? It's okay, I suppose, if you like to sing, at least a little, but surely not for more than an hour or so... maybe even a day... a week?... a month?... a year?... a century of singing "ceaseless praises"?... a millennium?... millennia?... eons?... eternity?... and that's just the first chorus, "which hath no end"! I mean, talk about hell!

If fact, while I'm on the subject, are you quite sure you wouldn't rather go to hell? As Mark Twain said: "Go to heaven for the music, hell for the company!" And as the 'profit' Joe Smith, himself, reportedly said (7 June 1844, *Nauvoo Expositor*):

Hell is by no means the place that this world of fools suppose it to be, but on the contrary, it is quite an agreeable place....

Maybe old Joe couldn't carry a tune! In any event and as you know, he got together one day (on 16 February 1832) with Sidney Rigdon and cooked up a "new and improved" version of heaven. In their fanciful, multi-tiered version of heaven (described in *The Doctrine and Covenants*, Sec. 76):

...every man shall receive according to his own works, his own dominion...

Thereby, people wouldn't be stuck just singing "praises to the Lord"; instead, Joe and Sydney held out the hope (at least to all male Mormons) that, when dead, they'd get to rule their own worlds.

But what amazes me about that Mormon hope is how fools who can't figure out how to run their own lives (save to follow the rules defined by the Mormon clerics) nonetheless "think" that they'll be successful running an entire world! Further, why would anyone want to? Anyone who has been the head of a household (such as your grandmother on our side!) or the leader of a group of engineers and scientists (such as your grandmother on our side!) knows that all such positions are significant pains in the butt! And Mormons want such pains to continue for eternity?! Either somebody's gotta be kidding or is totally out of touch with reality!

Please, Dear, be reasonable. Adopt some reasonable goals. How about trying to be all you can be? If as a singer, then good: you can help humans by providing good entertainment. Or otherwise, how about becoming a poet or doctor or scientist or...? How about trying to help intelligence go on? In any case, Dear, if you do your best in this life, then as for the 1 chance in 10^{500} (or so) that your intelligence will continue beyond this life (in some manner besides the ideas that you leave behind), let that take care of itself.

If you do your best to help humanity in this life, then as near as I can guarantee you anything, I guarantee that you'll have absolutely nothing to worry about after you're dead! And even before planning about what you're gonna do when you're dead, how about planning for this life? For example, how about planning for some exercise – and then get some!