

OUR HOLY HELL

THE CAUSES, THE SOLUTIONS



AND THOUSANDS MORE

By Aron Loyd

OUR HOLY HELL

The Causes, The Solutions

By
Aron Loyd

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface: I II

1. Pg. 1 Stupidity and lies of the Old Testament
2. Pg. 59 Evil of the Old Testament

3. Pg. 137 Stupidity and lies of the New Testament

4. Pg. 215 Evil of the New Testament

5. Pg. 302 A Pound of Cure
Pg. 343 Postscript

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

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

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

ll

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER ONE

Stupidity and Lies
of the
Old Testament

1

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3

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

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

wide range of unhealthy fruits.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

9

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

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

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

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

to help god take his part?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

10

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

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

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

32:4, it says:

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

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

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

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

For helping these spies, they tell the whore that she, her family and all her possessions will be safe from the coming attack. But if they leave their house during the coming attack, they will be taking their lives into their own hands.

Then the city is attacked. Part of the story of which is in Josh. 6:20. It says:

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

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

11

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

First of all, I guess god forgot to tell Joshua that the sun doesn't move. The earth does. And it's somewhat the same story with the moon. Also, this miracle must still be in effect. Because it still takes about a whole day for the sun to set. Unless they meant the whole twenty four hours. In such a case, it's too bad that god didn't slow down time for the Amorites. Then to the Israelites, it would have been like fighting people who were moving in slow motion. Another thing I would like to talk about while we're on the subject is this filth about the Israelites avenging themselves upon the Amorites. All the Amorites did was live in a place
12

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

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

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

