

## *Forward*

In order to speak intelligently of anything, one must first know the details. My journey from doubting believer to atheist began when I decided that I would read the Bible cover to cover, so that I could not be accused of plucking out concepts and content out of context.

As mentioned in the front matter, I did exactly that. I then I read it again, with frequent stops to research the facts attached to the claims of the Bible. I had experienced a lifetime of Bible explanations from theists, and now I sought the insight from other learned individuals who were critical of it. This is where I found the truth. These truths were not only self-evident, but based on upon facts and confirmation, not beliefs and proclamations. Those are, after all, the only facts to be had.

I did not approach it with a predetermined mindset of proving the Bible erroneous or repulsive or dangerous, and yet, that was the result.

After you have examined the details, as I have, I trust that you will see what I saw.





## Cosmology of the Bible

*“The Bible is a book that has been read more and examined less than any book that ever existed.”*

~ Thomas Paine

*“Most people are bothered by those passages of Scripture they do not understand, but the passages that bother me are those I do understand.”*

~ Mark Twain

*“Each epoch has found in the Gospels what it sought to find there, and has overlooked what it wished to overlook.”*

~ Ludwig von Mises

*“The Old Testament, as everyone who has looked into it is aware, drips with blood; there is, indeed, no more bloody chronicle in all the literature of the world.”*

~ Henry L. Mencken

*“When the missionaries came to Africa they had the Bible and we had the land. They said ‘Let us pray.’ We closed our eyes. When we opened them we had the Bible and they had the land.”*

~ Bishop Desmond Tutu

*“Were we allowed to read the Bible as we do all other books, we would admire its beauties, treasure its worthy thoughts, and account for all its absurd, grotesque and cruel things, by saying that its authors lived in rude, barbaric times. But we are told that it was written by inspired men; that it contains the will of God; that it is perfect, pure, and true in all its parts; the source and standard of all moral and religious truth; that it is the star and anchor of all human hope; the only guide for man, the only torch in Nature’s night. These claims are so at variance with every known recorded fact, so palpably absurd, that every free, unbiased soul is forced to raise the standard of revolt.”*

~ Robert Ingersoll





## *It's in the Bible...I Think.*

### *Bible Illiteracy*

*"Whenever we read the obscene stories, the voluptuous debaucheries, the cruel and torturous executions, the unrelenting vindictiveness, with which the Bible is filled, it would be more consistent that we call it the word of a demon rather than the word of a god. It is a history of wickedness that has served to corrupt and brutalize mankind. I sincerely detest it as I detest all things cruel."*

~Thomas Paine, *The Age of Reason*

I find it odd and telling that modern Christians will make time to read endless novels of popular writers, and I believe that very few have ever read the Bible cover to cover. According to the website, Jesus Christology, "Statistical research shows that less than 10% of professing Christians have ever read the entire Bible."<sup>1</sup>

But as usual, those who run that site don't realize it's something they should keep hush-hush. Instead, they use the statistic as an admonishment to finally do just that—read it. But don't they realize they are playing into our hands?

Christians can't possibly know what they're talking about, if they haven't read the whole Bible.

---

<sup>1</sup> Keller, Bill. *Heal the Land*. "Less than 10% of Professed Christians have read the entire Bible!" 23 January 2008. <http://healtheland.wordpress.com/2008/01/23/less-than-10-of-professed-christians-have-read-the-entire-bible/>.

And frankly, I think if they want to swell the ranks of Christians, they ought not encourage it. Reading the entire Bible is what turned me toward atheism.

While it would have made more sense if a divine, omniscient, omnipotent creator had created the text as a whole, with a snap of his cosmic finger, the Bible was instead written by a collection of fallible humans. One would think that a book of this magnitude and importance would be given more attention to accuracy.

Was it wise to have only ONE New Testament? Why didn't God provide a "Really New Testament" or a "Modern New Testament"? Don't we need an update, now that so many Christians are choosing to ignore so much of the Bible's teachings that do not, in any evolved and civilized society, make sense or coincide with our understanding of the world in the two thousand years since the Bible? Interesting, the more enlightened we became, the farther away we moved from biblical tenets. (Some of us, anyway). There is no Modern Testament because the ignorant, misogynistic, under-educated, naive, uncivilized men who wrote the Bible are NOW DEAD.

But the Bible the Christians use has 40 or more authors for its 66 books; it's divided into two parts, the Old Testament and the New Testament. The Christian Bible is taken from both ancient Hebrew and ancient Greek texts. The oldest surviving texts are from the Middle Ages (4<sup>th</sup> century) and are called the *Greek Translation* and the *Masoretic Text*.<sup>2</sup>

Michael Coogan, Professor of Religious Studies at Stonehill College and Director of Publications for the Harvard Semitic Museum, says that the Bible can

---

<sup>2</sup> Philip R. Davies. "Memories of Ancient Israel: An Introduction to Biblical History—Ancient and Modern." Westminster John Knox Press (October 15, 2008), 7.

be compared to another well-known anthology:

*The Norton Anthology of English Literature*, which covers over a thousand years, from *Beowulf* into the 20th century. The Bible covers a similar span. The earliest texts in the Bible likely date to before 1000 B.C., and the latest texts go at least to the 2nd century B.C., and for Christians, into the 2nd century A.D. So it is an anthology of the literature of ancient Israel and early Judaism, and for Christians, of earliest Christianity, as well.<sup>3</sup>

In the Catholic church during the Dark Ages, reading the Bible was forbidden, for fear that its contents would be misinterpreted. Why is there a fear of misinterpretation in a book that was ostensibly penned by God, through his servants?

More to the point, how do we know which if any of those inspired scribes were divinely inspired? If one was, how about the three others? If two, what about the seven? Any one of them could have been divinely inspired, but it's a non sequitur to say that the Bible is the inspired word of God, because all its authors were inspired. It also presupposes not only the existence of this god, but that the Bible is a book of his own devising.

When a novelist like myself composes a book, one of the essential elements that must be achieved is the willing suspension of disbelief<sup>4</sup> on the part of the reader. Once accomplished, the author can then manufacture whatever fictions he or she chooses, if there are enough elements which will suspend this

---

<sup>3</sup> Michael Coogan. "Writers of the Bible." Interview by Gary Glassman, September 2007. *The Bible's Buried Secrets*. Susan K. Lewis, ed. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/nova/Bible/coogan.html>.

<sup>4</sup> The Willing Suspension of Disbelief is "a willingness of a reader or viewer to suspend his critical faculties to the extent of ignoring minor inconsistencies so as to enjoy a work of fiction. The phrase was coined by Coleridge in 1817...The audience accepts limitations in the story being presented, sacrificing realism (and occasionally logic and believability) for the sake of enjoyment." (WordIQ).

disbelief. The story needs to be told, and this is how a writer gains admission to the mind of the reader.

The same holds true for Christianity's willing suspension of disbelief. And the book of Christianity is the Bible—another work of fiction.

George H. Smith said, "*The man who seeks truth calls on reason; the man who seeks conformity calls on faith.*" Accordingly, moral decisions that are based in conformity, rather than consequences, is the source of most crimes against humanity where Christians took part. This mindset completely removes any sense of responsibility. Pride, therefore naturally became another sin humans needed to avoid, according to Christian dogma, and this is because one cannot have a healthy self-worth or personal integrity and be a slave.<sup>5</sup>

*Does God exist?* is a metaphysical question. *How do we know God exists?* is an epistemological<sup>6</sup> question. If God cannot be proven to exist, then atheism is the only logical stance. Though I do recognize the tendency to instead label oneself agnostic<sup>7</sup>, instead. I think this stems from a fear of ostracization in our society or communities or families; and a deeply entrenched brainwashing brought on in this Judeo-Christian nation we live in.

Even our language is replete with scriptural phrases, most of which we are unaware.<sup>8</sup>

Never underestimate the power of methodical brainwashing. From birth, we have been assimilated

---

<sup>5</sup> George H Smith. *Atheism: The Case Against God*. (Prometheus Books, 1980).

<sup>6</sup> Epistemology is the theory of knowledge, especially the critical study of its validity, methods, and scope.

<sup>7</sup> Agnosticism is an intellectual doctrine or attitude affirming the uncertainty of all claims to ultimate knowledge.

<sup>8</sup> From the Phrase Finder website, there is a short list of common phrases that permeate our communication in this society, all of them from the Bible. You'll find a copy of that in Appendix B.

into the fold, even if we have not yet embraced any particular faith or belief system.





## *The Bible Tells Me So*

*“The Bible is the greatest hoax in all history. The leading characters of the Old Testament would today be in the penitentiary and those of the New would be under observation in psychopathic wards.”*

~ Charles Smith, U.S. attorney, author

The belief that Christians have about what the Bible actually tells them is violated first by the fact that most Christians have not read the entire Bible, and is violated second by their willingness to overlook the fact that the Bible contradicts itself so often within the same version. What would be a more accurate statement is “The clergy has told me what the Bible says, and the rest I get from circulating memes in society.”

A few quick examples.

In perhaps the most respected sections of the Bible, the Gospels, it is apparent that the authors of those books did not agree. Most scholars agree that the Gospels of Matthew and Luke are based on the Gospel of Mark, which was believed to have been written between 66-74 CE,<sup>9</sup> because in verse 13:2, the author mentions the Temple in Jerusalem that was destroyed at the time of a war between the Jews and Rome.

The caves of Nag Hammadi produced more than just the Gospel of Thomas. There were around 36 apocryphal Gospels discovered, including the Gospels of Thomas, Peter, Mary, Truth, Jesus and even the Gospel of Judas, which was found in El

---

<sup>9</sup> Austin Cline. “Dating and Origins of Mark’s Gospel.” About.com: Agnosticism/Atheism.  
<http://atheism.about.com/od/Biblegospelofmark/a/dating.htm>.

Minya, Egypt, in the 1970's. The various methods used to determine the authenticity of these found manuscripts are much more sophisticated in modern times.

Dr. L. Michael White, the Ronald Nelson Smith Chair in Classics and Christian Origins at The University of Texas at Austin, said, "All of those things can be, to a greater or lesser degree, pinned down to the period in which they were produced."

"So for the Gospel of Judas, we could determine that it is indeed an ancient Christian document. We also know that the manuscript is not in Greek, but in Coptic, the native language of early Egyptian Christianity. That already tells us that it's a later copy and translation of what should have been the original Greek work."<sup>10</sup>

White's background in classics and archeology as well as religious studies allows him a unique comprehension of the social, cultural and historical contexts in which these books were written. In his recent book, *From Jesus to Christianity*, he details the first 200 years of the Christian faith, and seeks to reveal the motives of Jesus' followers. White's book won the Hamilton Book Award.

The Gospel of Judas reveals that Judas was not the traitor the traditional Gospels present him to be, but rather, that he acted on instructions from Jesus to betray him.

With all the apocryphal books for reference, the traditional Gospels of the New Testament cannot be taken at face value, and have generous room for error; like the errors in the sequence or details of events.

---

<sup>10</sup> Stefan Lovgren. "Lost Gospel Revealed: Says Jesus Asked Judas to Betray Him." *National Geographic News*. 6 April 2006.  
[http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2006/04/0406\\_060406\\_judas.html](http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2006/04/0406_060406_judas.html).

Both Luke and Matthew want to portray Jesus as within the lineage of King David, yet their genealogy contradicts each other. Luke says there were 42 generations between David and Jesus, while Matthew says there were 27. And the names within these listed generations are not the same. If both these authors were supposed to be “inspired” by God, was God confused? I figure any being who lives long enough will eventually exhibit signs of Alzheimer’s. Logical thought tells us that if we have two different accounts of the same thing, one of them has to be incorrect, which calls into question the veracity of all.

Current scientific data reveals that when the taxing under Cyrenius took place, Herod had been dead for ten years. The result means that, according to the Gospel writers, Jesus was taken to Egypt ten years before he was even born, and “Herod killed the babes ten years after he was dead.”<sup>11</sup>

It’s also obvious that Jesus never said, “so that upon you may fall the guilt of all the righteous blood shed on Earth, from the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, whom you murdered between the temple and the altar” because Zacharias was killed in a siege by Titus, which happened 38 years after Jesus was dead. And Zacharias was the son of Baruch, not Barachias.<sup>12</sup>

And then there’s the account of Judas. For such a pivotal event in history, and with the scribes being inspired by God himself, one would think they

---

<sup>11</sup> Robert G. Ingersoll. *The Works of Robert G. Ingersoll, Vol. IV.* (Cosimo Classics, 1 November 2009), 254.

<sup>12</sup> Robert G. Ingersoll. “The Old Testament.” *The Foundations of Faith.* 1895. Holy Smoke/The Bank of Wisdom. <http://www.holysmoke.org/ll/rgi-index.htm>.

would agree on this character in Christology. As the biblical story goes, Judas accepted money to betray Christ, but what happened in regard to that money is up for debate if consulting the Gospel authors. Matthew says Judas gave the money back to the priests and elders, his guilt overwhelming him, and then summarily hung himself. Peter said Judas bought some land with the money, and somehow fell and all his guts gushed out into the “field of blood.”

How do we know which version to believe? And if it was necessary, and preordained that Jesus should be the human sacrifice for all humankind, why do Christians blame Judas for helping Jesus carry out his destiny?

Jesus told his Twelve Homeboys that they would all sit on thrones in judgment of the 12 Tribes of Israel. Though, a year before, he said that one of them was a Devil, and would betray him, and John clarified that it was Judas Iscariot. Did Jesus change his mind?

Paul said that after the resurrection, Jesus appeared to all 12 disciples. So did Jesus know Judas would betray him or not? Did he want that to happen, or did he not? According to the story of Jesus before Pilate, he did want to die, because he didn't attempt to defend himself.

Either way, we see that someone has to die in Christianity.

Then there's the confusion about the Trinity.

Christ, according to the faith, is the second person in the Trinity, the Father being the first and the Holy Ghost the third. Each of these three persons is God. Christ is his own father and his own son. The Holy Ghost is neither father nor son, but both. The son was begotten by the father, but existed before he was begotten — just the same before as after. Christ is just as old as his father, and the

father is just as young as his son. The Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and Son, but was equal to the Father and Son before he proceeded, that is to say, before he existed, but he is of the same age of the other two. So, it is declared that the Father is God, and the Son God and the Holy Ghost God, and that these three Gods make one God.

According to the celestial multiplication table, once one is three, and three times one is one, and according to heavenly subtraction if we take two from three, three are left. The addition is equally peculiar, if we add two to one we have but one. Each one is equal to himself and the other two. Nothing ever was, nothing ever can be more perfectly idiotic and absurd than the dogma of the Trinity.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Ingersoll, *The Foundations of Faith*, *ibid.*





## *Alleged Creation*

*"On the first day, man created God."*

~Anonymous

Generally we "know" something happened because there was a witness. So how can we know how God created the world, i.e., that he said, "Let there be light", when no one was created yet to record the event?

As I've pointed out before, we have no video, no text, no audio recording, nothing, to prove this is what happened. I think it's clear that means the idea of Creation is predicated entirely on faith. Meaning, not a fact.

Now, I realize that Christians will scream that God told men how the Earth was created, in retrospect, and they transcribed it into the story that is Genesis. But there's no proof of this either, nor that the voice of God was not merely a bout with schizophrenia.

The first five books of the Bible are known as the Pentateuch, and were alleged to have been written by Moses. (Even though Moses wasn't alive then). And, curiously, the story of creation was almost verbatim the creation story that Egyptians believed and taught; and wouldn't you know it, Moses was the adopted son of a Pharaoh's daughter.

Further, the act of creation is to some degree always an act of ego. If God is the infinite, omniscient, omnipotent, alpha omega that theists claim, what would he want with an act that demonstrates such a base human

feature? It does not seem plausible to me, unless God is NOT all those things, or unless God is NOT.

As Robert Ingersoll points out:

If God created the universe, there was a time when he commenced to create. Back of that commencement there must have been an eternity. In that eternity what was this God doing? He certainly did not think. There was nothing to think about. He did not remember. Nothing had ever happened. What did he do? Can you imagine anything more absurd than an infinite intelligence in infinite nothing wasting an eternity?<sup>14</sup>

It's all pretty ridiculous when you think it through.

Another problem with the biblical creation story is that there are two of them. Not just in the Bible, but in the same book of the Bible. And neither of these accounts agrees with what we know of the geologic column.<sup>15</sup> Notice also that there are references to days and mornings and evenings, again, before there was a sun to delineate these things.

In one part of Genesis, it tells us that man was created after the animals, (1:25-27) and in the next, that man was created before the animals (2:18-19). It also says that Adam and Eve were created at the same time, (1:27) and then says that Adam was created first, then the animals, then Eve (2:18-22). Which version are we to believe?

In the first chapter of Genesis, the sky, light and Earth were created on the first day, followed by water (overhead as well as on the Earth. *Please*); the third day, plants, the fourth day, moon, sun and stars.

How is it that the plants could grow without the sunlight?

On the fifth day, sea monsters, fish, birds reptiles, insects and land animals were created. The 6<sup>th</sup> day, humans.

---

<sup>14</sup> Robert G. Ingersoll. "Some Mistakes of Moses." (1879). (NuVision Publications, LLC 20 January 20, 2007), 29.

<sup>15</sup> More on that in the Volume, *Cosmology of Science*.

In the secondary story of creation in chapter 2, the Earth and Heavens were created on the first day, followed respectively by Adam, plants, animals, and Eve. Which version are we to believe?

As is the case with most of the Bible, its stories are in no way unique to Christianity. Many other cultures had cosmogonies.<sup>16</sup>

In Egypt:

**1<sup>st</sup> Day: Creation of light.** In the beginning there was only water, a chaos of churning, bubbling water, this the Egyptians called Nu or Nun. It was out of Nu that everything began.

Then the sun god Ra **emerged** out of primeval chaos, he came out of a blue giant lotus flower that appeared on the surface of the water. Ra gave light to the universe.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Day: Creation of air and moisture** - Ra created the air god Shu and his wife Tefnut the goddess of moisture,

**3<sup>rd</sup> Day: Creation of Earth and Sky** - Shu and Tefnut gave birth to the sky-goddess Nut and the Earth god Geb, and so the physical universe was created. Ra seems to rest while his sons and daughters are completing the task of creation, this is in accordance with the polytheistic beliefs of ancient Egyptians

**4<sup>th</sup> Day- Creation of Calendar** - Against Ra's orders, Geb and Nut married. Ra was incensed and ordered Shu to separate them, which he did. But Nut was already pregnant, although unable to give birth as Ra had decreed she could not give birth in any month of any year. Thoth, the god of learning, decided to help her and gambling with the moon for extra light, was able to add five extra days to the 360-day calendar. On those five days Nut gave birth to Osiris, Horus the Elder, Seth, Isis, and Nephthys successively. Even the heavenly bodies are seen as serving human needs, by providing the basis for a calendar.

**5<sup>th</sup> Day- Creation of Life** - Khnum created the living creatures on his potter's wheel. He modeled the animals, plants and people of the Earth. A detailed description of how he created humans is found at Esna Temple. It describes how he orders the bloodstream to cover the bones, and makes the skin enclose the body. He then makes the respiratory

---

<sup>16</sup> creation myths.

system and the food digestion. In contrast with the Hebrew mythology, the work of Khnum was seen as a continuous task, he was seen as a deity sitting on his potter's wheel constantly working in creating life.

The Mayan culture also had a cosmogony similar to the biblical one. Gia Milinovich, the wife of physicist Brian Cox, tells us on her Blog:

it took the Maya creation gods several attempts to create Human Beings who would worship them (a bit like God's first attempt at creating Woman). First, they created animals who didn't worship them, so they banished them to the forest. Next, they created Man out of mud, but soon they just washed away (there's a lesson for you, Yaweh). Next, they created Man out of wood, but they were pretty rubbish at 'worshipping' so the gods got angry and Flooded the place to get rid of them. Finally, Worshipful Man was made out of Maize.<sup>17</sup>

This shows that there are many similarities between biblical creation and other myths. But really, how seriously, can you take a civilization that worshipped a Corn God?

The Skeptic Wiki has a wonderful collection of creation myths,<sup>18</sup> and if you look them over, you will recognize all the archetypes, all the literary devices, all the many similarities among differing cultures about how the first humans came to be.

The Garden of Eden, for example, is similar to the Enuma Elish—Enki, the male god and Ninhursag, the female Earth or Mother goddess of Sumerian mythology, the seduction of fruit from trees of "life" which impose a curse to those who eat of it. This is also reflected in the story of Gilgamesh, with the Huluppu Tree, as well as the serpent/demon in a tree. And the Myth of Adapa, wherein the son is at least partially divine, and has made an egregious error against his creator, involving the eating of dangerous fruit offered by his female counterpart. This

---

<sup>17</sup> Gia Milinovich. "Apocalypmics 2012 – Mayan "Prophecy." 23 Jan 2008. <http://www.giagia.co.uk/2008/01/23/apocalypmics-2012/>.

<sup>18</sup> [http://skepticiwiki.org/index.php/Creation\\_myths](http://skepticiwiki.org/index.php/Creation_myths).

error costs them both their right to live in a beautiful place.<sup>19</sup>

This sucks the authority right out of the biblical account. If that many cultures had creation myths, then how can the Bible be the only one we're supposed to take seriously?

Early humankind must have realized when they looked at others like themselves, that they were controlled by something they could not see. Then they saw that weather and other animals, the sun, the moon, also seemed to be controlled by something unseen. It was not much of a leap, mentally, to assume that something invisible must be in control. And when they must have thought about it more deeply, they saw that small things grew from the ground and became big things. So it's not a stretch, either, to assume that this is how the creation of Adam myth came about. This invisible, more powerful being created him from the ground.

---

<sup>19</sup> George Smith and Andrew Dickson White. *Chaldean Account of Genesis*. (Nabu Press 9 September 2010).





## *The First Family*

*"If the Prodigal Son's a parable, and if Adam and Eve are metaphors, then maybe God is just figure of speech."*

~ Dan Barker

No matter how absurd the story, a person who wishes to believe, will find a way to justify it. On a blog maintained by a preacher and a skeptic, the issue of Adam and Eve was taken on,<sup>20</sup> and the skeptic asked, among other things, *"I'm always perplexed by how anyone could think that the story of Adam and Eve should be taken literally."*

To which the Preacher replied, *"To be consistent with the rest of the Bible, I need to accept the account of Adam and Eve as real history."*

It's almost the perfect atheist joke. This is essentially an admission of their own willingness to blind themselves. Believers will choose to accept something nonsensical, because if they don't the other nonsensical things will seem even more nonsensical.

The ancient Hebrews imagined the world as flat and round, covered by the great dome of the firmament which was held up by mountain pillars (Job 26.11; 37.18). Above the firmament and under the Earth was water, divided by God at creation (Gen 1.6, 7; Pss 24.2; 148.4). The upper waters were joined with the waters of the primordial deep during the Flood; the rains were believed to fall through windows in the firmament (Gen 7.11; 8.2). The sun, moon, and stars moved across or were fixed in the firmament (Gen 1.14-19; Ps 19.4, 6). Within the Earth lay Sheol, the

---

<sup>20</sup> The Preacher and the Skeptic. "The Mysterious Case of Adam and Eve." Friday, August 21, 2009. <http://preacherskeptic.blogspot.com/2009/08/strange-case-of-adam-and-eve.html>.

realm of the dead (Num 16.30-33; Isa 14.9, 15).<sup>21</sup>

The Gnostic and Manichaean traditions have similar stories about creation and the First Family. The Apocalypse of Adam and the Testament of Adam, found in the Gnostic Nag Hamadi texts, as well as the Protanthropos or World Soul of the Manichaean doctrine, all reflect these sentiments.

The Gnostics believed in one supreme god, as well as a secondary Creator-God, called a *demiurge*. And there are variations within the Gnostic traditions, regarding the roles of Adam and Eve and Satan.<sup>22</sup> Since this second god was a malevolent tyrant, it would address the problem of evil, as well as the psychotic behavior of the biblical version. Not that I believe either version is true. But it bears mentioning, if only because it reveals still another connection to the mixing of myths.

The closest I could come to ever believing in the creation of humans, as rendered in the Bible is this: we know that the first Homo Sapiens had predecessors—there are archeological, geological and anthropological facts supporting this knowledge. Thus, assuming Adam and Eve even existed, they were not the first humanoids, but only the ones that God selected as such.

The problem with this, though, is that the Bible says God made Adam out of dirt. So there's no reason to believe the biblical God used previous or then-existing humans to begin the race that sprang from Adam and Eve. And it certainly doesn't explain things like different races. Any neo-Christians who try to blend their dogma with evolution, then, are just trying to fill all those holes in the logic, and that's something they've been doing quite a lot of in recent years, to no avail, if we maintain scientific veracity.

---

<sup>21</sup> Paul J Achtemeier, ed. *The HarperCollins Bible Dictionary*. (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), 339.

<sup>22</sup> Plato. *Republic*. The Gnostic Society Library, 588A-589B. <http://gnosis.org/naghamm/plato.html>.



## *The Fall Of Man*

*"It all goes back, of course, to Adam and Eve—a story which shows among other things, that if you make a woman out of a man, you are bound to get into trouble."*

~ Carol Gilligan

Interestingly, Adam and Eve are not mentioned in the first creation story of Genesis 1:1-2. God merely created what sounds like a hermaphrodite—a being both male and female. This is because the creation stories were taken from other Egyptian creation stories and rendered by humans. The first story comes from the Theban Creation Myth, and the second, from the Heliopolitan Myth.

But, according to the second account in Genesis 2:17, which is the more popular one, God gave Adam and Eve the following instructions: "but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat from it you will surely die" and we know that they did not die, but were merely banished. So was God lying? Was he surprised? Was he playing a joke?

I immediately remembered the explanation that theists give for this apparent lie from God: they will tell you that when God said "you will surely die" that God meant, you will no longer be immortal beings but will suffer the pain of a limited lifespan and then will perish. Isn't this another ad hoc explanation for another scriptural contradiction?

Furthermore, let's blame the entire Hell-bent degradation of humanity on the woman, shall we? When God told the First Couple they would die if they ate of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, how could an innocent like Eve understand the meaning of die? If she was one of only two humans, and had never witnessed death, nor suffered it herself, what possible implication could there be for such an edict? And why was she

punished for something she could not have understood?

Furthermore, God told Adam not to eat of the tree before Eve was even created.

Then the LORD God took the man and put him into the garden of Eden to cultivate it and keep it. The LORD God commanded the man, saying, "From any tree of the garden you may eat freely; but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat from it you will surely die (Genesis 2:15-17).

So wasn't this trickery all-around on the part of God. Especially to place this tree in the Garden, knowing that Adam and Eve might be tempted by it? It sounds like a trap to me. And on an interesting note, we all have heard that Adam supposedly lived to be 930 years old. So much for God telling the truth. The serpent was right, God does lie.

And one more point: How could Adam and Eve know the difference between the act of being good or evil until AFTER they ate from the tree that gave them that knowledge and discernment? Another God-Trick?

And here's another thing—isn't it obvious that the message here is also that God did not want them to have knowledge? If Christians wish to follow the edicts of the Bible, they should summarily remove their children from school; because the last time I looked, schools were for gaining knowledge. And this omniscient god, himself, in possession of all knowledge, should have known this would happen, or else he's not omniscient.

Then the Lord God said, "Behold, the man has become like one of Us, knowing good and evil; and now, lest he stretch out his hand, and take also from the tree of life and eat, and live forever" (Genesis 3:22).

First, who is "Us"? I thought there was only ONE god? And why did God think that everlasting life was incompatible with knowledge? If one knows the difference between good and evil, wouldn't they be more worthy of eternal life, instead of less?

Additionally, why did God allow the serpent to trick Eve?<sup>23</sup> Regardless, she is blamed for it. Never mind that Adam had been given the same instructions, but ate the fruit she gave him. This is known as The Fall of Man. Meaning, Man Fell, Because Woman made an Honest Mistake.<sup>24</sup>

After this, God banishes Adam and Eve from Paradise and leaves them to fend for themselves. Because that's how he rolls. This God, he just demands absolute, blind obedience, even if you have to kill or be abandoned as an innocent into the wilds. And not only that, but now you must grow old and die, but before that, Eve, you must know the pain of childbirth, and after that, you have many millennia of rape and torture and abuse to look forward to from those men you'll spring from your womb. Men were then forever painful coming out, and painful after they grew up.

---

<sup>23</sup> And as an aside, God also punished the serpent for his actions, (though, again, God created the serpent to begin with, and put him in the Garden) and what was his punishment. That he would slither on his belly from then on. Wow. That's really harsh, to make a SNAKE slither ON HIS BELLY. If he was a snake, it's obvious he already did that. And God also cursed the snake to eat dust forever. We know that snakes don't eat dust. Did God forget to enforce that? One of those *duh* moments that just starts me eye-rolling.

<sup>24</sup> On the bright side, I could also infer from this that Woman had not fallen, and so women remain the purer of the two, since Man was the one who fell. The ironies and giggles of a Patriarchy.





### *Oh, Kill Me Now!*

*“This day is getting to be more and more trying. It was selected and set apart last November as a day of rest. I already had six of them per week, before. This morning found the new creature trying to clod apples out of that forbidden tree.”*

~ Mark Twain, (Extracts from Adam’s Diary)

In the Pseudepigrapha, resides the *First Book of Adam and Eve*. I at first approached this apocryphal book with great interest, hoping for some elucidation of the missing portions in Genesis. After reading it, I was very clear about why it was not included in the Bible we accept today.

From a literary standpoint, it is poorly written, repetitious and aggravating in its absurdity (though, honestly, so is much of the Bible; I thought I would scream before making it through the purple prose of the Book of Job).

Each chapter of the Book of Adam and Eve is normally only a few paragraphs long, and in each one, you can find Adam and/or Eve "weeping" and fraught with all manner of fear and trembling before God. Adam repeatedly dies or kills himself and is constantly resurrected by God. This is fine once or twice, but when it happens over and over again, in almost every short chapter, it just becomes intolerable. All right, already! We get it. God can resurrect humans. Got it.

In just the first half of the book only, Adam and/or Eve either wept or were weeping approximately 40 times. They fell down in fear and often died on the spot from grief or fear or some other factor some 35 times; God resurrected them from death every single time.

When one reads closely, it is like reading a manual of how a cult leader wears down his subjects until finally he has them completely at his mercy and worshipping him no matter what heinous acts he might perpetrate upon

them.

The entire thing was so absurd and so disgusting on so many levels, that I could scarcely suffer through it, and only did so, so that I could say I had actually read all of it, and could then speak of it with an appreciable amount of credibility.

The only interesting things I gleaned from the text were two:

First, According to this, Adam and Eve were not "human" or at least not "of the flesh" until after they left the Garden. They noticed that their bodies were now different, and reacted as if they were for the first time, walking on the ground. They were fearful of the terrain. And they also realized that they now required food or water to survive. Had they been spirits? Angels? Essences?

Second, God told them they had "five days and a half" to exist in this new world. Adam lamented, (crying again) but God explained that what he meant was 5,000 and 500 years, and "One would come and save him and his seed."

Well okay, so no worries about the Second Coming for another 3,000 years almost! Why is everyone so anxious and why are there so many Christians insisting that the world is about to end? Is it because God is notorious for making proclamations and prophecies that don't come to fruition? And even then, according to the First Book of Adam and Eve, everyone gets to be saved, because EVERYONE will be of the seed of Adam, since EVERYONE sprang from him, right? So when referring to the "Seed," instead of the seed of one man, among others who have seed, it seems it means the seed of humans in general.



## *The Second Book of Adam & Eve*

*“The inspiration of the Bible depends on the  
ignorance of the person who reads it.”*

~ Robert G. Ingersoll

In the Second Book of Adam and Eve, we suddenly hear of Cain’s wife, Luluwa, who tells her mother and father about Cain slaying Abel. It’s not clear where these other people came from, since there should have only been three on the face of the planet, according to the creation stories.

But the First Family is grief-stricken, and they tear at their clothes, throw dust on their faces—a custom that indicates the First Family is Jewish.<sup>25</sup>

Then in verse 6, we find that Luluwa was Cain’s sister, and that meant that the parents she told were her own and Cain’s. Further, it’s revealed that Cain married his sister, Luluwa. So we’re supposed to believe that an all-knowing, all-powerful god who created the universe and all the life in it, could not summon up a separate bloodline to perpetuate the race? He had to let them interbreed? Modern science tells us what happens when relatives breed together. Genetically, it’s a bad idea. And doesn’t this serve to validate the incestuous relationships we disdain and reject when we hear about it on news programs?

Adam and Eve then decided to have another boy-child whom they could marry off to Abel’s wife—again, incest. They named the child Seth. Then we’re told, for no apparent reason, that Adam and Eve stopped having sex for the rest of their lives, and Adam set up a bachelor pad in a nearby cave. Guess all the murder and incest sucked all the joy out of it.

---

<sup>25</sup> How did that happen when the Jews had not been created yet? Easy. Because the stories were written well after the fact, and with that culture as an influence.

Then Satan appears, appearing to Adam in the form of a beautiful woman, and tries to talk Adam into reuniting with Eve. Then in the second book of Adam, chapter 4, verse 4, God makes Satan show his true form and then says,

And look, O Adam, at him, who said of himself that he is God! Can God be **black**? Would God take the form of a **woman**?

So God was both a racist and a misogynist.

When Adam was 130 years old, the Book of Adam tells us, he became a father again—to a boy named Seth. The other children he had didn't bear mentioning. Either because it would take too long to name perhaps 130 or so children, or because the writers knew it would be hard to invent that many. So it gets skipped.



### *The Rook of Adam*

*“It is an unusual book which begins with two contradictory stories and with a narrative whose time and place are false. Yet for centuries that book has been read as the source of truth.”*

~ Robin Lane Fox, Fellow at Oxford, Historian

The story continues that Satan then appeared to Seth when he was a child and tried to get him to come to another place of creation and marry whomever he wished. (I can't help but wonder if this other group of people existed, why God allowed everyone to marry their sisters. But maybe Satan was lying about that. You know how he is). Seth told Satan he had to ask his mother and Father first, and Satan said if he asked them, they wouldn't let him go. He asked anyway, and Adam told him the visage he saw was Satan in another form. Adam then wanted Seth to marry one of his other sisters, and Seth didn't want to, but did anyway. That's two chances for marriage that Seth turned down. Maybe he was gay.

The story goes on in this manner for some time, but one thing is clear. It's a fable. A mythical story just like all the other mythical stories. Remember, the books that made it into the Bible were just like these, and supposedly, the best of the bunch were chosen for the god-anthology. Still, this makes the chosen ones seem suspect, as they were written by the same types of people in the same region. If we find the apocryphal books objectionable, why wouldn't we find the accepted ones the same?

And presumably, there is no Book of Eve, unless Mark Twain wrote one I'm not aware of. But, in the apocryphal Book of Adam, it seems the First Man is even more confused about how to deal with this God whose desires make little sense and whose actions are at once unpredictable.

3.2 Eve told Adam, "Oh, if I were dead then God would have accepted you in paradise!" Adam replied to Eve and said to her, "Because of us a great anger lies against (upon?) all creatures. (However) I do not know this: whether it is because of me or because of you." Eve replied to Adam, "My lord, if you think it wise, kill me so that I will be exterminated from the sight of God and his angels, so that God's anger against you may cease, which happened because of me: and he will bring you back into paradise.

3.3 Adam replied and told her, "No, no! Do not mention this matter, lest God send another judgment upon us because of (this) killing. How could I raise my hand and cause my own flesh to suffer?" Then Eve told him, "Arise, let us both seek vegetables."

Okay, after I quit laughing I'll address a portion of that...the last line smacks of some Saturday Night Live skit. Now...first, they are discussing what they should and should not keep from God, who is ostensibly all-knowing. Is he Omniscient or not?

Adam said, "how could I raise my hand and cause my own flesh to suffer?" Some would see this as a reference to Eve having been made from Adam—though she was made by his rib, not his flesh. But skipping that, she was related to him. This echoes some suppositions that Adam and Eve were more like twins than two separate biological beings. So that would be another indication that humans were created from incest. But that's already been established, since there were no other people on the planet at the time. (Unless Satan was telling the truth, but we all know that can't be possible).

In both the First Book of Adam and Eve and in The Book of Adam, there is a story of Eve doing penitence in the river—standing in it up to the neck for 34 or 40 days. First, this is obviously impossible. A few inches of river water could knock a person down. There's no way a human could stand in a current up to their neck for any amount of time, much less over a month. And obviously, the person would starve to death by then, too; though I

suppose there would be plenty of water to drink.

In verse 21.3, when Eve is about to give birth to Cain, there is suddenly a midwife. Where did she come from?

In 24:5.1a, we're told that the Earth was populated from the thirty sons and thirty daughters of Adam and Eve. Now, why didn't God just create five or six couples to do that? Why the inbreeding? It's not like he didn't have a choice—being the creator of the whole universe and all.

Another mention in 40:13.3 of the five thousand years—the promise that humans would live 5000 years and 6 months before Christ returns to the Earth to resurrect Adam, and he and all descendents will then rise to paradise. Everyone. Not just the chosen. Everyone. Since we are all, according to the Bible, descendents of Adam, that means we all are resurrected. Then why do we need to be saved? And again, since that's 5,000 years in the future, what's all the Left Behind/Second Coming stuff about? They can chill, we have another 3,000 to go.

All this might make for titillating fiction (if it were written better) but it in no way seems literal. Again, another example of how the stories are myths.

So there is no elucidation to be found by reading the apocryphal Books of Adam. Only more of the same material, written more poorly, and espousing the same ridiculous ideas that only the brainless would appreciate.





## *Apparently you ARE Supposed to Keep Your Brother*

*“Cain is the cleverest of all. He is really an expert at making the simpler kinds of fossils, and will soon be taking the most of that work off our hands”*

~ Mark Twain, *The Bible According to Mark Twain*

**I**n the fourth chapter of Genesis, we read the story of Cain and Abel, the two sons of Adam and Eve. God praises Abel for bringing him the sacrifice of a living animal, and punishes Cain for bringing him vegetables and flowers. Cain gets jealous and angry and in a fit of envy, kills his brother, and God banishes Cain; and in the antecedent for our modern usage of the phrase “the Mark of Cain,” a mark was placed by God on Cain’s head so that everyone would be able to recognize him and that whoever killed Cain, “vengeance will be taken on him sevenfold.”

So, God wanted to punish the person who might kill Cain, though he was a murderer—why? I am assuming the inference is that God wanted very much for Cain to suffer for the rest of his mortal life. Somewhat like our judicial system now, where we feel a life sentence is worse than a sentence of death, somehow. Worse for the convicted person, and worse for the taxpayer, alas. Anyway, this Scripture also says that Cain would be forced to wander forever and never have a home.

First, there were no other humans. The only people who reportedly existed at the time were Adam, Eve, Abel

and Cain. So who is this “everyone” who would be able to recognize Cain?

And Cain was obviously not sentenced by God to roam the Earth and never find a home, since a short while later, he is said to have “settled in the land of Nod,” built a city; for whom, it isn’t clear, since, as already mentioned, there were no others. Yet, the city was somehow populated in two generations. Additionally, Cain found a wife and married her, but it’s not clear where she was hiding either. So, Adam and Eve may have been the first, but they apparently weren’t the only humans created by God at that time. What was their story?

Apologists warn that in order for the Gospels to be true, adherents must be able to show that Cain’s wife was a descendent of Adam and Eve.

Defenders of the Gospel must be able to show that all human beings are descendants of one man and one woman (Adam and Eve)—as only those people who are descendants of Adam and Eve can be saved.<sup>26</sup>

Thus, they must accept that the human species began via incest. This is a case of cutting one’s nose off to spite one’s face. Adherents MUST admit the incestuous nature of their beginnings in order to accept the rest of the dogma.

Wait just a minute: if only the descendants of Adam and Eve are to be saved, and Adam and Eve were the first and only humans created at the beginning, as dogma asserts, then aren’t ALL people descendants of the First Couple? And doesn’t that mean all are saved without that dramatic trip to the altar?

Furthermore, there is a contradiction in Ham’s explanation of where all the people came from during the time of Adam and Eve.

His brothers, Abel (Genesis 4:2) and Seth (Genesis 4:25), were part of the *first* generation of children ever born on this Earth.

---

<sup>26</sup> Ken Ham. Christian Answers. “Where Did Cain Get His Wife?” <http://www.christiananswers.net/q-aig/aig-c004.html>.

Then later, Ham says,

In Genesis 5:4 a statement sums up the life of Adam and Eve—“And the days of Adam after he had fathered Seth were eight hundred years. And he fathered sons and daughters.” This does not say *when* they were born. Many could have been born in the 130 years (Genesis 5:3) before Seth was born.

So which is it? Was Seth part of the first generation, or was he after many others? Apologists will say that 400 years later, God told Moses it was no longer acceptable for relatives to marry and breed, and that was because by that time, the gene pool was marred by sin and the offspring would be deformed. This is another ad hoc defense that was created to explain something that made no sense (and still doesn't).

Double-speak again, from Christian apologists. It's a challenge to keep the details in line, just like with all other works of fiction, penned by HUMANS.