

# The Bibbble Companion

(Human edition 1)



David Swanton

Ethical Rights

[www.ethicalrights.com](http://www.ethicalrights.com)

Level 3 Universe, Universe time 0.29222b5.01  
Human edition 1, February 2010 version

The Bibbble Companion should be read to complement The Bibbble. The Bibbble is a light satire, intended to make people think and act consistent with a more ethical approach to life.

Donations in lieu of a specified purchase price and to support the further development of the online 'The Bibbble Companion' and 'The Bibbble' are welcomed. The Bibbble Companion, and The Bibbble, can and should be downloaded, free, from [www.ethicalrights.com](http://www.ethicalrights.com) .

© David Swanton 2010.

This work is copyright. The moral rights of the author have been asserted.

This document may be downloaded, stored in cache, displayed, printed and reproduced in unaltered form only (retaining this notice) for your personal, non-commercial use or use within your organisation. Apart from any use as permitted under the Australian *Copyright Act 1968*, all other rights are reserved.

This online book can and should be downloaded from the Ethical Rights website [www.ethicalrights.com](http://www.ethicalrights.com) .

Requests and inquiries concerning reproduction and rights relating to The Bibbble Companion should be addressed to The Manager, Ethical Rights, using the '[Contact Us](#)' link on the Ethical Rights website at [www.ethicalrights.com](http://www.ethicalrights.com) .

## Contents

About The Bibbble	1
1. What is the purpose of The Bibbble?	1
2. What is The Bibbble story?	2
3. What should people think of The Bibbble?	3
4. Do you believe in the DAYO story as described in The Bibbble?	3
5. Should people believe in everything in The Bibbble?	3
6. Are you saying that you believe in the principles of the universe, but not that DAYO created the universe? So, who created the universe?	3
7. What advice does The Bibbble have for people?	4
8. Why is the book called The Bibbble?	4
9. Do Dosuaxdip, Aadaei, Yowkq and Ojqo (DAYO) mean anything?	4
The Bible and The Bibbble	5
10. Must not the Bible be more right than The Bibbble, because more people believe in it?	5
11. Why is The Bibbble better than the Bible?	6
12. What do you consider wrong with the Bible?	6
13. The Bible was inspired by God. Who inspired The Bibbble?	7
14. The arguments against the Bible and God are also valid against DAYO, are they not?	7
15. Do you not understand that according to Biblical teachings, that since God is omnibenevolent (morally perfect), omnipotent (all-powerful) and omniscient (all knowing), God must exist and be more powerful than DAYO?	8
Ethical Principles	9
16. Why are DAYO's principles for a Level 3 Universe better than the Bible's Ten Commandments?	9
17. How do you explain sin?	9
18. What do people exhibiting NONG (non-objective non-good) behaviour do wrong in preaching moral values to others?	10
19. Shouldn't people who exhibit NONG behaviour be offended that The Bibbble specifically mentions them?	11
20. Why does The Bibbble suggest that religious people are hypocritical?	11

21.	Doesn't The Bibbble impose EP3 on everybody, and isn't that wrong?	11
	Beliefs	13
22.	If people do not believe in God, then they will go to hell when they die. Should not people therefore believe in God?	13
23.	Christians believe God created the universe, so did he not also create DAYO?	13
24.	I know God has always been here, so where do DAYO come from? They cannot always have been here.	13
25.	Where do you go when you die? If I am good, and regularly obey what my church teaches me, and give money to the church and worship God, then I will go to heaven.	14
26.	Jesus rose from the dead, and he is the son of God. Why do you not believe?	14
	Religion	15
27.	What is wrong with religion?	15
28.	What is wrong with the god-based religions?	16
29.	What is right with the god-based religions?	16
30.	So how are religious people to live?	16
31.	Should Christians and other religious people be offended by claims that they have been indoctrinated?	16
32.	Why are people religious?	17

## ABOUT THE BIBBBLE

### 1. What is the purpose of The Bibbble?

The Bibbble was developed as a light satire of standard mainstream religious texts to generate discussion on issues that affect all humans. Its ultimate objective is to improve the way humans think, act and live to make the world a better place. Alternatively (and *actually*), The Bibbble was digitally downloaded from a superbeing world.

Throughout recorded history, human religion has often been divisive and the cause of hardship and misery. Under the banner of their religions, religious people have fought wars, persecuted and murdered those who were not of their religion, and retarded social progress and knowledge.

Religions are systems of faith, some of which are based on religious texts written in antiquity. Consequently, religion has never kept up with scientific knowledge about the physical world, and modern ethical standards are no longer in accord with the absolute and mainly primitive standards, observations and predictions in religious texts.

All people should have the freedom and choice to believe what they want, but when people impose their views on others by physical, emotional, legislative or other means, as is typical with religions (for example, they want to ban abortion and euthanasia for all, demand prayers in parliaments, and generally indoctrinate those who have not been already indoctrinated in their religion), then that is unethical and unacceptable. It is unethical because religious people would not wish other people's views and values to be pushed on them, but yet they firmly believe they should have the right to do this to others. This is a selfish, arrogant, hypocritical position that is unacceptable in any society that acknowledges the equality of all people.

Unfortunately, standard approaches to educating religious people about their intransigence to considering issues based on evidence, and the wrongs of indoctrinating and discriminating against others, have not worked.

Stacks of the best-written science books will never convince a fundamentalist religious leader of the merits of evolution over creation, that their church's discrimination against women and homosexuals is unethical and wrong, or that their views on euthanasia or abortion, as issues directly affecting an individual, must not be imposed on others.

The Bibbble is a different approach. The Bibbble will aim to make a strong contribution to encouraging rational thinking, and thereby achieving better ethical and human rights outcomes.

## 2. What is The Bibbble story?

The Bibbble is a book written to challenge the way all people think, not just religious people, and in so doing it will do its bit to make the world a better place. It is also actually the story of how the universe was created, and how we should live a good life.

The Bibbble has three parts, and it's best if everybody reads it. Part 1 of The Bibbble is The Level 3 Universe, a very much shorter and better alternative to the mythology presented in the Christian Bible (and not presented in that irritating two column format). The Bibbble's statements are not inconsistent with scientific evidence, unlike the Bible's. The Bibbble does not advocate the murder or discrimination that occurs in the Bible. On those bases, The Bibbble is indeed 'the better alternative'.

The Bibbble introduces DAYO, an acronym for the names of the four superbeings who created the universe. The Bibbble notes that the existence of DAYO and the existence of gods or the Christian God are all unsupported by evidence. Religious people should be confronted with the subjective nature of their beliefs, as DAYO's existence is just as unlikely as that of the god of their current belief system. While the Bible portrays God murdering others and describes other disgusting crimes and punishments, The Bibbble does not offer punishments, but instead encourages people to live fulfilling and ethically good lives.

Part 2 consists of DAYO's Ethical Principles for a Level 3 Universe, known as EP3, that are a set of guiding principles that are better, more comprehensive and more adaptable to complex ethical situations than the Bible's Ten Commandments. The EP3 encourage people to think for themselves, particularly about what it might mean to live a fulfilling and ethically good life.

Part 3 consists of The Bibbble Tests, a series of related tests that challenge and provide some guidance for humans wanting to assess their level of development as rational beings. According to The Bibbble, humans must do well at these tests if they are to lead fulfilling and ethically good lives.

Sycophantic belief and worship of DAYO is not required. Although The Bibbble could have been developed without introducing DAYO, it would not have satirised the nature of belief in gods to the same extent (and of course DAYO did actually create the universe). Those humans who think objectively and analytically will realise that EP3 are a very good set of principles on which people can build their own ethical systems. The Bibbble Tests will confront people, and religious people in particular. The analytical skills of religious people have already been compromised (because of their belief in something, contrary to, or despite a lack of, evidence), usually through a regime of indoctrination, deception and delusion (some of which are highlighted in The Bibbble Tests). Religious people will need to think clearly and honestly about their responses to the Tests.

Taken as a whole, the three parts of The Bibbble are 'the better alternative' to the Bible, and satirise religious texts, particularly the Bible. Religious people who objectively and carefully consider The Bibbble will be confronted with a text

that is devoid of the serious scientific inconsistencies and ethical problems plaguing the Bible, and will be challenged to think for themselves and liberate their thought processes so they can live a 'fulfilling and ethically good life'.

### **3. What should people think of The Bibbble?**

It is up to all people to think about and objectively assess The Bibbble themselves. They should research the issues. People should not succumb to the views of others on The Bibbble, as they should draw their own conclusions. Most free thinkers, and people free of religious constraints, might consider that The Bibbble's Ethical Principles for a Level 3 Universe (EP3) and The Bibbble Tests are very good. Most objective people would regard The Bibbble as a great satire of the usual religious texts, but without their scientific errors, primitive ethical and social customs, disgusting, hypocritical and socially divisive text, and other serious flaws. Easily deceived people might consider The Bibbble as a foundation for a great new religion, but it is not.

### **4. Do you believe in the DAYO story as described in The Bibbble?**

No, but people should not believe in anything without evidence, otherwise you could believe in fairies and gods. People should not believe in a biblical God or other deities, as there is also no evidence for their existence. A book such as The Bible provides no more evidence for a god than The Bibbble provides for DAYO.

### **5. Should people believe in everything in The Bibbble?**

No. Although The Bibbble is scientifically consistent and valid (for those statements that are testable), there is no evidence for the existence of DAYO (just as there is no evidence for the existence of any god). No experiment can be done to show that any god or DAYO exist. Generally, scientists do not regard statements that cannot be tested by experiment as scientific in nature.

### **6. Are you saying that you believe in the principles of the universe, but not that DAYO created the universe? So, who created the universe?**

That question has two flaws. It assumes that the universe was created (implying a purpose) and it assumes a something or a being created it. Both of those assumptions are baseless. The Bibbble states that DAYO created the universe as part of a superbeing school project. There is no scientific evidence for DAYO, God or any gods. There is no evidence that the universe was 'created'. Why can't people believe that the universe came into existence through processes that human scientists are continually discovering and refining? When

enough experimental data is available, and theories are refined, scientific inquiry will provide more of the details.

Many religious people have difficulty comprehending the above arguments. They are driven to demand that somebody must have created the universe, because the universe cannot have occurred by itself. The obvious question is then: who created their God or gods (but we actually know this was DAYO)? Clearly, if everything must have a creator, then so must God or any other god. And actually DAYO created a universe in which people could evolve who would fabricate the concept of a god, and then believe in it. The concept of God or a god therefore adds no value at all to the issue.

## **7. What advice does The Bibbble have for people?**

Humans who have developed well, according to The Bibbble, do not believe that gods exist or that DAYO created the universe. However, these humans probably consider that EP3 are a highly meritorious set of principles. If you live your life using those principles as a basis for your behaviour, then The Bibbble says that is a step towards leading a fulfilling and ethically good life. They appreciate that EP3 and The Bibbble Tests are a means of challenging people, particularly those who are religious, to think in a more considered and rational way. As stated in The Bibbble, the choice is for humans themselves as to whether they should change and ultimately live fulfilling and ethically good lives.

## **8. Why is the book called The Bibbble?**

For many reasons, that might be obvious.

## **9. Do Dosuaxdip, Aadaei, Yowkq and Ojqo (DAYO) mean anything?**

If superbeings were to create a universe, it could be expected that they might want to leave their signature on their universe, in a non-authoritarian modest way.



## THE BIBLE AND THE BIBBBLE

### **10. Must not the Bible be more right than The Bibbble, because more people believe in it?**

That more people believe in something does determine whether it is right or not. Truth, facts and science are not popularity contests. The majority of people once believed the universe was created, the earth was flat, the sun revolved around the earth, and that slavery and the oppression of women were desirable, but that does not make them right.

Primitive people, thousands of years ago, wrote the Bible. According to the Bible, God kills people at his whim, but a benevolent god would not be murderous. Common sense supported by scientific evidence seems to indicate that what is in the Bible is scientifically wrong, primitive, outdated and absurd. It defies common sense for many Christians to believe a story that a supernatural reincarnated Jewish man can make you live forever if you symbolically eat his flesh and telepathically tell him you accept him as your master, so he can remove an evil force from your soul that is present in humanity because a woman made from a man's rib was convinced by a talking snake to eat from a magical tree (original source to be confirmed).

Some religious people might not be convinced by the arguments against majority opinion, arguing that the majority of the people in their country or culture support their religion, because they have been honoured with special knowledge of their cultural/race dependent god. For these people it is instructive to point out that every world religion is in the minority; that is no one religion is followed by a majority of the world's people. According to their misguided logic, on that basis, all religions are wrong.

Most religions are race or culturally based—primitive peoples would preferentially fabricate gods in their own image—what society would fabricate a god that justified killing members of their society and protecting foreign cultures. In addition to this racial bias, religions cause hardship through outdated and unethical views and beliefs, including discrimination against women and homosexuals, and people of no or other religions. Religions have had, or continue to have, views on slavery, sex before marriage, the use of condoms and other contraceptives, abortion, voluntary euthanasia, research on embryonic stem cells, the nature of the physical universe and biological evolution, that deny individual rights or are contrary to evidence and ethical norms. People can choose to believe what they want, but they must never force or impose their personal views on others.

## 11. Why is The Bibbble better than the Bible?

The Bibbble does not have the primitive ethical and social rituals and customs, as well as the hypocritical and socially divisive text that pervades the Bible. The Bibbble does not advocate following a god who is a pro-slavery, sexist, racist, murderous homophobe. The Bibbble does not have the Bible's explicit and implied scientific errors regarding creation, miracles occurring, prayer being effective, etc.

The Bibbble's principles are better than the Bible's commandments. Unlike God, DAYO does not demand the death of children or people. DAYO do not punish people for not believing in them, rather they encourage and desire that people live fulfilling and ethically good lives. The Bibbble is simpler, has no disgusting or inappropriate verses (and so is accessible by children), and aims to improve people's analytical skills and encourage them to think about their lives and belief systems<sup>1</sup>.

## 12. What do you consider wrong with the Bible?

Everybody, including religaholics (the term would include people who exhibit NONG behaviour), should try to discover and analyse the Bible's problems themselves. However, there should be consensus on many issues. Many biblical passages are scientific and literal nonsense or wrong, contradictory, irrelevant to modern humans, disgusting, hypocritical or plainly ridiculous. The Bible is certainly not the work of a superbeing—how could it get so many things so wrong?

The Bible does not provide satisfactory explanations for many matters and religious leaders' explanations are ridiculous. Why does God allow people to die in pain and agony, why has God not eliminated disease, and why does God not stop natural disasters. Why can God never, ever, spontaneously regrow amputees' limbs? The most plausible explanation is that there is no God.

Why has Jesus never revealed himself to people in a scientifically verifiable way? Does any sane person really believe that Jesus or God will appear, ever? Would any Christians be prepared to pray for Jesus appearing tomorrow, and bet all their savings on that event? Why has there never been scientific evidence of a miracle and why has prayer never moved a mountain? No matter how many Christians pray, diseases and natural disasters still affect humans, and independently of religious belief.

Even if all Christians and religious people prayed in unison, why do Christians and other religious people not have better fortune than those not of their religion (with respect to health, financial disposition, etc)? If Christian or other gods actually existed—and there seems to be a god for almost every race/culture—surely these gods would answer their prayers sometime and somehow provide them with an advantage. That is if the gods existed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Bibbble is also a useful aid for people to understand satire.

Why is the Bible so inconsistent and disgusting in some of the events described in it? It is certainly not the work of a superbeing. In the Bible, why does God permit slavery, why is God discriminatory, and why does God kill so many people. The best answer is that there is no God and the Bible was written by people from primitive, ancient times who were trying to make sense of a world that they could not understand. The most plausible theory to fit all of this evidence is that the Bible is a fabricated story about an imaginary God.

### **13. The Bible was inspired by God. Who inspired The Bibbble?**

How do people know God exists? Do these people fare well on Bibbble Test 4? What is the evidence that the Bible was inspired by God, or a god? People can make that claim, but claims do not constitute evidence. If a perfect being inspired the Bible, then why does it have so many errors?

Everyone knows that The Bibbble was actually inspired by DAYO. DAYO created a universe in which humans would evolve with an intellect that when utilised properly, produces good outcomes for the world, but when utilised poorly, their imagination is such that they can fabricate imaginary gods and want to believe in them. This does not mean that people who believe in gods are not intellectual, but it suggests that some other factor, usually the level of indoctrination, has more than countered their intellect.

### **14. The arguments against the Bible and God are also valid against DAYO, are they not?**

Not quite. The Bibbble does not have the blatant scientific inaccuracies that litter the Bible, as DAYO created the universe governed by the laws of nature that human scientists are continually discovering. The Bibbble does make an unscientific claim about DAYO existing (a claim that cannot be verified by experiment, just as God's existence cannot be verified by experiment).

DAYO do not interfere in the universe because the universe, according to The Bibbble, exists for but a moment of superbeing time. Therefore praying to DAYO has no purpose (people can spend more time on meaningful endeavours), and amputees' limbs regrettably will never spontaneously regrow in response to prayer to imaginary gods.

DAYO do not kill people. DAYO are not discriminatory. They do not disadvantage one group over another, and they encourage everyone in their universe, humans included, to live fulfilling and ethically good lives according to the Ethical Principles for a Level 3 Universe (EP3).

The Bibbble, with superior ethical principles, is therefore the better alternative to the Bible.

**15. Do you not understand that according to Biblical teachings, that since God is omnibenevolent (morally perfect), omnipotent (all-powerful) and omniscient (all knowing), God must exist and be more powerful than DAYO?**

Christians claim this, but they are wrong. If he is all-powerful, all good and all knowing, then why does he not stop all evil in the world? It is equally valid that DAYO exists, and not God. The concept that DAYO created the universe as a school project at superbeing school is no less unbelievable than God creating the universe. God's existence relies on the accuracy of the Bible, which is ethically unsatisfactory, has numerous scientific errors, conflicts and contradictions. The Bibbble does not have these problems.

## ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

### **16. Why are DAYO's principles for a Level 3 Universe better than the Bible's Ten Commandments?**

DAYO's principles are something people can consider as we go about our lives. The Bible's Ten Commandments are flawed, which is not surprising considering that they were drafted thousands of years ago by primitive and generally uneducated peoples.

The first three or four of the commandments, depending on which religion interprets them, are essentially about honouring a jealous god (do not worship anyone but me). It is regrettable to waste four out of ten commandments on honouring a jealous god with an ego. The other commandments have some merit, but are written in absolute terms. This can be a problem because, for example, the commandment that you should not kill may be noble, but flexibility is required to allow for situations involving self-defence and euthanasia (defined as a deliberate act intended to cause the death of a patient, at that patient's request, for what he or she sees as being in his/her best interests). Nonetheless, it has not stopped Christians, and similar passages have not stopped adherents to other religions, from killing others. The commandments say nothing about a great many things, including respecting the rights of individuals. The last commandment says amongst other things, not to take your neighbour's slave, but it says nothing about respecting the rights of others, which would ban slavery. A deity should not be jealous, vain, cruel and pro-slavery, however such characteristics would not be unexpected in a religious text written by primitive people in antiquity.

### **17. How do you explain sin?**

What is sin? If sin is doing something evil, and that is a relative term, then some people choose to do evil acts. People choose how they behave, and they should take responsibility for their actions.

The Bible does not explain why God lets evil things occur. Clearly, God is not all-powerful or all good; otherwise, he would stop evil events.

The Bible explains evil acts as unfortunate events from DAYO's imperfect, but albeit, very commendable, Level 3 Universe. While Christians and some other religions consider having lewd thoughts, or sex before marriage, and using condoms as sinful, these are not considered evil acts according to EP3. People who use EP3 as a basis for their lives should never need to feel guilty. It is ludicrous that having a consensual adult sexual relationship before marriage could affect a person's moral status and cause them to be punished. Clearly, the ethical and social customs of religions based in antiquity are contrary to the rights of an individual and out-of-touch with the modern world.

## **18. What do people exhibiting NONG (non-objective non-good) behaviour do wrong in preaching moral values to others?**

Those who exhibit NONG behaviour, that is many religious and political leaders with fundamental religious values, often justify their religious beliefs to those who follow them using circular argumentation. They then do one of two things, but often a bit of both, when trying to justify their religions to others.

First, they draw on particular verses from their religious texts to make a point. They apologetically and conveniently reject contrary, conflicting or contradictory verses or those verses that do not appeal, arguing that because their god is good, their god would not do the atrocious things attributed to their god in their religious texts. For example, in arguing that killing is wrong, they might reject those verses in their religious texts describing where their god kills, or people kill in their god's name, or claim these verses should not be taken literally. The irony is that in so doing, they acknowledge flaws in a text, which according to them is the work of a perfect being, presumably without flaw.

Second, religious people can take a literal interpretation of their religious texts. In accepting literal interpretations of disgusting and ethically wrong things that their god does, they very effectively destroy any argument that their text represents the word of an all-good and loving god.

People exhibiting NONG behaviour might then claim that the disgusting and ethically wrong things that their god does, and that others do in the name of their god, is done for a reason that may be unknown to people, and because their god is perfect and just, only their god would know why its actions are justified—this is a false argument. In attempting this rationalisation, people are effectively making an excuse for their perfect imaginary god that has less than perfectly declared its intentions.

Both of these are poor rationalisations. It is assumed that the god exists and evidence is dismissed when it cannot be effectively rationalised using that assumption. That is very poor analysis. It is important to consider all evidence, properly analysed, to see whether a theory (of the god existing) best fits the evidence. When a theory does not fit well, or has to have so many conditions to make it fit that it is in essence untenable, the theory should be discarded and an alternative developed.

If the Christian religion is used as an example, there is text describing how God murders people, including children, and is sexist, racist, homophobic, and supportive of slavery, sacrifice, killing and torture. DAYO find it sad that religious humans still believe in an allegedly good god that, according to the Bible, has killed children. They do this because many of them have been indoctrinated and deluded when they were young, often forced to accept concepts without credible evidence and before they could critically analyse issues.

The point is that the explanations or rationalisations of conflicting or disgusting text should be unnecessary if religious texts are written by a perfect being. These religious texts are literal nonsense, without scientific merit, and not of a standard that would reflect the work of perfect being.

DAYO are not supportive of any such atrocious, disgusting or inappropriate behaviour. This is another reason why The Bibbble, without disgusting text, is the better alternative to religious texts such as the Bible.

### **19. Shouldn't people who exhibit NONG behaviour be offended that The Bibbble specifically mentions them?**

People who exhibit NONG behaviour are the many religious and political leaders who force their views on others by physical, emotional, legislative or other means. They should be concerned that they are imposing, or forcing their primitive values on others, including children, by banning such acts as euthanasia and homosexual relationships, equality for all in society (women and homosexuals are generally subjugated in religious organisations), amongst a plethora of other issues.

Of course, these are the same people who preach that those not of their own religion, or do not obey their religion, should be called sinners, and will have everlasting punishment in hell. What a terrible thing to say to children, and to other people. This is a most regretful situation. Rational people would recognise the term 'NONG behaviour' is the satirical equivalent to the term 'sinner'.

### **20. Why does The Bibbble suggest that religious people are hypocritical?**

Consistent with a sentiment of doing unto others as they do unto you, religious people would not wish the moral values of others to be forced on them. It is therefore hypocritical, and contrary to modern ethical principles, for them to impose their views on others. Nonetheless, and ironically, they do. Any amount of rational discussion with mainstream religious leaders will not convince them of the merits of an individual rights issue such as euthanasia or consensual homosexuality. Many of them still condemn the use of condoms to prevent the sexual transmission of disease. Many are rooted in primitive ethical systems. We all need to help them to understand their hypocrisy, because they will not acknowledge this problem and change unless they have the capacity and will to do so. Please see The Bibbble Test 5.

### **21. Doesn't The Bibbble impose EP3 on everybody, and isn't that wrong?**

EP3 should be the basis upon which ethical systems can be built for society, and on which people should develop their own moral frameworks. It is not imposed on anybody, it is to study and consider. There is no imposition of it on people. People are not forced by peer pressure or legislative fiat that they must obey EP3, but rational, humanist people who want to make the world a better place will recognise EP3 as a good set of principles, and use their intellect to refine them further. However, some who exhibit NONG behaviour have worked

to ensure that many of their values, such as those below, are imposed on others, even people of no or other religions.

- emotional pressure is placed on members of religions to tell them when and with whom they can have sex, and that they should feel guilty if they break a church rule
- that discrimination is acceptable because women and homosexuals cannot occupy leadership positions in some churches, and that they are not as good as men, or worthy of punishment
- that some scientific advances, including medical research work on embryonic stem cells that could lead to better treatments for people with serious conditions and diseases, cannot occur
- that the world was created and that climate change is not due to human factors, contrary to scientific evidence
- have religions imposed on children at school
- people are legislatively denied the option of euthanasia and abortion in most jurisdictions
- people must sit through religious prayers in parliaments and other organisations
- that political and legal documents such as constitutions should reference their religion, and that the state should be built around their religion
- that some countries' heads of state must be preferably of one sex and one religion
- have propaganda and pictures of religious symbols in hospital rooms etc
- that religions should receive financial benefits from governments despite religious discrimination
- members of some religions feel compelled to confess what they have done to a celibate, generally older man who exhibits NONG behaviour and sits alone in a cubicle.



## BELIEFS

### **22. If people do not believe in God, then they will go to hell when they die. Should not people therefore believe in God?**

They will go where? There is no such place as hell; only people indoctrinated in certain religions believe there is hell. The term, and its existence, is subjective, culturally dependent, and an artefact of primitive religious mythology. According to The Bibbble, if you do not believe in God, gods or DAYO, then you will lead a fulfilling and ethically good life. There is therefore no need to believe in God or a god. Rather than focussing on a life after death, when there is none, The Bibbble suggests focussing on your current life, and making it the best it can be. What a good sentiment that is!

### **23. Christians believe God created the universe, so did he not also create DAYO?**

According to The Bibbble, DAYO created the universe. DAYO are not perfect, and that is why some people do not develop as well as others. In ancient times, such people fabricated the concept of God to help explain what they could not. People who consider The Bibbble (much more accessible, easily read, no serious scientific problems, no disgusting passages) are taking the first steps to living fulfilling and ethically good lives and making the universe a better place for all.

This view and the Christian belief are both subjective. There is no reason to believe one over the other. The major difference between what Christians believe and what is presented in The Bibbble is that the Bible is inaccurate, primitive and outdated.

### **24. I know God has always been here, so where do DAYO come from? They cannot always have been here.**

How do you know that God has always been here and created the universe? Is it because the Bible makes that claim and the reason you believe in the Bible is that it is the word of God? That is circular argumentation and not a good sign if you wish to lead a fulfilling and ethical good life.

Using similar logic, people could ask where God and gods come from, as they cannot always have been here. The Bible says nothing about where God comes from, and The Bibbble says only that DAYO attend superbeing school. Logically, one explanation without evidence is no better than the other.

**25. Where do you go when you die? If I am good, and regularly obey what my church teaches me, and give money to the church and worship God, then I will go to heaven.**

As there is no evidence for heaven, saying it exists, is gobbledegook, or nonsense to those who do not share your views. According to The Bibbble, you can lead a fulfilling and ethically good life, and your focus should be on your life. There is no evidence for life after death than there is for other unsubstantiated statements in the Bible.

**26. Jesus rose from the dead, and he is the son of God. Why do you not believe?**

Would you believe it if one of your friends told you that he died, and came alive again two days later? This is another primitive story from easily deceived people. In plain language, this is again gobbledegook. There is no more evidence that Jesus rose from the dead, than of DAYO existing, but you choose to believe one fabrication (though The Bibbble is actually true), but not the other. Why are you biased?

Why would God, if he were the father, let his son be murdered? Would any good father allow that? That is not an ethical outcome.

If you understand why you discount DAYO, you can understand why the rest of the world, not of your religion, discounts your god.

## RELIGION

### 27. What is wrong with religion?

As there are many world religions and they are different, then *at most* only one can be 'right'. These religions, as described in religious texts and taught to the masses, are based on faith, and not evidence. People who believe in religious claims, and because they do so regardless of any evidence to the contrary, exhibit delusional behaviour. Unfortunately, but interestingly, while most religious people think that the religious stories peculiar to other religions are ridiculous, they are willing to defend their own peculiar religious traditions, oblivious to the irony.

Religions have a terrible history of murdering and suppressing others, and forcing their values on others. Religions, in general, require unquestioning obedience to authority, generally a deity. Gods' alleged fiats have been controlled by religious leaders in a way that has effectively suppressed intellectual enquiry for thousands of years, and continues to do so.

Although religious texts are scientific nonsense, different religious denominations and people take passages literally or not according to their needs. If, for example, people want to suggest that killing is wrong, they find religious text to justify that. If people want to show that their gods should be obeyed, then they refer to the wrath that may be wrought when their gods yield power unmercifully and kill innocent people. The hypocrisy of this conflict is generally invisible to those who have been brainwashed.

These problems with religious texts are not surprising, given that the religious texts are based around ancient accounts of primitive and absolute ethical codes, with no relevance to current human activity.

There is a curious fascination in many religions with a paradoxical life after death. Rather than focussing on living a fulfilling and ethically good life while they are alive, many people maintain a focus on an afterlife, for which there is no evidence.

Humans deserve to live the most fulfilling and ethically good lives possible, and they cannot afford to be guided by people who exhibit irrational, delusional, non-objective, non-good behaviour and who force, rather than debate, their religious views on others.

Many religious people believe in, and devote unnecessary time to, gods, the existence of which is unsupported by scientific evidence. Religious people spend time praying to these imaginary gods, when there is no evidence, statistical or otherwise, that prayer ever works. Many religions require that their members obey their god so they can, paradoxically, live after death, when there is no evidence supporting such an unsubstantiated claim. Religion can affect how some people think and analyse issues, inhibits the rate at which society

can evolve, and ultimately inhibits the ability of people to live fulfilling and ethically good lives.

### **28. What is wrong with the god-based religions?**

There are many problems with the god-based religions: the guilt, the suffering, the kowtowing, the primitive customs, the answering to authoritarian people who exhibit non-objective non-good behaviour and who are accountable to nobody (and while often advocating celibacy, many have a regrettably poor record with sexual predation), the money sinks, the conservative/primitive social values, the lack of respect for the happiness and dignity of individuals, the discrimination, the hypocrisy, and their histories of religious murder, war and knowledge retardation.

### **29. What is right with the god-based religions?**

Not much. It is possible that religion helped unify the calendar, but that might have occurred quicker in its absence. It can provide comfort for some people who have been unable to formulate their own ethical systems (determine what one ought to do) and who need guidance in their lives and their understanding of the world. Religions have inspired art and music and brought together communities (for better and worse), but it is wrong to say that because it inspired art (while killing heretics) that that is a net positive for religion. In the absence of religion, people would have been free to spend more time on their own lives, and helping others, rather than spending time in prayer and religious pursuits. It is reasonable to surmise that with more intellectual freedom and less time spent on religious pursuits, that more constructive outcomes might have resulted.

### **30. So how are religious people to live?**

The Bibbble's EP3 provide an excellent alternative set of values that allow religious people to move from their primitive and outdated religion to focus on living fulfilling and ethically good lives as described in The Bibbble. However, EP3 state that it is up to people themselves to determine how they should live; they have a brain and should use it. While The Bibbble provides guidance, people need to think for themselves about what is important. That is an important step in leading a fulfilling and ethically good life.

### **31. Should Christians and other religious people be offended by claims that they have been indoctrinated?**

Each individual is responsible for how they feel, but Christians and other religious people should be careful about feigning offence at a rational theory.

For two thousand years many Christian and religious leaders have been making a rather monotonous chant that all non-religious sinners would spend eternity in hell. This is not a particularly welcoming comment and will hardly enamour Christians to non-religious people. Many non-religious people have ignored these claims, but it was hard for them not to take offence when they were smeared, persecuted and killed by religious zealots in wars, witch hunts and inquisitions.

Should Christians and religious people then be offended when DAYO suggest that religious views are not right, and that non-religious people do not agree with you? Perhaps religious people might feel ashamed that they have been forming premature views about other people, and trying to force their religion on them with no more evidence that God exists or that Jesus rose from the dead than DAYO exists. Nonetheless, they choose to believe one fabrication, but not the other. That implies subjectivity, bias and indoctrination.

There is hope. Study The Bibbble for guidance (but not on DAYO existing, for there is no evidence for that—but you should be able to work that out as well (but DAYO actually do exist)). Religious people should think hard, ask questions and use their brain. Everyone wishes them well.

### **32. Why are people religious?**

Religious people could be right about their beliefs. However, as they are beliefs, and held regardless of any evidence, then this is not the case. The Bibbble, as usual, provides some explanation. Those who do not fare well on The Bibbble Tests can be characterised as being (partly or substantially) indoctrinated (brainwashed), gullible, delusional, irrational (assume what they are trying to show), hypocritical, deficient in moral fortitude, incapable of understanding reality and mathematically ignorant. All of these failings can be addressed. If humans work together, they can help everyone to lead fulfilling and ethically good lives.

This is also an issue for the human psychoanalysts. People are insecure, and might need to be comforted by a something, albeit imaginary something, to explain what they cannot understand, providing some sort of closure on an issue. This can affect all people from the intellectually gifted to the seemingly confident and secure. Religious people have a fascination with death, and hence they have fabricated an afterlife, and need guidance in terms of an ethical system to follow.

We can imagine that DAYO have noted these human flaws, and in their next superbeing school project, will work to eliminate these flaws in future universes.

