

Who or what is God? Not a powerful subject but a mere construct of the human imagination to which people ascribe any content!

Robert Kaufmann

## Introduction

It is generally claimed that God is an omnipotent subject that cannot be refuted in a reasonable way. In this text I will try to refute both assumptions with numerous arguments. God is then the most pathetic object and its real existence will be refuted.

### 1. Main subject of the investigation: the supposed single Abrahamic God

Human history knows millions of gods. In this text, I will concentrate on the supposed single God of the Abrahamic religions, even though there were and are other monotheistic religions with a God that differs in content from the Abrahamic God - or correctly: the Abrahamic gods - insofar as people believed or believe in him. Examples include Sikhism, Bahaism, Zoroastrianism and Jizidism. The gods worshipped in these religions differ in content from the Abrahamic concepts of God.

### 2. Starting point of the considerations: What is man?

Before I deal with the Abrahamic deities or God-claimants, I would like to look at deities and their origins in general. The starting point for my considerations is a meaningful classification of man in nature. In this context, I see humans as animal-like ape-like beings, because the genetic material of humans and chimpanzees is about 99% identical. Humans and apes have common ancestors. An independent development of the common ancestors of humans and chimpanzees, which is our closest relative, took place about 5 to 7 million years ago and not from one day to the next but over a long process over many generations.

### 3. All living beings interpret their environment

First of all, it should be noted that humans are nothing other than a specific biological life form. This living being, like all other living beings, interprets the world in a specific way on the basis of its biological characteristics, above all in a meaningful way, namely in order to survive in its own environment. However, I recognize that humans have detached themselves to a certain extent from the animal environment and that human life is no longer a matter of mere survival, but of numerous aspects that go far beyond that. Thanks largely to technical achievements, humans can afford to misinterpret the environment without suffering immediate harm. Animals, unlike

humans, cannot afford gross misinterpretations of the environment because they will perish as a result. For example, a rabbit that thinks a fox is a friend and playmate and approaches it will not survive for long.

#### 4. Gods: a blatant misinterpretation of reality

In my opinion, man's greatest misinterpretation consists in adding incorporeal entities - especially gods - to nature. Incorporeal entities and especially gods are a priori only constructs of the human imagination. The fact that these non-entities are even supposed to support humans if we believe in them further exacerbates the misinterpretation and is merely an expression of pronounced individual egoism. If people also believe that they can make contact with the non-existent invisible beings and even have intimate conversations with these figures, then in my opinion religiosity is simply even heading in the direction of an acquired, widespread mental illness.

#### 5. Religiosity with a tendency towards mental illness

a) I am thinking here primarily of manic-psychotic states and the phenomenon of hearing voices, which are certainly comparable to religious practices and delusions. I do not want to deny that people, as in manic states, can certainly feel better when they believe they are in contact with an incorporeal entity - a god - and are supposedly even supported by it in their daily activities or plans. The positive effect of religion without real existing gods is comparable to the placebo effect of medication without health-promoting substances, which nevertheless have a certain effect due to the patient's positive attitude.

b) For me, incorporeal entities a priori represent something completely absurd. All living beings on earth are corporeal. Incorporeal entities cannot be identified in a conclusive and comprehensible way. It is not possible for humans to make contact with incorporeal beings in a plausible way. It has never happened and will never happen. The so-called holy scriptures themselves are also an indication of this. On critical examination, they are extremely flawed and lacking in content. In this sense, incorporeal beings only exist in the imagination of many people and are not a reality in a world of living beings and of inanimate material world.

c) There are even people who, through their belief in a non-existent invisible entity, believe that if they kill so-called unbelievers after their own death, they will be miraculously and eternally rewarded for these crimes in the afterlife. I am thinking here of Islamist suicide bombers who lose their lives in their extremely pronounced religious delusion. All this is simply sick to the highest degree and also extremely dangerous, both for the person affected by the religious delusion and for his fellow human beings. I would like to emphasize that religiosity in a pronounced form is nothing more than an acquired misinterpretation of reality, which is only generally accepted because it is very widespread and because certain people benefit from the

religiosity of the faithful, namely the priesthood in particular, but sometimes also the rulers associated with them, such as a so-called emperor by the grace of God.

## 6. Miracles: a preference to be rejected

a) If we as humans can afford, largely without sanction, gross errors of interpretation regarding the environment, culminating in religions with supposedly intensive contacts with invisible beings, and if we live predominantly in conditions that are not equivalent to the daily struggle for survival of animals, then miracles for individual humans are an a priori assumption to be rejected. They would represent nothing more than a further unjustified favoritism of humans over other living beings.

b) In any case, I do not need miracles performed by a higher power and even reject them completely. Everything should happen naturally, and everything does happen naturally. I am sure of that. However, I myself have a certain amount of influence on the course of events through my own behavior. If there are miraculous effects of higher powers, I think it would be fairer to support rhinos, which are threatened with extinction, than humans, of whom there are already billions, and who are also establishing themselves as destroyers of nature. Unfortunately, rhinos continue to be ruthlessly hunted for their horns and the false assumption that they are an effective sexual enhancer.

## 7. Jesus as an example of a miracle-working person

With regard to miracles, I would like to point out that Jesus in particular was portrayed as a miracle-working person. However, I only assume natural causes for supposed miracles. Healers like Jesus have a positive effect simply through their emphatic attention to people, which can have a certain healing effect. Furthermore, there are naturally occurring spontaneous healings, natural healing processes, as it were, which primarily originate from the immune system. In contrast, there can be no resurrections from the dead. But there may be cases of apparent death, which are subsequently misinterpreted. Since the authors of the texts invented numerous lies about Jesus, especially the miraculous effect of his death on the cross, which I will discuss later, it is likely that some miracles were also attributed to Jesus simply through lies. For example, I think the transformation of water into wine is an appealing thing, as I like to drink it. However, as a rational person, the pleasurable consumption of wine and its subsequent transformation into urine seems more plausible to me. However, this is unlikely to appeal to people with a penchant for the supernatural and a desire for miracles.

## 8. Unique selling point of humans through language

An essential point for the classification of humans in the world is the following: In my opinion, humans have not primarily separated themselves from nature through reason, but rather through language, which is peculiar to humans and enables the passing on of information across group boundaries and across generations, which is not possible with animals in a comparable form. This allowed culture to develop and each individual could and can benefit from the knowledge of countless other people and countless previous generations. Gods and religions are nothing more than a human cultural asset that is also related to language. For me, given that millions of them have developed, gods and religions are also only intellectual and cultural creations of people. We are not, as it is assumed, creations of the respective religion-specific god or the respective religion-specific gods.

#### 9. Lack of knowledge as an origin of gods

Gods result in part from ignorance of the actual processes. I am thinking, for example, of the fact that an entity was assumed to be behind thunder and lightning. This is at least more plausible than the assumption that there is an invisible higher being behind texts of inferior quality such as the Tanakh, the Bible and the Koran, which were even written by humans and selected by humans over a long period of time.

#### 10. Gods as an ordering factor for humans as social beings

Another key aspect of religion is that humans are primarily social beings who organize themselves into ever larger communities. Here it made sense to ensure law and order, for which supposed deities created by humans were well suited because they could set certain rules as a superior authority. De facto, however, it was always only the leading priesthood that laid down rules for the people and only invoked or referred to one or more gods. Even with regard to the different supposed divine regulations, it is easy to see that there definitely cannot be one God. This is because the rules vary according to culture and religion - including the Abrahamic religions - and are therefore created by humans.

#### 11. Gods as inferior products of the human imagination

Gods are related to the human imagination. In this sense, people have not only invented gods, but also fairy tales and mythical creatures or angels in a similar form, for which there are even supposed to be different hierarchies depending on the religion. I have made a classification with regard to material phenomena and man-made figures such as gods and, in this context, have created a hierarchical structure of levels with regard to value. According to this, the supposedly only god is not in the highest position, but in the last. From a rational point of view, "God" represents the

absolute unsurpassable unworthiness. You will find a short text on this theory on this website. Gods, as incorporeal entities that only exist in our imagination, are simply worthless misconstructions that a rational, healthy person should not really have to deal with at all.

## 12. Gods as arrogance towards nature

I consider the creation of gods by humans, which has taken place countless times, to be a very problematic and arrogant matter, because humans have placed something above valuable nature that is not real, but originates solely from their imagination and only corresponds to their evaluation. The higher valuation of invisible, incorporeal, supposed entities simultaneously represents a devaluation of what actually is. Human evaluation, on the other hand, should only take place with regard to human behavior and contents and thoughts conceived by humans and not with regard to different manifestations of being. And above the human evaluation should not lead to an evaluation that any mental products of humans - human history has already produced millions of gods and goddesses! - should stand above the value of real being.

## 13. The higher and lower of living beings does not exist in nature

a) In general, I consider human values with regard to different forms of life to be a mental mistake that ultimately only serves to devalue other living beings and to valorize oneself. Just how misguided the human idea of the superiority or inferiority of living beings is can be seen, for example, when we are asked to make a different assessment of, say, an apple tree and a hedgehog. They are simply completely different creatures that have evolved in nature and, in my opinion, cannot be meaningfully categorized as higher or lower. Even the supposedly high level of human thinking is not a characteristic from which one should derive a superiority over other living beings. Intelligence is only one of many factors for the survival of biological entities. I also believe that every living being has been given biological equipment in its life in order to be able to survive. Humans, like all other living beings, need a specific endowment that is simply different from other living beings such as animals, plants or fungi, but which should not necessarily be categorized as a higher quality.

b) Ranking systems for living beings only play a role for hierarchically structured species such as humans or wolves within their communities and serve the purpose of survival. However, living beings beyond species boundaries are not part of any ranking system.

c) Furthermore, I am certain that I, like all other living beings, have not somehow chosen or earned my individual existence. I regard myself as an accidental manifestation of being that could just as well be another. I derive ethical consequences from this insofar as everything that has developed in nature and is here

has a certain independent value. This applies not only to living beings but also to the common basis of life for us living beings on planet Earth.

#### 14. The only God: the most terrible thought in human history

a) The only God, who stands above all other existing things, is subject to my comprehensive assessment in this text as a human thought, like other contents conceived by humans. For me, the idea of only one God is completely wrong and even the most terrible idea in the history of mankind, because this idea above all carries with it an unacceptable devaluation of everything that really exists and is already valuable as a result, and of other millions of gods and goddesses also invented by humans and of other systems of thought that manage entirely without gods. The single God is the most aggressive and intolerant concept of God, because it does not accept any competing products such as polytheistic gods or other monotheistic gods of a different design alongside its own conceptual product. In this sense, the idea of only one god represents a particularly disgusting presumption of people towards those who think differently. It is obvious that this idea leads to violence and intolerance, because people who do not share the view of the one single God are held in lower esteem.

b) In Islam in particular, those who do not share the view of the Qur'anic Allah are systematically devalued as unbelievers. According to the texts, they should already be fought in this world and in the hereafter they should only be punished with eternal hell because of their unbelief. There is often violence and even terrorist attacks based on the fact that the Koran propagates violence against unbelievers. All of this can be found in the source texts of Islam itself and is not based on a so-called misinterpretation of the texts, which is often euphemistically argued by theologians.

#### 15. Violence in Christianity and Islam

If you look at the violent spread of Christianity and Islam and the crimes committed in these religions against those who think differently, the idea of only one God has probably caused the most deaths through violence in history. Moreover, it is obvious that disputes and violence between the believers of the respective monotheistic religions must also occur when it comes to finding out the correct - and only correct - will of the supposed God. The members of the different faith communities were and are sometimes hostile to each other. There have been and still are conflicts, splits in different faith groups such as Sunnis and Shiites, violence and wars such as the Thirty Years' War and even terrorist attacks.

#### 16. The single Abrahamic God: at least three worthless objects

The violence between the individual Abrahamic faiths shows that the idea of a single God is not a unifying bond for people, but is in fact the exact opposite. I therefore do not recognize the supposedly single Abrahamic God as the highest, but rather as at least three misconstructions of human thought, because they can be clearly distinguished from one another in terms of content in the at least three different God-claimants of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. The Abrahamic God is not an adorable, wonderful subject worthy of worship, but three objects that were created and endowed by means of man-made scriptures with content that, in my opinion, is inadequate for today's requirements.

#### 17. God was created like Donald Duck through a book

The creation of the three false constructs from the Tanakh (the Jewish Bible with the most important part of the Torah or Pentateuch, which comprises the five books of Moses), the Christian Bible (which, in contrast to the Tanakh, comprises the writings of the New Testament) and the Koran, the holy book of the Muslims, is comparable to the creation of artificial fantasy figures such as Asterix or Donald Duck. Like the three inferior Abrahamic God-claimants, the latter two likeable, valuable comic characters do not exist in reality and derive their presence in our imaginary world from books written by humans, just like the three Abrahamic God-claimants.

#### 18. How should the holy scriptures be assessed today?

a) Having read hundreds, if not more than a thousand books in the course of my life, I have certain comparative possibilities with regard to the quality of scriptures. I can then make the following judgment: The worst books I have ever read in terms of content are the original texts of the Abrahamic religions - the Tanakh, the Bible and the Koran. These texts are obviously not writings that were inspired by some higher being, but rather writings written by humans that are morally reprehensible by today's standards. Very ill-informed or simply misinformed people have only subordinated their preferences, their largely meaningless rules, their intolerant attitudes and even their racist preferences to a god in the scriptures. Above all, the scriptures were intended to establish a powerful priesthood that could assume a leading role in the society in the slipstream of the respective invisible figure - God.

b) It can even be assumed that the Tanakh and the Bible itself were written by members of the priesthood, who essentially simply recorded outdated traditions in writing and in some cases incorporated their own ideas into the texts, deliberately and dishonestly subordinating these ideas to the non-existent God. Karl Heinz Deschner, for example, has critically examined the history and prehistory of Christianity in detail. The priesthood still enjoys numerous privileges on the basis of archaic, not exactly high-quality texts, imposes rules on other people and lives at the expense of people who, unlike them, do meaningful work.

## 19. Does the origin of the holy scriptures speak for divine involvement?

The following essential point should also be noted: If a God and even a supposedly single God wants to reveal himself to humanity, then any kind of spiritual contact with only a few people, with the result that something is then recorded in writing by individual other human authors much later, is not a suitable method. It should be emphasized, for example, that the Tanakh and the Bible have a centuries-long history of preparation and that it was not just any God, but again only humans who finally agreed on which of the extensive texts handed down were found to be sacred and which were not. In view of this long process of development of the supposed revelations, which was determined by humans, it is incomprehensible to me how one can assume divine involvement with regard to the texts.

## 20. When could one more plausibly assume a divine revelation?

- a) How should a divine revelation take place at all, if one wants to have it at all? Would this not rather be a simultaneous message to all people? In any case, the latter seems much more plausible to me than a transmission through writings that necessarily spread very slowly and that were also equipped very differently. The transmission of a divine will through man-made writings is not a suitable method for a revelation and should be rejected from the outset.
- b) One could only see an indication of a divine origin in writings if the writings themselves were not of human origin, for example if they were made from huge 100-metre gold letters and covered huge areas such as large parts of the Sinai Peninsula or, for example, the entire Salzkammergut in Austria and these golden writings were created from one day to the next in a way that was not possible for humans. However, this is not the case. The writings were only written by humans, and on ordinary material. In the writings of the Tanakh, the Bible and the Qur'an, only ordinary human beings have revealed themselves due to the numerous serious deficiencies in content and morals, and the dissemination of the content has subsequently also taken place in a non-divine way in a very ordinary human way over centuries and even millennia.

## 21. Different versions of holy scriptures

It should also be noted that it was only people who decided in very lengthy processes which of the ancient scriptures were considered holy. And even in this, people did not even agree, because there are very different versions of holy scriptures! A single almighty God can therefore logically not be behind the various different texts that have been found to be sacred!



## 22. The long wait for certain peoples for a revelation

In this context, one can point to the discovery of America and Australia centuries after the writing of the “holy” scriptures by people who had knowledge of the Abrahamic religions, which meant that the indigenous inhabitants of America and Australia could only become aware of the supposed wisdom of a revelation centuries or millennia later. In my opinion, such a revelation must be rejected a priori as outdated and obsolete. It is thus clearly proven: In addition to the inadequacy of the content of the Abrahamic source texts, which I will discuss below, the manner of the “revelation” is also proof that it was necessarily not God who revealed himself, but only ordinary people!

## 23. The extremely long wait for God's revelation

a) The following aspect should also be emphasized with regard to the timing of a divine revelation: As I have already explained before, man gradually emerged as a separate species in his evolutionary development about 5 to 7 million years ago. If a supposedly unique God wanted to reveal himself to humanity, it is obvious, in my opinion, that he would reveal himself to people as close in time as possible to their emergence. However, the source texts of the Abrahamic religions, the “revelations”, were only written millions of years after the creation of mankind. The question arises as to why a single God did not reveal himself earlier in a way other than through writings written by humans (!) and why he waited quite a long time - namely 5 to 7 million years - to transmit his more or less wise messages. The answer is obvious: because this supposed God does not exist at all! Only humans have written more or less valuable texts and attributed the content they found positive to a deity. **PEOPLE HAVE SIMPLY LEARNED THE ABILITY TO WRITE AND HAVE USED THIS ABILITY FOR THEIR RELIGIOUS SPHERE! THAT'S WHY IT TOOK SO LONG FOR “GOD” TO REVEAL HIMSELF.**

b) It should also be noted that the oldest of the “holy scriptures” of the Abrahamic religions, the Tanakh, is also only dedicated to a certain chosen people, which is not exactly an indication that there is a single universal God behind it. If so, then a universal God should have been dedicated to the whole of humanity. Could it have been just one person who expressed his preference for his people in the Tanakh?

## 24. Who needs a divine revelation?

a) The following should also be emphasized: As a responsible, rational and educated human being, I am a priori not at all interested in a declaration of will and a prescription of my way of life by another entity - a god. I do not need any instructions from other entities. When I look at the inferior scriptures Tanakh, Bible and Koran, I definitely know much better how to live. In view of the inferiority and inaccuracy of the texts, I am embarrassed by the relevant religious beliefs.

b) Only people who are not very self-determined need guidance in life from other, non-physical entities. However, they have never received it and never will! In fact, they only ever receive instructions from other people, namely the respective priesthood. This will never change unless we all realize this. The fact that only the priesthood stands behind God or is God, as it were, can also be seen from the fact that there are different rules in the numerous religions, and this despite a claimed single God. An outright contradiction!

## 25. The origin of the only Abrahamic God is lies

I assume that the origin of the Abrahamic religions with the belief in one god was not even due to negligent misconduct, but to deliberate lies by the authors. On this website you will also find a shorter text on this subject. In this sense, the Tanakh contains what I believe to be the **BIGGEST LIE IN HUMAN HISTORY**, namely that there is only one God, even though people have worshipped and continue to worship a myriad of different gods. The writers of the Tanakh were people who were intelligent enough to realize that the other gods they knew did not exist and were simply figments of human imagination. They were probably atheists like me. However, unlike me, they did not profess atheism, but created a new god themselves with their writings, who was supposed to be above all others because he was supposed to be the only one. The ordinariness of the texts in terms of their quality and at their time (by today's standards and for me, the texts are not valuable and contain many erroneous statements that can be refuted), the numerous stories freely invented by the authors that do not correspond to the truth, the meticulous and sometimes stupid prescriptions, make it clear that the authors themselves certainly did not believe they were communicating with a superior God.

## 26. The sacred texts were of little value even in their own time

a) In general, I would like to counter the argument put forward by religious people or theologians that the texts must be viewed in relation to the time of their creation and therefore no current, scientific findings should be demanded: The texts do not even have a quality for the time they were written. I attended an ethics course and studied philosophy (without an academic degree) and would like to point out that there were outstanding people in ancient Greek philosophy who produced culturally and scientifically valuable achievements, people who tried to understand the world, nature and also man himself with reason, which they also succeeded in doing in various areas, paving the way for subsequent generations. This has value.

b) The authors of the “holy scriptures”, on the other hand, did not concern themselves with science at all, which is why the content they conveyed is already wrong in relation to ancient Greek writings. For example, in the creation account there is day and night and a light before there is a sun. These people obviously did not even know that the light on earth comes from the sun. They were essentially only concerned

with imposing their ideas and values on a non-existent higher being so that the priesthood could rule over people, and this on the basis of eternal rules, which is completely unacceptable. The latter has no value at all.

27. Is it any of God's business what we eat or drink?

a) An imposition in the supposed holy scriptures is, for example, a general “divinely decreed” ban on alcohol in the Koran or petty food prohibitions such as those regarding pork, also in the Tanakh. Such petty, arbitrary regulations in no way originate from a god. They are obviously just small-minded people from the priesthood who want to impose rules on other people! We should not let invisible fantasy figures - behind whom only priests stand - forbid us to enjoy pleasures such as wine or beer.

b) In this sense, Edmund (Mundl) Sackbauer, played by Karl Merkatz, in the entertaining Austrian television series “Ein echter Wiener geht nicht unter” (“A real Viennese doesn't go down”) aptly said “Mein Bier ist nicht deppert (dumm)” (“My beer is not stupid”). The people who are not the wisest are those who allow invisible, non-existent figures to tell them what to do and don't realize that the prohibitions certainly only come from patronizing people.

28. Does a god need sacrifices?

The fact that the authors of the Tanakh and the Old Testament were deliberate liars is particularly clear in the case of the supposedly divine commandments, which comprise 613 commandments or mitzvot. In these commandments, people are given meticulously arbitrary and, at least in part, simply stupid rules. Much revolves around rituals and sacrifices, which can in no way play a role for a supreme being, but only for a pedantic priesthood that strives to incapacitate people so that they become dependent on it and in order to present itself in the community as the master of ceremonies.

29. Barriers between people through petty religious rules

With regard to the 613 mitzvot, I would also like to point out that people who strictly adhere to them find it difficult to make contact with other people who do not observe these rules. A strict religious system of norms for one group of people has a divisive effect on other groups, which I do not see as positive. Artificial barriers are erected that are not necessary. Orthodox Judaism, for example, is not exactly conducive to positive coexistence with people who have a different view of the world.

30. The lies about the progenitor Abraham

The stories about the progenitor of the Abrahamic religions, Abraham, who probably never lived at all, are also fictitious and lies. Abraham is said to have communicated with the God of the Tanakh or the Old Testament. How could the authors of the Tanakh know what exactly a god spoke to Abraham? Were they there? No, they were not there! They simply made up stories that made sense to the authors and the priesthood. They were simply liars, since they knew that the facts did not happen that way.

### 31. The test of Abraham's obedience

- a) The most disgusting part of the Abraham tale is the test of Abraham's obedience by God: Abraham is told by "God" that he should kill his son Isaac, which Abraham subsequently wants to do. Only at the last moment is "God" content to kill a ram instead of Isaac. In a short humorous contribution from me on this website, the fine gentleman receives a suitable answer to perverse wishes regarding obedience, this from the film character Edmund (Mundl) Sackbauer.
- b) Behind the last story outlined is obviously only the following: No superior being and also no morally appealing person comes up with the idea that a person should kill his own child as a sign of loyalty. Such a god is merely a disgusting figure created by human scribblers to demand the following from humans: Blind obedience to human authorities, and here especially to the priesthood.

### 32. The lies could also have had a positive effect

- a) I summarize: The authors of the Tanakh, which essentially agrees with the Old Testament, were intelligent but, unlike me, not openly avowed atheists who deliberately lied about the core statement that there is a single God. As very creative people, they freely co-invented various sometimes entertaining stories and in some cases simply adopted stories that had previously been passed down orally. I don't even assume that the authors, unlike Jesus and Mohammed, thought they were communicating with any god at all in the context of exceptional mental states. They were simply deliberate liars.
- b) However, I do not want to rule out the possibility that the authors of the Tanakh even wanted to achieve something positive, namely the establishment of a larger, cohesive human community with a state of law and order, which was perhaps unthinkable at the time without the worship of some great invisible - a god.
- c) What was not necessary was the concept that the Israelite God should even be the only God in the world.

### 33. The only God as a pioneer for overcoming the mistaken belief in gods?

- a) Perhaps the authors of the Tanakh are even pioneers for a general overcoming of people's mistaken belief in gods, because the thesis of a single God is particularly absurd and false in view of the millions of gods and goddesses believed by people.
- b) There were subsequently even two other Abrahamic “only gods”, namely the Christian God and the Mohammedan God, which are very different from each other. There have also been other “only gods” of non-Abrahamic origin in human history.

#### 34. The miraculous effect of Jesus' crucifixion: a lie

- a) The New Testament, with the central story of Jesus, also contains significant lies, some of which have their origins in the Old Testament, which is why I will also look at passages in the Old Testament. The idea that the painful death on the cross of any human being should have a general miraculous effect on humanity - on earlier and later generations right up to the present and future (!) - should actually make everyone suspicious. For me, as a critical lawyer, the idea is so sick and absurd that it can only be a clear, deliberate lie.
- b) There is no relevant connection at all between the death of a person who has been dead for around 2,000 years and people living in the present.

#### 35. A combination of numerous biblical lies

Furthermore, the central doctrine of original sin in Christianity, which is associated with the salvific effect of Jesus' death and is advocated in different variations, is a morally inferior and disgusting concept based on lies. First of all, the supposed creation of the first man Adam by God from the earth, or more precisely from the soil, in Genesis 2, 4b is false and stupid. Humans emerged gradually over the course of many generations from ape-like ancestors and not in a single act from the earth. There was therefore never a clearly recognizable first human being. There was no Adam. The subsequent creation of the first woman Eve, also from Adam's rib, is idiotic. This is another lie. The earthly paradise, in which the first humans lived forever without disease, never existed either. That is the next lie. Humans and all human ancestors in common with apes were always mortal beings.

#### 36. The doctrine of original sin: a pack of lies and legally unacceptable

There was also no tree of the knowledge of good and evil, from which one was not allowed to eat because otherwise one would become mortal, and this represents the next clear lie. No one has ever entered paradise with God and no one has ever been expelled from it and become mortal. The fact that there is an original sin that is passed on to the next generation is another lie and is something that I, as a lawyer, completely reject. No human being inherits the possible offenses of a previous

generation (!). Everyone is only responsible for their own behavior. Anything else is legally and morally untenable and moronic!

### 37. The punishment of Eve: a lie

The supposed punishment of Eve by God to the effect that she should bear children in pain is also wrong and idiotic. It was never otherwise that women and also the ape-like human ancestors gave birth to offspring in pain. This is not due to punishment by a more or less embarrassing “God”, but is based exclusively on the laws of nature, to which humans are also subject.

### 38. The immortal human soul does not exist

a) That people would be cleansed by the death of Jesus Christ and would live forever in the afterlife is another lie. In my opinion, people's desire for a continued existence after death is simply an erroneous, immoderate wishful thinking that should generally be overcome as quickly as possible, because otherwise one could drift into religious delusions.

b) The supposed immortal human soul is also related to this. Something is already certain from the evolutionary development of man: there can be no (immortal) soul that is unique to man because, contrary to what is assumed in many religious ideas, there is no specific day X with regard to the existence of man. There were simply precursors between the common ape and human ancestors, which only developed into distinct species over many generations. There can therefore be no soul peculiar to humans.

### 39. What did Jesus' death on the cross bring today?

Thus, since there has never been a paradise with eternal life for people and there has never been any fall of mankind, the unfortunate death of Jesus Christ on the cross has, strictly speaking, achieved exactly the following for mankind: NOTHING AT ALL (!).

### 40. Jesus was born without conception: another lie

Another bold lie in connection with the Jesus stories is the alleged virgin birth of Jesus from his mother Mary, who is said to have become pregnant through the Holy Spirit without sexual intercourse. Jesus was of course born after sexual intercourse between his two parents, just like all people in his time.

### 41. Habitual lies in communion

According to numerous Christian doctrines, the giving of bread and wine during the Eucharist or Holy Communion is supposed to make Jesus real again and again. All of this is also gross nonsense based on lies. No person who died around 2000 years ago can appear in any form through a ceremony with wafers and wine.

#### 42. Resurrection and ascension: two interrelated lies

Jesus' resurrection was also a lie, as was his ascension. Since Jesus' resurrection did not take place, his ascension was also invented in a consistent manner. Otherwise Jesus would still be here and we could actually admire him as the one who overcame death.

#### 43. Who benefits from the Jesus lies?

The whole false story about the miracle-working Jesus idealized in the scriptures only served the following purpose: First of all, honest people were persuaded that they were born as sinners, which allowed the priesthood to intervene and interfere in their lives at a very early stage, namely with baptism. Furthermore, the person of Jesus was exaggerated in a completely irrational way, to the extent that with his death people were persuaded of an impossible, absurd eternal life and Jesus himself was deified. The promises based on lies led to an accumulation of power and immense wealth on the part of the Christian churches, the latter mainly through taxes and other extensive contributions from their own gullible followers. See for example Carsten Frerk "Finanzen und Vermögen der Kirchen in Deutschland".

#### 44. Jesus was an ordinary man

In my opinion, Jesus was simply an ordinary healer and itinerant preacher who was probably not even very successful during his lifetime. Like Mohammed, he probably thought he was in contact with a deity when he was in a state of mental illness. In modern psychiatric-medical science, this is not a peculiarity but something that occurs in many mentally ill people.

#### 45. Jesus also brought positive things

The miracles that Jesus' death would have brought were only attributed to him through deliberate lies. However, I don't want to deny that Jesus and the principle of love for one's neighbor, which was also conveyed in connection with him, did and continues to do a lot of positive things for many people. However, I assume that Jesus has been extremely exaggerated and glorified by various texts, especially the source

texts - the Bible. As Jesus did not express himself in writing, other people have attributed exaggeratedly positive content to him and to the respective God himself.

#### 46. Criticism of Jesus

a) Jesus' ideas of belief in only one God are to be completely rejected because there is de facto no God and it is completely absurd to enter into any kind of relationship with an incorporeal non-being. If gods in general are absurd, then the idea of only one God, which Jesus must also have held, is the most terrible idea in human history. Therefore, in my opinion, Jesus was not a person worthy of veneration.

b) Jesus' thoughts regarding the supposed eternal reward for believers and the supposed eternal punishment for unbelievers in the afterlife are also to be rejected. These are very polarizing ideas that have led to a great deal of intolerance and violence. The history of Christianity, which also spread with violence, confirms the latter thesis. Many valuable cultures throughout the world have been wiped out precisely by the negative thought of Jesus in terms of only one correct view of the world and of only one God, this on the basis of violence and missionary work. The world would be richer and more pluralistic if it had not been for such a spread of Christianity based on lies. In this sense, for example, it was a massive cultural step backwards that people suddenly began to worship invisible false constructs created by flawed, lie-ridden writings such as the Bible instead of the value-laden nature worshipped in natural religions. Behind the supposedly single deity, de facto only the priests of the various religions were ever at work.

c) I don't find it very plausible that Jesus propagates the love of enemies, but on the other hand says that you can't be a disciple of him if you don't hate your close relatives such as parents and children.

d) A completely irrational hype has been built up around the person of Jesus. I reject extremely pronounced personality cults.

#### 47. Believing in an incorporeal supreme being is a sin

I would like to add a thought in connection with the moronic doctrine of original sin and sin in general: I consider it a sin against reason and against nature to refer to the three disembodied misconstructions from the Tanakh, the Bible and the Koran, which are inferior in content, as the highest being, as God! Only that which actually exists has value, and not the disembodied figments of the imagination created by banal scriptures. In this sense, baptism does not eliminate sin, but only creates it, because one allows other people to raise one's own child in the sense of religious delusions. The healthy and rational growth of a young person is endangered by baptism.

#### 48. Muhammad, too, had no contact with a higher being



Muhammad, like Jesus, may have experienced pathological psychological states of emergency, in which he believed, at least at certain times, to communicate with a superior being. However, the shockingly poor quality of the texts in terms of content inevitably leads to the conclusion that Muhammad, like all other supposed prophets in human history, was simply communicating with himself. Overall, the texts of the Quran offer no improvement over the Tanakh and the Bible: one's own group is exalted. Dissenters are systematically devalued. Violence is even initiated against them. Above all, it demands blind obedience to Allah, de facto only to the priesthood. The commandments and regulations are largely unreasonable and, at least in the 21st century, completely unusable. Women are discriminated against. A pathological gender segregation is prescribed. Intolerance prevails with regard to sexuality. The criminal law contains brutal, inappropriate corporal punishment. It is also alarming that the religion of Islam, which is backward by today's standards, even intervenes heavily in state affairs.

#### 49. Islam: A Great Danger to Life and Body

a) All in all: Even the texts of the Quran cannot be viewed positively by today's standards and are by no means suitable to serve as a guideline for human life and, above all, for peaceful coexistence in the present. The French-based Foundation for Political Innovation recorded 66,872 Islamist terrorist attacks worldwide between 1979 and April 2024, resulting in at least 249,941 deaths.

<https://www.fondapol.org/en/study/islamist-terrorist-attacks-in-the-world-1979-2024/>  
The figures make it clear that Islamist terrorism is anything but exceptional. With regard to other religions, there is currently no comparable widespread terrorism.

b) As an example of the dangerous nonsense that can flourish in religions, the houris, or virgins of paradise, awaiting devout male Muslims in the afterlife, are worth mentioning. These appear several times in the Quran. This raises the question of what the afterlife soul of a devout Muslim should be like so that he can relate to a larger number of virgins of paradise in paradise. In any case, houris are frequently used today as a means of motivating young male Muslims to commit suicide attacks. For example, the September 11, 2001, attackers were promised in the “spiritual guidance” found in their luggage that the Gardens of Eden were already decorated for them and that the houris were calling them.

c) Given the extreme danger potential that Islam obviously poses, I cannot understand why children in schools, and later even adults at universities, are being educated in such a dangerous mindset as Islam. This should be stopped as quickly as possible. Human education should shift exclusively toward a higher-quality, knowledge-based approach, without an extremely polarizing attitude rooted in inferior religions that systematically devalue dissidents.

#### 50. Islam as a Main Cause of Refugee Flows

Islam is also a key cause of the massive refugee flows, including to Europe, because in Islamic-dominated states, minorities or even those who think differently than the majority tend to be barely tolerated, and they therefore feel compelled to leave their homeland. A religion with only one recognized truth is also highly polarizing and promotes conflict. In this sense, a genuine mass migration is currently taking place, even to Europe, which is difficult to manage in the host countries. Its root cause is not only—but at least to a significant extent—in a religion with an intolerant and totalitarian orientation. Statistics on asylum applications by country of origin confirm this latter statement.

#### 51. Asylum law should not lead to mass migration

- a) Regarding the influx of masses of people to Europe, I would like to note that I advocate for humanitarian aid, especially in the problem states themselves, but I do not want to accept the right of asylum as an instrument for mass migration to Europe. The right of asylum should, by law, be granted almost exclusively in a neighboring state of the asylum seeker, and not in a state several thousand kilometers away, which the asylum seeker probably often chooses primarily for economic reasons.
- b) Furthermore, it should be considered that with a large number of asylum seekers from other cultures, one at least partially adopts other cultures that do not correspond to the values of the European host state, and sometimes even conflicts from the refugee's country of origin. It is not surprising that numerous people, institutions, and refugee reception centers in the European host states are overwhelmed in the face of the current mass migration based on an overly liberal asylum law.

#### 52. No free practice of religion for Islam!

- a) Due to the violence, totalitarian, and intolerant tendencies emanating from Islam, I am completely opposed to the free practice of this religion in Europe. I don't understand why a modern democratic state allows a demonstrably dangerous religion like Islam to be freely practiced and even allows parallel or even counter-societies to develop as a result. Regarding the latter idea, I would like to point to the proclamation of a caliphate by radical Muslims, which has already occurred many times in Europe, and note that in Islam, like in no other religion, there is a connection between religion, law, and the state, which, in my opinion, is completely unacceptable.
- b) Well, if Islam is allowed to continue to flourish in the spirit of misunderstood tolerance and clear legal and de facto steps are not taken to counter it, a caliphate will likely become a reality in Europe quite soon, primarily due to mass immigration from Islamic countries and a generally high birth rate among Muslims. As a result, the indigenous non-Muslim population of Europe would hardly enjoy the same freedoms as it does now.

c) One argument for the latter idea is to consider the situation in many countries where Muslims constitute the majority society. For those interested in learning more about the situation of Christians in Saudi Arabia, I would like to refer to the following website: [https://www.opendoors.org/persecution/reports/Saudi-Arabia-Media\\_Advocacy\\_Dossier-ODI-2025.pdf](https://www.opendoors.org/persecution/reports/Saudi-Arabia-Media_Advocacy_Dossier-ODI-2025.pdf)

### 53. Why is God viewed as something positive?

- a) The fact that not everyone has yet come to a conclusion regarding the Abrahamic aspirants to God comparable to mine, according to which God is merely a completely worthless object of attribution by humans, especially priests, is primarily due to early childhood conditioning with regard to even the most abstruse religious content and the inappropriately positive reappraisal of these inherently low-level texts by the priesthood and most theologians, who have so far successfully claimed the authority to interpret them.
- b) The social pressure to belong to a religiously influenced community also plays a very large role in the establishment and maintenance of religious delusions. Humans, like our ape-like relatives, are, in my opinion, primarily social beings. Therefore, if someone belongs to a religious group, usually from early childhood, it is probably not easy to leave it, especially if they have made friends within that group. It should also be noted that religions promote community life within the group and, for example, provide members with enjoyable experiences through shared celebrations. In this sense, I certainly don't want to deny the positive aspects of religions.
- c) I also assume that there is only a minority among religious adherents who, in connection with their faith, engage extensively with philosophical questions such as the existence of God or who study the source texts of their own religion in depth and critically. For many people, the positive community life of the respective religious community, in their lived religiosity, will be of greatest importance.

### 54. The at least three Abrahamic deities

As I have already explained, it is entirely wrong to assume only one Abrahamic God with regard to the Abrahamic religions. There are AT LEAST THREE of them, created through human-written scriptures. I would like to explain this now.

### 55. Yahweh is a God with a chosen people

The target audience of Yahweh in the Tanakh are exclusively Jews. He is a deity who pursues racist preferences and who has no interest in peoples other than Jews, and toward whom he is sometimes even hostile. The program of this "god," which does not exactly contribute to international understanding, runs like a thread through the Tanakh, which largely corresponds to the Old Testament. Time and again, there are

wars that are supposed to be fought according to the will of the god. The territories that are supposed to be destined for the supposedly chosen people are supposed to be racially pure, thus practically genocides are committed. For example, Deuteronomy 20:16 states: "But of the cities of these peoples which the Lord your God is giving you as an inheritance, you shall not leave alive any living thing that breathes. But you shall devote to destruction the Hittites and the Amorites, the Canaanites and the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites, as the Lord your God has commanded you..."

56. It's a disgrace that only Israelites are allowed to have a god.

I find it particularly outrageous and audacious on the part of the lying authors of these texts that Yahweh or YHWH is supposed to be the only god ever, one who chose the people of Israel. This disparages other peoples and the gods they believe in, and denies people other than Israelites the right to worship their own gods, reserving this right exclusively for the Israelites.

57. Ethnic affiliation plays no role for a god.

a) Furthermore: I consider it completely absurd and stupid that gods even think in categories such as peoples formed by humans and territories to be ruled by them.

b) This certainly only reveals itself to people who have overemphasized their ethnicity and deliberately and improperly foisted their primitive ideas on a merely supposed god. In this sense, I consider the so-called Old Testament, which is primarily about the people of Israel, to be completely irrelevant and uninteresting for people who are not Israelites or Jews. It was only through the audacity and lies of the authors of the Scriptures that the God they created using inferior texts was the only God that many people became interested in these texts.

58. The Jewish-racist God gets a proper name

a) Since the meaning of the Old Testament YHWH as "I am who I am" or in the future tense as "I will be who I will be" doesn't seem sensible to me and I don't like it, he is given a proper name, namely "Kratochvil," to distinguish him from the millions of other gods conceived and worshipped by humans.

b) With regard to the possible use of the future tense for YHWH, it might even be entirely in the spirit of the authors of the Tanakh that I gave YHWH a proper name, because they were perhaps just waiting for a future naming with the future tense. This has now been done by me. YHWH became Kratochvil.

c) In connection with the naming of YHWH, I would like to note that I definitely do not address YHWH as "Lord," because "Lord" is a masculine subject, while YHWH, or rather Kratochvil, is not a subject. He is a mere object created by the authors of the

ancient texts and to whom arbitrary and even low-level content was ascribed. By choosing a Czech-Slovak surname for the God of the Israelites or the Old Testament, and subsequently also for the Christian and Muslim aspirants to God, I in no way intend to disparage the actual human bearers of these names. By arbitrarily naming the three imaginary creations from the Tanakh, the Bible, and the Koran, I only want to clarify that merely ordinary people are behind the creation of these "gods" and in any case not a superior being, and that the three figures from the different texts must be clearly distinguished from one another.

d) Another more meaningful name for Kratochvil than "I am who I am" would be "I am who I am not", because the misconstruction of the authors of the texts does not actually exist.

## 59. Theology can do without the foundations of thought!

a) Theologians and clergy who cannot even distinguish between the three incorporeal entities and simply use "God" for all three constructs that differ in essential respects are likely to lack the foundations of human thought, which also includes distinguishing between different things. They can't even count to three with regard to the Abrahamic deities, so to speak.

b) It is embarrassing for humanity that such nonsense as theological studies, of which there are several with varying content despite the supposedly single deity, are still taught at universities. In my opinion, theological studies only cause an intolerable contamination of university institutions that are actually geared towards education.

c) Even those philosophers are likely to lack the foundations of critical thought and differentiation when they question the existence of – God – yes, please, which one in a series of millions of gods in human history? – questions and even present idiotic proofs of God that are taught in philosophy courses and have to be reproduced again and again.

## 60. The Christian God also receives a proper name

The Christian "God" must be distinguished from Kratochvil, or "I am that I am not," who unfortunately still has no name, and to whom I therefore give the name "Zapletal" for the sake of clarity. Zapletal is said to love all people so much that he allowed the sacrifice of his son, whom, remarkably, he is also supposed to be at the same time (another bizarre delusion), so that all people would miraculously be able to enjoy eternal existence after death. As already explained, the Jesus stories are a deliberate deception of believers.

## 61. Why is the Christian Zapletal different from the Jewish Kratochvil?

a) Regarding the differences between the two claimants to God from Christianity and Judaism, the following should be noted: Jews reject the New Testament entirely. It is not part of their faith, and Jesus is not a relevant figure for their faith. For Christians, Jesus is the central figure. He has been depicted in churches and artistically billions of times elsewhere. In contrast, to my knowledge, one cannot find a single crucified Jesus in Jewish houses of worship.

b) There are also numerous other essential differences between Judaism and Christianity, such as the Trinity inherent in Christianity, a triune coexistence of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Judaism also does not have such a pronounced veneration of saints as Christianity, with its central figure Mary, the mother of Jesus. With the Trinity and the veneration of saints, Christianity, especially in its Catholic form, even contains, in my opinion, the beginnings of polytheism. For this reason, and also because there are other very large differences in content between the two aspirants to God and the religions, the Jewish aspirant to God Kratochvil is necessarily a completely different kind of "God" than the Christian Zapletal and must necessarily be distinguished from him and named differently, as I do.

62. The Muslim God is again different from Kratochvil and Zapletal.

The "deity" Allah, which is said to originate primarily from the inspiration of a certain Mr. Muhammad, must be distinguished from these two constructs of the human imagination. Its content, in turn, differs significantly from the other two deities, and it explicitly advises believers to avoid the believers of the other two deities. Sura 5, verse 51 makes this clear: "O you who believe! Do not take the Jews and the Christians as friends (note in the translation: or as allies or as protectors). They take one another as friends. Whoever of you takes them as friends, behold, he will become one of them. Indeed, Allah does not guide the unjust." Sura 9, verse 29, reinforces this deity's aversion to Jews and Christians: "Fight those of the People of the Book (note: meaning Jews and Christians) who do not believe in Allah and the Last Day, and do not forbid what Allah and His Messenger have forbidden, and do not follow the true religion, until they submit and pay the tax willingly."

63. The Muslim God also receives a proper name

Even from these two passages of the Quran, it is clear to any reasonably reasonable person: The deity of the Quran is necessarily a different deity than the two from the Bible and the Tanakh, for it cannot suggest to its own believers that they should avoid or even fight themselves. Since Allah is not a proper name, but merely the Arabic name for God, I give him the name "Pospishil" to better distinguish him from other supposed deities that humans worship or have worshipped.

64. Distinguishing Features for Pospishil from Kratochvil and Zapletal

- a) It should also be emphasized that the central figure in Islam is the supposed prophet Muhammad, whereas in Judaism and Christianity, Muhammad is not a person worthy of veneration. There is no comprehensive veneration of saints in Islam, as there is in Christianity, nor is there a Trinity. The central Islamic precepts also differ significantly from those of Christianity and Judaism. The concepts of the afterlife in Islam do not result from the central lie of Christianity concerning the salvific effect of Jesus's death on the cross; rather, an afterlife is simply assumed.
- b) Due to the serious differences, one can recognize, if one possesses a modicum of common sense, that Pospishil is necessarily a different god than Kratochvil and Zapletal. He was endowed by humans in essential respects very differently from the other two human fictions.

#### 65. Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil, and several others

- a) In fact, there should be far more substantive demarcations and naming conventions for the various Abrahamic "gods." Indeed, within the Abrahamic religions, there are more than three substantively different ascribed Gods, insofar as numerous different attributions have been made by people to the supposedly nonexistent one and only God. As a consequence of these differences, one can also study Catholic theology and Protestant theology.
- b) As an example, the concept of God of the Mormons, who at least predominantly identify themselves as Christians, should be mentioned. This concept differs significantly from other Abrahamic religions because only the Mormons consider another text, namely the Book of Mormon, as holy scripture in addition to the Bible. With the Book of Mormon, the American Joseph Smith introduced peculiar attributions to the worshipped God in the 19th century, according to a specifically Mormon understanding. Therefore, the God of the Mormons is also different from Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil. However, for the sake of simplicity, I will not give him a separate name and will stick with the three main "gods" I have named individually. The Mormons themselves can and should give a name to the misconception they worship.

#### 66. Muhammad: Not a Person Worthy of Reverence

- a) I would also like to make a comment on Muhammad as a person: I consider Muhammad to be anything but a person worthy of reverence. He falsely attributed his thoughts and values to a supreme, single God and demanded that humanity follow him unconditionally. He strove for world domination in accordance with his ideology, and to do so by all means, including brute force. His life path is not even remotely that of an emphatic, worthy of emulation, but rather that of an intolerant, dominant, ruling personality, such as humanity has unfortunately produced on numerous occasions. In my opinion, he also made no positive cultural contributions to

humanity. There are even anti-cultural tendencies in Islam, based on his personality, such as the prohibition or restriction of painting, music, and dance, because non-religious culture is sometimes viewed as an unpredictable and seductive opponent of pure orthodoxy. In some cases, hostility to science is also propagated for religious reasons, which I consider very negative.

b) I consider the promotion of non-religious culture, art, music, sports, and games to be very important and even a key opportunity for people to develop individually and experience joy, even in a pleasant environment with like-minded people.

c) Ali Dashti's excellent book "23 Years – The Career of the Prophet Muhammad" is insightful and recommended for assessing Muhammad as a person. Based on the biography outlined in this book, Muhammad's life was likely primarily concerned with asserting his will and with power. Just one example of how Muhammad is certainly not a person worthy of veneration is the fact that he himself decreed barbaric stoning for adultery, which amounts to nothing less than terrible torture. In this context, one thing should be clear to anyone even halfway capable of reflection: For a supreme God, it can absolutely make no difference which adult members of an ape-like species engage in sexual relations with one another. Influenced by modern, secular European legal sensibilities, many people probably consider it more punishable than adultery between adults if an adult man marries a six-year-old girl and has sexual intercourse with her when she is already a minor of nine years old.

## 67. Religious Education Damages the Cognitive Apparatus

The fact that in the three monotheistic religions, despite the evident differences in content and the different audiences of the at least three deities, people often mistakenly speak of one God or only of God is due to the fact that religions can lead to a significant impairment of the cognitive apparatus of the people affected, so that sometimes even obvious differences are not recognized and facts cannot be correctly assessed. The early childhood imprinting on religious content, no matter how absurd, and the conditioning to religious rites contribute significantly to errors of judgment that are difficult to correct.

## 68. The Unacceptable Arrogance of the Abrahamic Religions

Furthermore, the monotheistic Abrahamic religions contain an arrogance in the sense that their God, who actually already encompasses at least three clearly distinguishable figures, is the only one, even though human history has already produced millions of deities.

## 69. Example: Millions of Hindus worship neither Kratochvil, Zapletal, nor Pospisil

In the current beliefs of millions of Hindus, a multitude of different gods and goddesses are worshipped in this sense, which have nothing in common with



Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil. In the belief system of most Hindus, the Tanakh, the Bible, and the Koran play no role whatsoever. Atheists, agnostics, and even members of polytheistic religions such as Hindus should not follow the misjudgment of members of the monotheistic Abrahamic religions when they perceive the nameless designation as "God," but rather, in terms of content, should sometimes name very different deities.

#### 70. Names for the Three Abrahamic Deities as an Educational Measure

This can have a certain educational effect on monotheistic religious people, in that they will discourage the presumptuous manner of referring to the God they worship as simply God, without using a proper name. However, they are certainly permitted to develop names other than the ones I have used, such as "Kratochvil" for the Jewish God, "Zapletal" for the Christian God, or "Pospischil" for the Muslim God, ideally within the framework of a democratic process among the followers of these "deities."

#### 71. Feuerbach: God is a psychological being

It is also necessary to examine the problem underlying humankind's need to worship something higher. Feuerbach already provides a very plausible explanation in "The Essence of Christianity" (Leipzig 1849): In each god, each individual ultimately worships only himself and, with a god, creates an imaginary human being with a more positive content. Thus, according to Feuerbach, the following applies: In the goodness of a god, man honors his goodness. In the love of a god, man honors his love. In the wisdom of a god, man honors his wisdom, etc. Feuerbach consistently concludes: "God is not a physiological or cosmic being, but a psychological being."

#### 72. Worship of gods is narcissistic

- a) Humans' need to worship gods is thus nothing other than an expression of hidden narcissism.
- b) The story of Jesus Christ already represents a bizarre case of pronounced selfishness: People who consider Zapletal a god believe that he sacrificed himself to them as Jesus Christ, and assume their supposedly unsurpassed importance insofar as gods have nothing better to do than to reward the killing of a human being, who is supposedly the same god, with an eternal afterlife for all human beings. For me, as a person with the ability to view things from a certain sober distance, such wishful thinking is downright sick. The desire for life after death is per se nothing other than an expression of an excessive instinct for survival, an expression of the inability to cope with the finiteness that humans have in common with all living beings.

### 73. Continued Existence After Death: Cultural Differences

- a) A clear demonstration that continued existence after death is nothing more than a rather simplistic human invention can be found in the fact that different religions have conceived of continued existence after death very differently. Examples include continued existence in heaven and hell, transmigration of souls, reincarnation, or resurrection from the dead.
- b) Humans, like other animals, are physical beings with a limited existence, and everything mental and spiritual in a person necessarily depends on the existence and function of their brain. Even the near-death experiences that occur in numerous people in a similar way, which many people who have not died report, cannot, in my opinion, be interpreted as evidence of a transition to another existence, because they are formed in a brain that was still functioning, and the events are reported by living people with a functioning brain, not by the dead. Otherwise, people wouldn't be able to report on the relevant experiences afterwards. I don't doubt the existence of near-death experiences, in which one feels as if one is walking into a radiant light. However, I understand these experiences only as an expression of certain brain activities.

### 74. The soul and spirit primarily serves to preserve the body.

- a) In my opinion, the function of all soul and spirit is primarily the preservation of the living body, and therefore, with the demise of the living body, it also loses its central purpose. This latter statement can be well supported if we think of our animal relatives, who probably don't have the same problems as some humans in wishing for and imagining an afterlife—especially with a God who is invisible (!) during their lifetime. Our animal relatives simply live their limited lives as best as they can, based on their biological makeup, and do so from one generation to the next.
- b) In my opinion, animals interpret their environment even more accurately than humans because they don't originate misinterpretations of reality, such as religious delusions or philosophical concepts that are far removed from reality.

### 75. On the Quality of Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil

I would now like to examine the quality of the three Abrahamic supposed deities Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil, whose content formation in human minds is based primarily on ancient texts written by humans. The ancient texts are therefore the central point for assessing quality.

### 76. Quality Presupposes Existence

A key point regarding whether something or someone is to be worshipped, and thus has any quality at all, is that it, he, or she, exists at all. It should be emphasized in this

context that at least three Abrahamic and other deities are not accessible to life forms other than humans. They do not a priori become part of the thought world of animals. The only unquestionable existence of the three aspiring deities Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil is rooted in the psyche of some members of our species, as it were, in their specific interpretation of the world. Furthermore, in this respect, one cannot speak of knowledge about the three deities, but rather of a mere belief in their existence, which is at least cognitively much weaker.

#### 77. We no longer believe in countless deities

In this context, it is also important to consider the considerable number of other deities that have so far been refuted, that is, that no one believes in anymore. It follows that even the most staunch belief in Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil is no guarantee of their existence, since the human mind has demonstrably been mistaken in similar cases regarding a multitude of other supposed deities. This is to the extent that, to my knowledge, no one today worships Zeus, Poseidon, Jupiter, Athena, Tlaloc, Fu Xi, or Thor, among countless other traditional figures once worshipped.

#### 78. Gods: Products of our imagination and our desires?

In this sense, the question arises whether gods in general and also the three aspirants to God discussed in more detail here are, to a certain extent, mere excretory products of the human imagination, in which a world is conceived according to subjective human needs, in which oneself is the complete center of the world, in which needs for help from "above" are satisfied, in which one has an imaginary, supposedly wonderful contact person, in which one is loved (!) by this imaginary person - even though they are not even supposed to have a body, in which needs to overcome death, which one does not want to accept as the complete end, are satisfied, and in which the species-specific desire for justice is fulfilled by one deity or another, at least in the imaginary afterlife.

#### 79. The existence of gods depends on human judgment

It should be noted that without human thought processes, there would necessarily be no gods, for gods are based on an exorbitantly positive evaluation of a specific content substrate by humans, which exclusively results in the evaluation of "deity" in humans. The existence of deities is therefore only derived from human existence and, in this case, from the human evaluation of a specific content substrate as a superlative, as "God."

#### 80. The Abrahamic Candidates for God: Powerless Objects

Based primarily on the available ancient writings written by humans, I conducted what I consider to be a necessary review of the respective content substrates with regard to their suitability as deities. However, regarding Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil, I came to a clear alternative assessment to that of their followers: These are definitely not deities revealed in the scriptures, but simply low-quality constructs invented and conceived by humans; not powerful subjects, but powerless objects endowed by humans with quite arbitrary content. The supposed god doesn't even have himself under control. He is pathetic.

#### 81. God: merely an object of human attribution

It is sound: every so-called god is not a powerful subject, but rather an initially empty object, which is then endowed with quite arbitrary content by humans. A sound argument for this is precisely the multitude of gods that humans have produced throughout history. This is also clearly evident in the fact that the will of each deity is essentially mediated and developed by the priesthood and can sometimes (fortunately) deviate significantly from the original text. In other words: the mind and will of the deity is the mind and will of humans, especially those of the priesthood, who presume to impute their thoughts to a god. This also explains the large number of different Jewish, Christian, and Muslim faiths.

#### 82. Can a single god have different opinions at the same time?

It should be emphasized in this context: Obviously, no single God can simultaneously hold very different opinions on essential issues; it's evidently just different people who have different opinions (!). "God" is therefore nothing more than a mere, completely powerless object of attribution for us humans.

#### 83. Gods: Mental Constructs of Humans

Gods in general, and also the three Abrahamic "deities" Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil, are not real entities, but merely mental constructs of humans. They are merely objects to which content is attributed in scriptural religions, initially by human authors of the scriptures and later, especially by the priesthood, through interpretation or even reinterpretation of the ancient texts into a contemporary form.

#### 84. Is it meaningful to worship mental constructs?

In any case, it would be more meaningful to value and engage with actual living people, animals, nature, and the environment than to worship these human figments

of the imagination, as unfortunately happens in schools and even universities. Because the way humanity is currently behaving, especially due to the worship of polarizing mental constructs such as Kratochvil, Zapletal and Pospischil, peaceful, sustainable survival is by no means guaranteed.

#### 85. What should one think of the devil?

- a) I have recognized that supposed gods such as Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil are merely figments of human imagination. The same, of course, also applies to the evil antagonists of the respective god or gods—Satan or the Devil, or in numerous religions, several of these, namely demons or similar constructs. They, too, are all merely constructs of the human imagination and do not exist in reality. These figures also merely represent—in this case, negative—objects of attribution by humans and therefore vary just as much as the positive objects of attribution, the gods.
- b) It should also be noted that the devil or similar figures have been and are often used to denigrate legitimate criticism of God—de facto the priesthood that exercises power in his wake—and to silence and even dehumanize critics.
- c) Satan or a similar figure has often been branded as the lying tempter. As I have come to realize, the authors of the supposedly holy scriptures were themselves liars and tempters because they promised their believers absurd ideas of salvation, such as a miraculous life after death.
- d) Both groups of figures, gods and demons, represent only a primitive, highly polarizing way of thinking that we should overcome as quickly as possible.

#### 86. Incitement to War and Violence in the Old Testament

The Tanakh, or rather the Old Testament, certainly contributed greatly to the course of violent human history by waging wars on behalf of a supposed god and by establishing a territory exclusively controlled by a certain people.

#### 87. The New Testament also failed to bring peace on earth

Even the wrongly idolized Jesus is said to have made the following statement to the apostles, based on Matthew 10:34: "Do not think that I have come to send peace on earth. I have not come to send peace, but a sword." Yes, Christianity clearly has a history of violence behind it. With his polarizing ideas about the clear distinction between good believers, for whom a kingdom of heaven awaited, and the clear distinction between bad unbelievers, for whom hell awaited, Jesus himself paved the way for violence. With his primitive classification of good and evil, he was certainly not the prince of peace that he is sometimes called.

## 88. The Quran, a Lot of Violence

The Quran is dominated by violence, and much of it revolves around raids and wars led by Muhammad himself. Muhammad himself was essentially a warlord and violent man, and in a sense, only a part-time supposed prophet. As a consequence, Islamic history, like that of Christianity, is strongly shaped by war and violence.

## 89. The Idea of Only One God Promotes Violence

Overall, it seems to me that with the monotheistic Abrahamic religions and the absurd and pathological idea of only one incorporeal God, the most intolerant and most violence-promoting human ideas have spread throughout the world like a harmful cancer.

## 90. What benefit do the three Abrahamic deities have?

Special attention should be paid to the benefit of the three aspirants to God for humanity.

The question arises whether human life would perish without Kratochvil, Zapletal, or Pospischil. This is definitely not the case. The argument of religious people that we owe life to gods can be refuted simply by the fact that, according to the well-established theory of evolution, individual species gradually evolved through a natural process, from simpler to sometimes more complex living beings, and that humans are only one link in the evolutionary process.

## 91. God did not create the world and us

The seemingly childish idea of the creation of the world and life by gods has been conceived time and again by people in various cultures, with the Abrahamic religions being no exception. The absurdity of the creation story in the Tanakh and the Old Testament is at best suitable for a cabaret program. As an example, it can be pointed out that according to Genesis 1, the earth and light, with day and night, were supposed to have come into being before the sun, which is definitely false.

## 92. There is no beginning and no end to being

a) I am not a natural scientist, but I counter the theory that the world was created by a God who desires a circumcised penis in boys of Jewish origin for the purpose of entering into a covenant on the eighth day with what I consider a more plausible theory: Any idea of creation is false, and any idea of a beginning and an end to any

kind of being is false. There are only changes with regard to the manifestations of being.

b) Energetically, however, nothing changes overall. I therefore assume a necessarily infinite existence and include energy in every form, based on the so-called law of conservation of energy. If it has been proven that a being never becomes a complete nothing, but only a transition to another form of being, how can one even assume that something comes from nothing?

c) I therefore consider the Big Bang and a singularity, along with the emergence of the physical properties of time and space, to be an unintelligible and illogical concept because it contradicts the law of conservation of energy.

d) Space, outer space, has always been, is, and always will be necessarily infinite. It cannot necessarily separate itself from another entity, because that entity would itself have to be spatial. I therefore also consider theories of an expanding universe implausible. It could only be that stars and other celestial bodies are moving away from each other, but this occurs in the space that belongs to the universe, which is at best empty.

e) I propose the following hypothesis: Everything that currently exists materially has always existed – albeit in different forms – and will always exist.

### 93. What is time?

a) I would like to briefly address the topic of "time" in connection with ideas about the beginning of the world, and my approach here is as follows: I am very skeptical of models of thought that assume that time exists per se, even that it came into being at some point within a singularity, and that time passes differently depending on the speed of the moving object (kinetic time dilation). Experiments with atomic clocks, which, when in motion, reveal a different time reading than stationary clocks, in my opinion, at most prove that these clocks could react to the movement. Furthermore, the supposed time differences measured in various experiments involve nanoseconds, which are not particularly relevant for the everyday life of an ordinary person.

b) I see evidence that time passes for humans regardless of how fast one moves in the fact that, unlike the majority of humanity, pilots and flight attendants, who regularly move very quickly in airplanes throughout their lives, do not end up in a different time dimension than non-flyers. Events in nature are perceived simultaneously by both frequent flyers and non-flyers. Despite significantly different average speeds of movement, frequent flyers and non-flyers remain in a completely identical time throughout their entire lives.

c) I also have my doubts about the fact that time depends on mass attraction (gravitational time dilation). Here, too, there have been experiments with atomic clocks that have revealed different time readings in the nanoscale at different altitudes on Earth. Here, too, it should be noted that the nanosecond range is not particularly relevant for our survival and that only atomic clocks could react to gravity.

d) I also have a practical, illustrative counterargument to gravitational time dilation: People who live at approximately sea level for most of their lives and others who live

at high altitudes, such as the Himalayas, for most of their lives do not end up in different temporal spheres. For them, all events on Earth occur completely simultaneously. Neither the lowlander nor the highlander is in any way ahead of the other in terms of perceiving events on Earth, nor lags behind the other.

e) My central idea about time, however, is the following: In my opinion, TIME PASSES a priori ONLY FOR LIVING MATTER, such as humans, and this is independent of the speed at which the living being moves and independent of any gravitational environment. In this sense, time is a mere perception, an interpretation of the environment, by living beings, because recognizing sequences and regularities in nature is important for their survival. For example, it is important for orangutans to know when (and where) edible fruit is available. The orangutan therefore has a concept of time. It serves its survival. For a civil servant, such as I used to work, it is also important to know when working hours begin and end. Knowing that there is a lunch break is also quite relevant. Time thus passes for humans and animals alike. In our thinking, we link certain events according to a before and after, and we memorize sequences. This also creates a past for us.

f) However, time does not pass for inanimate objects such as a stone, an entire planet, a satellite, or even a clock itself. In this sense, a clock only indicates how time passes for us. Since atomic clocks, for example, could react to movement or gravity, slight differences could arise compared to the time actually passing for us.

g) Because time is merely a perception of living beings, there can be no curvature of spacetime of any kind. The latter is a central concept in general relativity, which describes how masses distort the structure of space and time.

94. In the absence of a beginning and an end, there can be no creation and no creator.

In this sense, I consider the notion of a beginning and sometimes also an end to everything, which numerous religions assume, to be fundamentally wrong. There is an eternal being in various material-energetic forms. CONSEQUENTLY, THERE CAN BE NO CREATION AND NO CREATOR. There is a being that can be divided into time for animate matter and is necessarily temporally limited, and that is timeless for inanimate matter.

95. The Abrahamic deities pose a threat to human life

I now return to the benefit of gods for humans. In my opinion, the three Abrahamic deities demonstrably pose a threat to human life: Clear evidence of this is provided by the centuries-long violent Islamic expansion, the Crusades, the violent expansion of Christian-dominated states, the near-extirpation of Native Americans by Christians, the Thirty Years' War over religious disagreements, the murder of so-called witches and heretics by Christians, the current widespread Islamic fundamentalist terror, and the violence in Islamic-dominated countries against



religious minorities, atheists, and people with a sexual orientation that deviates from the intolerant religious norm.

#### 96. Emotionalized Extreme Positions of the Deities

- a) All of the negative aspects of religions discussed above are primarily based on the emotionalized extreme positions taken by the three "deities," which are then sometimes adopted by people who are misled by these contents.
- b) As an example of the potential danger to human life posed by the three Abrahamic, only supposed deities, reference can be made to Sura 5, verse 33 of the Quran: "Verily, the just recompense of those who fight Allah and His Messenger and spread corruption in the earth is that many of them are killed or crucified, or that their hands and feet are cut off on opposite sides, or that they are banished from the land. That is their recompense in this world, and in the Hereafter, they will have a painful punishment." Such texts are a key foundation for the widespread use of violence by people, for example, in Palestine, where the divisive nature of all Abrahamic religions is clearly evident.
- c) I have already addressed the reprehensible racist stance of Kratochvil, who even calls for the murder of peoples other than Israelites, and have cited a particularly disgusting passage (Deuteronomy 20:16). In any case, the underlying attitude of the inferior religious original texts does not exactly contribute to international understanding.

#### 97. Visiting the Temple Mount is strictly separated according to religious affiliation

For example, there are often conflicts surrounding visits to the Temple Mount in Jerusalem by Jewish Israelis and Muslim Palestinians, where even over time, varying regulations with different access restrictions and opportunities for entering and praying strictly separated according to religious affiliation had to be enacted (!). This, too, is a clear demonstration that Jewish Israelis and Muslim Palestinians do not believe in the same supreme God, but rather in two very different, inferior, misconstructions that even drive a wedge between these groups of people. Instead of living together in friendship and peace, Jews and Palestinians are strictly separated from one another precisely by these two misconstructions, Kratochvil and Pospishil, and the religious dignitaries operating in their wake. The view of one group toward the other is often characterized by dislike and even hatred.

#### 98. The world and humanity could exist better without gods

I conclude from this: The world and humanity could exist very well without the worship of Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospishil as deities, and in my opinion, they could certainly exist much better.

99. Devaluation of people who do not belong to one's own group as a main principle of the Abrahamic religions

- a) These three mere constructs of the human imagination have even been shown to pose considerable potential dangers because they exalt their own believers over those of other faiths or non-believers, devalue those who think differently, and sometimes, as already described, even openly call for their killing.
- b) I find ideologies that greatly exalt their own group or nation and devalue others to be very negative. In this context, I would like to mention National Socialism in the Third Reich as a particularly deterrent example. The Abrahamic religions also contain this element of devaluation of people who do not belong to their own group.

100. Humans: a random biological life form

- a) I counter this: Every human being, like all other living beings, is ultimately just a random manifestation of being. I consider the individual human being to be a symbiotic biological life form that undoubtedly exists only for a limited time, composed of Homo sapiens and a multitude of bacteria and other microorganisms.
- b) The human microbiome refers to the totality of bacteria and other microorganisms that inhabit the body – in the intestines, on the skin, on mucous membranes, in the respiratory tract, and in the urogenital tract. A healthy microbiome weighs about 1.5 kilograms and consists of more than 100 trillion microorganisms from about a thousand different species (!).
- c) Each of these predominantly beneficial and even essential microorganisms is more significant and valuable than any human-created figments of the imagination such as the Jewish Kratochvil, the Christian Zapletal, and the Muslim Pospischil. The microorganisms in our bodies should undoubtedly be given more respect and attention than the three inferior fictions of the Abrahamic religions, which were created by the greatest lie in human history—that of a single God.

101. Innate group membership is random

- a) I would now like to return to the primitive notion of group membership prevalent in the Abrahamic religions. The fact that one is born as a particular person is the result of chance, as is the fact that one belongs to a particular religious community or nation from birth. As a consequence of this random nature, the group affiliations acquired at birth should represent only a very subordinate category in human thought, and especially in the formation of young people.
- b) In this context, I also reject the teaching of history, especially with regard to the size of states, which unfortunately is mainly achieved through wars. It also seems to me a complete waste of time to learn about battles and their dates, and the associated territorial changes.

## 102. The size of a state is irrelevant

- a) In this sense, even supposedly successful warlords who have expanded a certain territory of one state at the expense of another – because this was done at the cost of many people's lives – are anything but venerable figures for me. I cite Caesar, Alexander the Great (wrongly so-called), or Charlemagne (wrongly so-called) as examples. The size of the territory of states in which people live plays absolutely no role in the quality of life of the people living in that state! For example, I assume that I could currently lead a more comfortable life in the small states of Monaco or Liechtenstein than in the larger states of Afghanistan or Iran, which are characterized by religious state terror.
- b) Ultimately, all military conflicts are completely pointless zero-sum games that destroy life and severely limit the quality of life, given the limited space available on Earth. For example, a group of people expands their territory by 50,000 square kilometers. The other group will inevitably lose its territory, amounting to 50,000 square kilometers. A senseless zero-sum game that only produces corpses.
- c) For me, the most important task of a state is to live peacefully with other states and not send its own citizens to war, as is unfortunately still the case today.

## 103. The willingness to wage war should be eradicated

- a) We should generally strive to reach a higher ethical and cultural level where the existence of armies becomes completely unnecessary, because simply no one will be willing to kill complete strangers in wars who just happen to live in another country. From a humorous context, I know the following saying as an argument against war: "You don't shoot strangers." For me, wars are nothing more than mass murder ordered by political leaders.
- b) Political leaders, who are also just ordinary, fallible people, or who can sometimes even be dishonest people, are granted far too much importance and power—in the sense of deciding over the lives of others—in the form of vast arsenals of weapons and even weapons of mass destruction that can wipe out entire human civilization. The vast sums of money spent on arming armies could, in any case, be used far more sensibly. Many of humanity's major problems could be solved this way.
- c) That such a military-free state is not impossible can be demonstrated, for example, by the exemplary state of Costa Rica. It has not had an armed forces since 1949. There are currently other states without a military: see Wikipedia [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_sovereign\\_states\\_without\\_armed\\_forces](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_sovereign_states_without_armed_forces) Other states could and should follow Costa Rica's example.

## 104. Self-determination instead of categorizing people into groups

- a) A person's goodness definitely does not derive from belonging to a particular nation or religious community. I would like to emphasize this, especially in connection with the previous paragraph, which dealt with the military and wars. Abrahamic religions, with group-promoting rituals and rules followed in public, promote a strong sense of group belonging, rather than a more cosmopolitan self-determination with individual reflection by the individual, which is more relevant to me.
- b) These religions therefore contribute significantly to wars and conflicts, as history and the present clearly demonstrate. There were also clergy who supported secular rulers in their military campaigns – also in the interest of spreading the true religion – and even blessed weapons. There was and is a strong intertwining of political power with religion, which also approved and approves of war and violence as a means to an end. I consider this an unholy alliance.
- c) Even today, warlord Vladimir Putin, for example, maintains excellent connections with the Russian Orthodox clergy, the majority of whom do not oppose the war in Ukraine. Human lives are unlikely to be of great importance to the high representatives of the Church in Russia.

#### 105. Note on the current war in Ukraine

- a) Regarding the war in Ukraine, I would like to point out that I do not want to blame Mr. Putin and Russia alone for this war. To put it simply, the West also has a significant share of the blame. With the fall of the Iron Curtain, the Warsaw Pact was dissolved in 1991. In my opinion, it would have been conceivable if the Western alliance of NATO had also dissolved in light of the disappearance of its potential main adversary. However, this was not the case. NATO subsequently expanded further and further toward Russia, and Ukraine was also granted accession prospects for the military alliance. In view of this, there was and continues to be a steadily increasing threat to Russia from the expanding NATO and possible weapons of mass destruction stationed near Russia. In this sense, the West bears partial blame for the military mass murder in Ukraine.
- b) Another argument for the Russian war of aggression against Ukraine could be that there is a significant Russian minority in Ukraine, which may have been discriminated against. At least, this is often claimed. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, there were at least certain legal changes in Ukraine that also affected the status of minorities.

#### 106. The Disparaging Treatment of Women in the Abrahamic Religions

- a) Another negative aspect in the Abrahamic religions is the discrimination against women, which is particularly pronounced in Islam. For example, the Quran, Sura 2, Verse 223, states: "Your wives are a field for you. So come to your field whenever and however you wish...." It should be emphasized in this text that the women

themselves are obviously not even being addressed, but rather only the male readers, and these are obviously addressed by a male writer. The woman is objectified as a field for you, which is a clear denigration.

b) In the Koran, Sura 4, verse 34, it says: "... Therefore, the righteous women submit humbly to Allah and guard what is to be hidden, because Allah guards it. And those whose disobedience you fear, admonish them, avoid them in bed, and beat them...." Here, too, the women are not addressed directly, but only the circle of male readers, and this again by a male human writer. I actually find it really embarrassing that a god should grant men the right to chastise unruly wives. The pathetic, non-existent Pospischil obviously couldn't defend himself against this attribution with regard to the violent resolution of private relationship matters. I also find it a complete outrage that a merely supposed god even interferes in people's intimate spheres.

c) I would like to note that on numerous websites, I have found creative reinterpretations of the texts by theologians who deny any denigration of women. However, theologians are generally just vehement advocates of their religion and not credible interpreters of texts.

d) It should also be clear to everyone: Behind the legal and actual discrimination against women, which can also be seen in Islamic-dominated states, and, for example, in special clothing regulations for women only, there can be no superior being, but simply certain ordinary men who do not sufficiently value women and systematically want to marginalize them in society. Ultimately, in my opinion, it is merely a matter of chance whether someone is born male or female, which is why the superiority of one gender over the other is completely misguided.

107. Inheriting one's parents' religion at birth is wrong.

A person's affiliation with a religion simply by virtue of birth is wrong. Only a mature adult can and should decide whether they want to belong at all, and if so, to which religious community. In the spirit of human self-determination and to protect physical integrity, religious circumcisions and baptisms of minors should be completely prohibited with immediate effect, because in truth, this definitely does not create a covenant with a superior being—a God—but only a bond to the respective priesthood and, in my opinion, a misguided upbringing in the spirit of religious delusions.

108. Religion has no place in universities and schools.

a) In general, I find it outrageous that Abrahamic religions are still taught in schools and even universities, and that the study of archaic texts, which is primarily done in the sense of a whitewashing reinterpretation of the texts, even leads to the awarding of academic degrees. Theological studies do not impart sound knowledge and critical thinking. They primarily train religious dignitaries and people from their circles, who are primarily expected to become advocates for their religion. The training there is primarily geared toward selling their "product," namely, above all, the respective

God, Jesus, Mohammed, belief in an afterlife, etc., and presenting it as positively as possible to potential customers, in conjunction with downright delusional promises to potential clients.

b) Theologians should be judged similarly to criminal defense attorneys. The starting point for trained advocates of various religions is also comparable to that of lawyers who try to achieve the best possible outcome for their clients in court proceedings. This also applies to criminal defense lawyers who, even if they may know their client's guilt, still try to get them off the hook somehow. Based on the texts that created them, Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil are responsible for numerous crimes, such as incitement to murder (cf. Testing Abraham's Faithfulness), incitement to genocide (cf. racially unified territory for the Israelites with the extermination of the other peoples in this territory), and the commission of mass murder (cf. The Flood), which I will discuss later in this text. These three misconstruits must indeed have excellent criminal defense lawyers in the form of theologians if they have not only escaped scot-free for centuries but are even allowed to bear the title "God." Well, in my opinion, the three serious criminals certainly don't pass muster, even if they are wrongly worshipped as gods by many people. At most, the guilt of one or the other of the three Abrahamic criminals can be questioned because, in view of absurd alleged torture in the de facto non-existent afterlife – this is due to disbelief –, they could be mentally abnormal and therefore not accountable.

#### 109. Theologians are theo-liars

Given the initial situation described above, the statements of representatives of religious institutions, as well as of theologians associated with them, should be treated with extreme caution with regard to their veracity. Based on the assumption that the supposedly sole Abrahamic God was created through a lie, the entire study of theology is a concept of lies. It can therefore be assumed that the majority of theologians are theo-liars.

#### 110. Theological Literature: Misuse of Language

In my opinion, humanity certainly has more meaningful tasks than investigating the will of Jesus, who lived about 2,000 years ago and, moreover, probably never expressed himself in writing (!). The utter nonsense of investigating the will of a God that certain people themselves created through texts containing the central lie of the existence of only one God. Millions upon millions of sheets of paper have been written by people in this context, and this has resulted in very different wills attributed to the supposedly one and only God! In my opinion, all of this represents nothing other than an absurd and downright misuse of human language and time, if one knows, as I do, that God does not exist and is merely an object of attribution by us humans and, indeed, by those people who have written and continue to write theological texts.

#### 111. Where was Jesus' achievement?

- a) Allow me to make one more comment about Jesus Christ: In my opinion, Jesus did not accomplish any demonstrably outstanding achievements; rather, he only served the Christian churches to incredible power and wealth. This was done, at least in part, through deliberate deception of his own followers.
- b) It therefore seems to me far more sensible to value people who are active in all sorts of areas in the present than someone who lived 2,000 years ago and whose miracles were only attributed to lies. In this sense, anyone who performs any task in the here and now does more for us than Jesus.

#### 112. Many priests probably don't believe

I also assume that many religious dignitaries of all Abrahamic religious communities possessed and still possess a critical mind and did not and do not believe in the truth and accuracy of the messages they themselves conveyed. The less than blameless lifestyles of numerous religious dignitaries, including popes, and the frequent sexual abuse of children, especially in religious contexts, strongly support this theory. Some religious dignitaries might even be relieved that the idea of a single God is generally recognized—and even by themselves—as false and derived from a lie.

#### 113. Clergy should educate their believers

This text you are currently reading should actually make it completely clear that all gods are merely human constructs. Now that religious dignitaries have convinced people of the delusional existence of incorporeal beings and the pathological possibility of intensive contact with them, they themselves should decisively educate their own believers that any belief in phantoms and any supposed contact with them is based solely on error, on a blatantly erroneous interpretation of reality.

#### 114. The absurd alignment of the calendar according to the birth of Jesus

- a) Moreover, aligning the calendar according to the man Jesus is merely an expression of the power of the Christian religions that have long dominated humanity, and only to their advantage. Jesus himself left no lasting writings, and his statements, thoughts, and achievements can therefore only be speculated upon in the dark. The question arises whether it is appropriate to align the calendar according to any specific person at all, especially a person to whom miracles were attributed through lies, things that not everyone believes in.

b) A more objective and factual approach would be to calculate the calendar based on the creation of the Earth. This would also reflect how relatively short a time human beings have existed and how insignificant they and their thoughts are in relation to the universe.

#### 115. The Pathological Contact with Jesus

Humanity has certainly occupied itself far too much with Jesus and various supposed prophets. Does Jesus benefit from this? In my opinion, certainly not, because he is simply dead like everyone else and incapable of any kind of communication or emotional development. Who benefits from people mistakenly believing they are in contact with someone who died thousands of years ago, and that they love him and are even loved by him? Especially the church, the priesthood, so to speak. Certainly, believers can also feel better. Something comparable to a medical placebo effect might have a positive effect here.

#### 116. Order of Life by the Abrahamic Aspirants to God

- a) Another point for evaluating the three Abrahamic Aspirants to God is their usefulness for shaping human life.
- b) With regard to the three Abrahamic Aspirants to God, it should be noted that they massively intervene in human behavior. However, this is obviously a double-edged sword: On the one hand, a person is relieved of the agony of choosing their behavior. People who are happy to be dictated to by others and believe they are obeying the will of a deity thus benefit from mandatory prayer rules, purification rules, dietary rules, clothing regulations, and all sorts of other regulations that make it easier for them to choose the right behavior in everyday life.
- c) Divine instructions for behavior vary depending on the religion. This is evidence that the instructions cannot come from one god, but from several different people.

#### 117. Dear God, may we eat locusts?

- a) As an example, I would like to point to the purity laws in Leviticus 11 and following, which express the concerns Kratochvil, after a brief description of the creation of the vast universe, grapples with in an almost meticulous manner for his followers. For example, one should not eat small animals with wings and four feet. This is because they are supposed to be abhorrent to the addressees of the purity law. However, according to this specific god, one may eat those small animals with four feet that have jumping legs for hopping on the ground. Therefore, one may rejoice as a member of the illustrious circle of this god's chosen ones that Kratochvil subsequently permits one to eat the migratory locust, the solam locust, the hargol



locust, and the hegab locust. Many religious dignitaries and theologians instruct us that this rule actually originated from a single, supreme God.

b) I counter this: As a person capable of reasoning, one should recognize without a doubt that this rule originates only from a severely disturbed person with a compulsion to overregulate, from a petty pedant from the priesthood.

#### 118. Do the 613 mitzvot originate from one god?

For Jews, there are 613 so-called mitzvot, i.e., rules, which, in my opinion, are largely unreasonable and therefore obviously do not originate from a deity. Furthermore, for an all-powerful deity, it is completely irrelevant how ape-like beings dress or what they eat, or that certain sacrifices are offered to them. This obviously only matters to petty members of the priesthood.

#### 119. On circumcision of the penis as a covenant with God

One of the 613 mitzvot is circumcision of the penis, which must be performed on the eighth day of a Jew's life. This is intended to establish a covenant with God, whom I refer to as Kratochvil. I find it remarkable and discriminatory that this God only wants to enter into a covenant with male babies and not with female babies. What could be addressed with girls? "God" didn't think of this, or does he not want to enter into a covenant with girls? It is generally stated here that girls are accepted into the community solely through their lineage, which is not very plausible to me, because this argument applies equally to boys.

#### 120. The one God enters into a covenant with humans in different ways

a) In any case, if this God—I gave him the name Kratochvil—doesn't even respect the physical integrity of a baby, it clearly shows that this is merely a product of the imagination of the liars who wrote the texts and, subsequently, of the priesthood, who even seek to create a bond between the young person—not to God!—but only to themselves, even through physical interventions.

b) In this context, I would like to note that the Islamic candidate for God, Pospischil, is also said to place value on circumcision. However, when and how this should be done varies depending on the interpretation of the priesthood of the respective religious community.

c) Compared to Kratochvil and Pospischil, the Christian aspirant Zapletal is at least somewhat more civilized, for he does not require physical injury for the covenant with him in the broader sense, but rather a ritual dousing with water (baptism), which is actually understood as participation in the forgiveness of sins through Christ's death on the cross. This occurs in a non-discriminatory manner, moreover, with both boys and girls.

## 121. My Baptism and Its Troublesome Consequences

- a) I, too, was baptized as a baby. However, I consider this an infringement on my personal rights and my self-determination. In my deepest conviction, I definitely do not value any kind of bond or contact with a supposed higher being, now or in the future, because I know with certainty that it doesn't exist at all and, based on the inferior texts that created this defective product, I simply dread it.
- b) In reality, baptism only established a connection with the representatives of Mr. Zapletal, the Christian priests, and religious teachers. In this sense, it was only wasted time and attempted spiritual defilement for me as a child that I was taught delusions in Catholic religious education, such as the belief in an invisible, miraculous being, the paramount significance of Jesus Christ's death on the cross, and an afterlife with heaven and hell. In any case, it took a certain amount of energy to defend oneself against the religious nonsense that was spreading in schools.

## 122. Why religious slaughter?

Likewise, slaughters carried out without anesthesia should be prosecuted and stopped entirely. In this case, too, it becomes clear that Kratochvil and Pospischil are not exceptionally compassionate beings, for they fail to consider the unnecessary suffering of animals during slaughter without anesthesia. In this respect, too, Zapletal is more sophisticated, for he does not demand this strange ritual of slaughter with residue-free bleeding.

## 123. Do we all have to become vegetarians?

- a) In connection with the slaughter of animals, I would like to express the following thought: I see us humans as natural omnivores and therefore certainly entitled to kill animals for consumption. However, if we use animals, this should be done in such a way that the animals are given the most species-appropriate, positive life possible, and their death should occur as quickly and painlessly as possible. Archaic religious rites that contradict these ideas should generally be abandoned as quickly as possible because they are ethically inferior.
- b) If people largely abstain from animal food out of respect for animals and because of the suffering they experience in the currently widespread factory farming, which is probably not very sustainable for the animals, I consider this entirely understandable and positive from an ethical point of view. However, I do not assume that the complete abstinence from partially animal-based foods—which is fundamentally in keeping with human nature—should be elevated to a general dogma.

124. A life in conformity to God is impossible.

The advantage of taking away the decision—for example, the suitability of a particular locust as food—is obviously offset by the right to self-determination and freedom, which is inherently a valuable asset for many more individualistically oriented people, but which is restricted by the comprehensive—and also strongly divergent (!)—rules of the three aspiring gods: Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil. It should be emphasized in this context that a life in conformity to God is actually impossible at all, because different religions have different rules!

125. Only immature need divine regulation

I would like to emphasize, however, that I am not in the least interested in the regulation of my life by invisible entities of a different kind, or in truth, obviously only by other people who eke out their existence as mouthpieces for the respective invisible entities, namely the priesthood.

126. Eternally valid "divine" regulations are completely useless

I reject any supposedly divine regulation and, as a lawyer, consider it sensible to always question the usefulness of regulations and to constantly revise them. In this sense, a predetermined divine order that persists in the long term is necessarily utter nonsense and inferior, indeed, a priori completely useless.

127. The Islamic legal system: backward and completely unacceptable

a) In this context, it is sufficient to critically observe the prevailing Islamic-dominated legal systems and the associated human rights violations. Religious self-determination is often severely restricted there; in particular, leaving the Islamic religious community is sometimes prosecuted. On the basis of Sharia, which is interpreted differently, even barbaric and gruesome stoning is sometimes practiced for adultery, which in my opinion is not punishable, and other corporal punishments such as flogging and amputations are imposed.

b) Any acceptance of Islamic law is intolerable in modern, higher-level legal systems.

128. How do the Abrahamic gods behave toward us?

Another key factor in assessing the aspirants to God is their behavior toward humans. Zapletal and Pospischil, although both are said to be incorporeal, are said to reward or punish humans for eternity in the afterlife—primarily for their belief or disbelief in them.

### 129. Eternal rewards and punishments are unjust and idiotic

- a) If one considers the principle of balance, which is a very important point for me as a lawyer, this approach of eternal rewards and punishments in the afterlife is a priori to be rejected, because a lifespan in the form of the human species currently only lasts between 70 and 80 years on average, with women having a somewhat higher life expectancy. Given this limited lifespan of humans, an eternal reward or punishment in the afterlife is completely excessive and misguided, and simply a very stupid human-originated idea that represents the opposite of a just system.
- b) Furthermore, the question also arises as to what happens to people who were not able to develop a belief in a particular God during their lifetime, for example because they lived in a time before the respective revelation or did not gain knowledge of the respective revelation for other reasons, because they died too early or were not mentally able to understand its content or because they simply come from a different cultural background.

### 130. Belief in gods is a flaw

- a) Furthermore, it should be noted that disbelief in a particular god is not to be judged as a flaw, but rather as something entirely positive and normal. It is the result of a rational, reasonable thought process that every mature human being should undergo. Regarding the suitability of the respective aspirants to God, of which humanity has already produced millions, as the actual and, in the case of the Abrahamic religions, even the only God, this can and should necessarily lead to the conclusion that there are no truly existing, superior beings beyond the realm of human imagination.
- b) In my case, a lengthy, rational thought process and an examination of the relevant erroneous and inferior writings have produced the unequivocal conclusion that neither the Jewish Kratochvil, nor the Christian Zapletal, nor the Muslim Pospishil can even remotely bear the title of "deity." They are merely inferior, human-created fantasies that deserve only sincere, complete, and open rejection. Therefore, with this text, I would like to support others with substantive arguments in overcoming false and delusional beliefs.

### 131. The Pathological Nature of Punishment by Pospishil

- a) Furthermore, the nature of the punishments promised for disbelief calls into question the sanity and moral quality of the "deities." This is especially true of Pospishil when he expresses himself as follows: Sura 3, verse 10: "Behold, the disbelievers—neither their wealth nor their children avail them against Allah; they are fuel for the Fire." Sura 4, verse 56: "Behold, whoever rejects Our signs, We will burn

them in the Fire. As often as their skin is burned, We will give them another skin, so they may taste the punishment. Indeed, Allah is Mighty and Wise."

b) Since for me, as probably for every reasonably sensible, reasonably healthy person, the principle is "You don't barbecue anyone", in my opinion, if Pospischil actually behaves as in the quoted passages, which fortunately is not the case since he does not actually exist, he is neither wise nor powerful, but the clear opposite of both.

### 132. Humans attributed low-level content to Pospischil

The previously presented thoughts of Pospischil are obviously not the thoughts of an all-surpassing, wise, and emphatic God, but rather thoughts of the lowest human category, expressions of excessive violence and intolerance. Here, only a human being has presumed to attribute his low-level thoughts and judgments to a god, the only question being whether this was done intentionally or negligently due to psychological dysfunction. In my opinion, it is very regrettable that not everyone has recognized this yet. Now, what I have already stated before becomes clear here: God cannot defend himself against human-made attributions of content. He is merely the pathetic plaything of humans, more powerless than anything that actually exists in the world—in contrast to "God." As this example of Pospischil shows, any content, no matter how low-level and sick, is attributed to "God."

### 133. Is it permissible to worship a figure who grills unbelievers forever in the afterlife as a god?

a) The mere objectivity of God—and, given the extensive textual evidence, even that of a particularly inferior object—is particularly evident here. Incidentally, I don't feel particularly comfortable with the fact that people around me worship Pospischil, who is supposed to grill me and you as a non-Muslim forever in the afterlife, as the highest being and worship him five times a day at fixed times in a pathologically stereotypical manner.

b) The otherworldly grill master Pospischil should not be allowed to be worshipped at all. Therefore, there should be legal and de facto restrictions on the practice of Islam, which should tend toward a complete ban. Islamic religious madness is demonstrably particularly dangerous, potentially dangerous to both oneself and others, and should therefore be treated as such.

c) I would like to emphasize at this point, however, that I also consider Muslims to be valuable people. Unfortunately, they have grown up in a value system that is fraught with conflict, backward, and discriminatory. Given the current significant population movements in the world, it seems important to me to offer Muslims in Europe better alternatives for living their lives than the religion they grew up with.

### 134. Does it matter to a deity that we believe in it?

Furthermore, a deity is necessarily completely indifferent to whether ape-like beings, who live for a few decades at most on a planet tiny compared to the universe, believe in its existence and then worship it or not. A deity should certainly be self-sufficient and certainly doesn't need worship. Certainly, only the clergy need belief and worship. Their good existence in the community depends on belief in their "god."

#### 135. Pospishil is worshipped five times a day

I also consider the prescribed worship of the misconstrued Pospishil, which is supposed to take place five times a day at fixed times that vary depending on the worshipper's location, with stereotypical movements and the cry of "God is great," to be a complete imposition on believers, because it disrupts their daily routine and hinders more important, meaningful activities. Now, I am quite certain that no great God desires such idiotic behavior from people. If someone terrorizes people to such an extent that it even disrupts their peaceful sleep through the night—there is a mandatory prayer before sunrise—then this is certainly not a god. It is only the priests who terrorize people.

#### 136. On the Strict Fasting in the Month of Ramadan

The strict fasting during the month of Ramadan is also an idiotic, unnatural, unhealthy, and in no way divinely imposed imposition on devout Muslims. According to various studies, Muslim drivers, for example, suffer from dehydration and low blood sugar levels during Ramadan, which can impair their attention span and even their eyesight. Fatigue and exhaustion have been proven to cause numerous accidents, including fatal ones. Here, too, human lives are unnecessarily endangered by the pathological religion.

#### 137. The Priesthood Stands Behind God

It is certainly only the priesthood for whom the central role is played by whether people regard the content they offer as God and then condition their believers with prayers at fixed times and other idiotic commandments and prohibitions in the spirit of religious madness. Because if the religious dignitaries fail to achieve this, the following applies: Then the religious dignitaries are out of work and can no longer exert any influence. The priests, and definitely not some other, superior entity, are the ones who want to keep their own believers in line with disgusting threatening messages like eternal punishment in the afterlife, and who want to massively intervene in their lives. Every person could and should recognize this as soon as possible.

### 138. Authoritarian Systems Make Use of Religion

It should be noted that authoritarian systems of government also take advantage of the religiosity and the resulting tendency toward uncritical obedience to leadership of their citizens. Current examples in this context include the regimes of Iran, Afghanistan, and Saudi Arabia.

### 139. Religions Promote Tunnel Vision

I would like to add one more thought regarding the idiotic division of people into believers and non-believers, which should be avoided as much as possible. It is certainly not in the interest of a supreme God, but rather in the interest of the respective priesthood, that there be no personal and intellectual exchange between its believers and believers of other religious communities, or even atheists. For if their believers were to engage in more intensive exchange with those who hold different beliefs, they might realize that their belief system is not the only truth. They might then lose the tunnel vision desired by the priesthood and possibly question their supposed beliefs. Perhaps, after critically examining religions and engaging with scientific findings, they might, like me, view religion as a whole, especially belief in a single God, as a collection of absurd delusions, which in essential respects are even based on lies.

### 140. On the Flood

a) The "fine figure" that is venerated in connection with the three Abrahamic misconstructions is particularly evident in the story of the Flood, which can be read in the Book of Genesis, Chapter 6. There may well have been major flood disasters in world history, but a flood caused by a god as punishment, virtually inundating the entire earth, is another blatant lie by the dishonest authors of the Tanakh, or rather, the Old Testament.

b) The fabricated story is preceded by sexual contacts between equally fictitious sons of God and human daughters who are attractive to them, from whom heroes of ancient times are said to have emerged. In this context, I also find it a shame that there were no daughters of God who had relationships with human sons. This fits very well into a patriarchal world of thought, which hardly fits with an unequal God, but rather with a world of thought characterized by male rulers, which is found in all Abrahamic religious texts.

c) Giants were also freely invented by the notorious liars in these passages.

### 141. The Flood would be the greatest crime

- a) The central point of this fabrication is this: A general wickedness of humanity as the trigger for the divine Flood is, in any case, completely unacceptable and foolish.
- b) Each person must be judged individually. Collective guilt is misguided. It should also be borne in mind that the phantom figure known as "God" would also have killed babies and small children as a result of the false Flood, which is completely unacceptable because they are certainly not guilty of any evil.
- c) The assessment of "God" that all flesh-based creatures lived corrupted lives is seriously flawed. One cannot rationally accuse animals of being wicked. Moreover: How did plants and fungi come to be destroyed? Were they also evil?
- d) The destruction of almost all life on Earth would by no means be a divine or even remotely appropriate act, but rather the greatest crime in Earth's history.

#### 142. Noah's Ark is a lie

The idea that Noah saved life on Earth using a giant ship is another lie. Noah's age of 600 is absurd and agrees with many other impossibly high ages given for largely fictitious characters from the Tanakh and the Bible, and is another lie. If you save only two members of a species, that species can hardly survive in the long run because it creates a genetic bottleneck. Furthermore, planet Earth is somewhat too large for Noah to accommodate two of all animal species. In addition to a logistical problem, Noah would have also had certain difficulties rescuing, for example, kangaroos or polar bears living far away from him and transporting them to the boat.

#### 143. God neither created nor destroyed anything – He was created

- a) In this sense, I consider it utterly absurd to search for evidence of a Flood or Noah's Ark, as is still sometimes done today. For me, the following is a fact: The alleged God neither created nor destroyed anything! The creation of the world by a god is a blatant lie. The same applies to the destruction of almost all life by a god through the Flood. Equally a blatant lie! The same applies to other supposed divine punishments, which I have discussed elsewhere. The miraculous effects of the Crucifixion are also based on a chain of lies. All lies!
- b) "God," as a non-existent, incorporeal being, was himself created by humans, as the main lie, through faulty and inferior texts.

#### 144. Gods can be eliminated through thought and writing

The at least three misconstructions created by the Tanakh, the Bible, and the Quran, which are falsely referred to as "God," can just as easily be erased by a more meaningful literary counter-act in the sense of spiritual purification and cultural advancement. It is high time this happened. I myself am striving for this with this text you are currently reading.



#### 145. God is not something positive

In view of the alleged eternal torture in the afterlife through burning of the skin due to disbelief and the alleged extinction of almost all life on Earth without any reasonable cause, Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil are merely at least three despicable misconstructions of the human imagination. If one critically examines the content of these at least three figures in the source texts and refers to the same product as "God," then God is not a positively charged word.

#### 146. Positive Attributions for God

- a) I would like to note that with regard to "God," there are certainly more positive attributions made by humans to the respective worshipped object than, for example, those I discussed in the previous passages regarding Pospischil. This is especially true for Zapletal, who is already attested to in the source texts – the Bible – as having a particularly pronounced love for humans.
- b) There are even religious people who take the attribution of love to the respective worshipped god to extremes and make statements like the following: "God is love."
- c) However, the ability of an incorporeal entity (which doesn't exist at all) – a god – to love must be rejected a priori. For love is a physical matter related to hormones and certain brain areas, especially the reward system. Zapletal, for example, lacks any of these! He has no brain. He has no hormones.
- d) Furthermore, love has a proven, useful function in evolutionary development, namely, that a living being, such as a human, cares for its offspring and that sexual partners enter into a long-term pair bond—which is also beneficial for the offspring. Positive feelings that culminate in love are sometimes also partly responsible for the fact that sexual intercourse occurs between living beings of opposite sexes and that offspring can be conceived.

#### 147. Divine love makes no sense at all

- a) In general, the feeling of empathy only plays a role for social, corporeal beings in their interactions with other beings, especially those of their own species.
- b) The incorporeal Zapletal has no sexual partners, no offspring, and is not a social being, but rather a unique, disembodied construct created by humans. Due to God's unique characteristic, without any social context, divine love makes no sense a priori.
- c) His love is merely a positive attribution—in this case—by humans who want to elevate him and shape him in a positive way. However, the content is nonsense.
- d) It is especially useful for the priesthood to portray the respective god as particularly loving, because this is simple and understandable and appeals to many

people, and the respective god conveyed by the priesthood can thus be better marketed.

e) However, I don't want to deny that there are certainly texts in this context that are pleasant to read, insofar as they convey positive feelings and sometimes even inspire positive actions. It can also be quite positive for believers to believe that they are loved by an invisible, higher being, even if this is not the case. Something similar to a medical placebo effect is at work here.

#### 148. Love is not the highest good

a) Moreover, for me, love is not an exclusively positive ultimate, as many people see it. For me, the question arises as to whom or what one loves. For example, I consider a pronounced love for Adolf Hitler to be downright negative in light of the crimes this man committed.

b) I also do not consider it appropriate to promote the strong love of dead people, such as a supposed son of God, supposed prophet, or saint, because this love cannot be reciprocated by the loved ones. This is simply because they are dead.

c) The same applies, to an even greater extent, to incorporeal entities that cannot reciprocate the love and veneration shown to them by humans—for lack of their existence alone. Love for an invisible God is pathological.

d) In my opinion, it is more sensible to promote people's empathy and capacity for love toward living beings who undoubtedly exist in the present.

#### 149. God is Hate

Concluding the topic of "love" and the frequently expressed assessment by religious people that "God is love," it seems more correct to me, after a critical analysis of the source texts, to make the following judgment: God (I mean at least three imaginary figures of Abrahamic origin) is certainly not love, but rather, due to his devaluation of people who do not belong to his own group and his incitement to violence in this world as well as by himself in the human-constructed afterlife: "GOD IS HATE."

#### 150. God is a lie

a) Furthermore, I make the following judgment: "GOD IS A LIE." I have discussed several central lies of the human creators of "God" as examples. For me, in view of the clarity and precision of the numerous false statements and the pedantically stupid prescriptions of the so-called holy texts, there is no doubt about the authors' dishonesty.

b) The motives for the lies are evident: The primary goal is to establish an authoritarian priesthood that is supposed to be at the top of society, and it is to convince believers of untenable promises, such as a completely absurd eternal

existence after death with miraculous rewards, and it is to systematically enrich themselves at the expense of gullible people.

c) God served only as a mouthpiece for the lying authors of the texts, as an instrument for giving great weight to their own human thoughts and interests.

#### 151. God: A victim of abuse

In this sense, GOD could be seen as a POOR OBJECT always ABUSED by humans, mainly based on lies of people who wrote the source texts of the Abrahamic religions.

#### 152. The world would be better without the Abrahamic gods

a) The various content-related criteria I have discussed clearly speak against any worthiness of veneration for the three or more Abrahamic aspirants to God, who differ clearly and diversely in their design due to diverging human attributions.

b) The world would be more peaceful, more reasonable, freer, more tolerant, more progressive, more liberal, more beautiful, more diverse, and above all, more pure if people worshipped only real, existing subjects and objects. This would certainly be better than worshipping incorporeal, misconstrued with inferior content, created by mendacious texts.

c) The incorporeal misconstrueds primarily drive a wedge between people when they differentiate and evaluate people into believers and non-believers in a primitive and inappropriate manner. Certainly, no god values belief in him. These are just human liars who value belief in the "God" they have constructed because this allows them to deceive, abuse, and exploit other people.

d) With regard to Kratochvil: Equally stupid and flawed is the racist differentiation of people into Jews chosen by a god and non-chosen and thus inferior non-Jews. Racial affiliation certainly plays no role for any god, but only for primitive human racists. One is not born a Jew in this sense, but rather one is made into an Orthodox Jew, primarily through the demarcation-oriented work of rabbis.

e) One is born an individual human being who should be open to as many opportunities for development as possible. Monotheistic religions and the early influence of young people by clergy and religious teachers are an obstacle to this. Regarding the lie of a god's fixation on a specific people, it is also irrelevant to me that the mendacious authors were Jews. The same assessment on my part would apply to mendacious authors of any other ethnicity. For sophisticated people, a person's ethnicity plays no role at all in judging an individual, and certainly not for a so-called higher being.

f) Furthermore, one doesn't choose or in any way earn one's ethnicity. It is largely irrelevant.

g) I would like to note that membership in smaller human groups has played a significant role in phylogenetic development. Membership in a people and a state is something quite new in phylogenetic terms, and since it involves such a large entity,

it seems problematic to me to attribute anything like the same importance to this large society as is given to small groups. Since membership in a particular people or a particular state is not particularly relevant in my opinion, I consider fighting and violence against other peoples and states to be completely absurd. Going to war for a state is a misguided sense of loyalty.

#### 153. Summary: God is merely a human thought

- a) I would like to summarize: Every "God," and also the "only" God that has appeared repeatedly in human history, is nothing more than a human thought, a mental object from a specifically human culture. Humans have, as has been clearly demonstrated, attributed arbitrary—and even truly embarrassing and sick—content to each respective God, and continue to do so.
- b) This idea of God has absolutely no meaning outside of the human world of imagination and no equivalent in nature. Furthermore, the construction of gods by humans is based on a presumptuous idea that must be rejected a priori: the idea that something is mentally placed above the valuable being that corresponds exclusively to human imagination and evaluation.

#### 154. The One God: Refuted by the Abrahamic Source Texts Themselves

The idea of a single God is completely untenable, demonstrably false, and also the most terrible idea in human history, because it has and continues to lead to many negative consequences, such as violence, intolerance, and the separation of people instead of unity across groups. The Abrahamic religions and their diverse source texts themselves clearly refuted the idea of a single God: For they already contain at least three figures of God that differ greatly in content, with different, strictly separate religious communities that follow different rules, practice different rituals, and consider different beliefs to be central.

#### 155. God: Three Inferior Fantasy Products

I simplify by referring to at least three Abrahamic human fantasy products, which are based in their origins on tall tales, as the Jewish Kratochvil, the Christian Zapletal, and the Mohammedan Pospischil. According to a critical analysis of the texts through which they were created, these three figures are, in terms of content, three inferior human fantasy products.

#### 156. Summary: The idea of a single God is particularly sick and false

- a) Given a history of humanity with millions of worshipped gods and goddesses, the idea of only one God is a particularly sick and false presumption on the part of the authors of the texts.
- b) In this sense, "God" as a mere nonexistent product of the human imagination represents, for me, the absolute, unsurpassable worthlessness.
- c) Everyone should recognize that the texts clearly originate only from ordinary people who freely invented essential content, arbitrarily issued regulations that were essentially unreasonable, and who, above all, only wanted to establish a permanent system of rule for the priesthood with a subservient following that was as uncritical as possible. However, the authors of the Tanakh, the Bible, and the Koran evidently never had any contact with a transcendent being. The poor quality of the texts and the numerous errors, which I have discussed as examples, are proof of this.

#### 157. Summary: There are no beings without bodies

A human being can and will never have contact with a god, because all gods are merely objects of attribution by us humans. In general, I would like to emphasize that, for me, disembodied entities are a priori misconstructions of the human imagination. This is even more true when they impose different (!) and sometimes truly idiotic rules on us humans. There are definitely no beings without bodies! The idea of disembodied entities is simply pathological and disturbed.

#### 158. We must overcome God

- a) The idea of a single God as a real existence outside of the human world of thought, as a thesis refuted here, should therefore be overcome as quickly as possible by every human being in the interests of spiritual healing and maturation.
- b) Finally, I emphasize: It is high time that we humans evolve and stop calling the misconceptions of our imagination "God," and above all, stop following and paying attention to people who invoke "God." Because anyone who invokes (any) God in any context necessarily has no argument on their side.

#### 159. Thoughts on an Ethics Without God

- a) I would like to add some thoughts on questions of ethics without gods constructed by humans and, according to some religions, an afterlife administered by them, in which humans are rewarded or punished for their earthly actions and beliefs. I see myself, first and foremost, as a random manifestation of being that has not in any way chosen or earned its selfhood (actually, even a symbiotic biological we-ness, which I have discussed elsewhere). I could just as easily be a life form other than a human being. I also consider the idea of a superiority of a life form or even a specific human ethnicity to be fundamentally wrong. The culmination of this mental aberration is that

people assume that an incorporeal entity—and thus a contradiction in terms—a god—is supposed to be supreme over everything else. God is absolutely worthless because he stands in contrast to the existing, valuable, actual being!

b) Due to the random nature of my selfhood and indeed of all other human beings and other living beings, all of whom strive for happiness, I feel a certain connection with all living beings and fundamentally do not want to harm them, simply because they are here just as I am.

c) Furthermore, I recognize in nature not a system of superiority and subordination but a system of mutual dependence, based solely on the fact that most living beings need water, air, an appropriate temperature, food, and even light for their long-term survival. For this reason alone, that which is other than oneself, the environment, has a value necessary for general survival.

d) Humans in particular, who have separated themselves from the rest of nature through language and culture, who have the technical capabilities to destroy everything, and who have thus assumed a unique position among living beings, should become aware of the value of other beings. It is therefore important, in the interest of sustainable survival on Earth, to promote an appreciation for true being – rather than a misguided appreciation of incorporeal, only supposed entities – gods.

#### 160. We Perish with Gods

I'll even go so far: If human empathy isn't redirected away from polarizing, nonexistent fantasy figures—gods—toward what actually exists and is valuable, human civilization will surely perish quickly.

#### 161. We Must Purify Ourselves!

In the spirit of spiritual purification and healing, it is urgently necessary that such impure, misconstrued entities like those I have termed Kratochvil, Zapletal, and Pospischil be consigned to the garbage dump of human history and under no circumstances be referred to or worshipped as God. Supposed gods are, a priori, merely useless concepts created by humans.

#### 162. Summary: Gods Are Only Objects of Human Attribution

Gods were and are not independent, valuable beings, but always only objects to which humans arbitrarily attribute content. For me, this is a clearly proven fact, based on the considerations presented.

#### 163. Individual positive attributions by critical believers

- a) People, including believers, like to see themselves as critical thinkers. In my opinion, it is quite understandable in a religious context if believers distance themselves from the guidelines of the "official church", especially in their image of God, and develop their own more positive image.
- b) In my opinion, instead of an authoritarian image of God, many people develop more positive pantheistic thoughts in the direction that everything is God and therefore worthy of value. For me, however, the idea of the value of all existence via the detour of a god is not necessary. All existence has a value per se. God has no value.
- c) In the sense of my understanding of the nature of God, the critical believers here only take over the attribution of - more positive - content to their God themselves instead of the otherwise dominant priesthood. Even in the case of individual independent creation, the respective GOD remains A BLOSSOM OBJECT OF ASSIGNMENT BY PEOPLE, in this case by the respective believing person. This explains the countless very different images of God held by different people.

#### 164. Final thought for religious people: Why not be God yourself?

- a) If, as a believer, you allow yourself to deviate from the "official church" and shape God in a more positive way through your own attributions, why not allow yourself to be the highest authority - God?
- b) In any case, I have no doubt that all people, atheists, agnostics, and even religious people, ultimately only conduct inner dialogues with themselves.
- c) Even if religious people are ultimately the ones who decide what is right and what is wrong, they should admit that they themselves, not another supposedly higher being, are the highest authority for judgments of any kind. In fact, religious people themselves often actually have higher-quality thoughts and ethical standards than those of the supposed God who supposedly expressed himself in writings hundreds or even thousands of years ago. For me, this is simply based on the fact that the respective god at the time the scriptures were created only had thoughts from people of that time. People ascribed content to him long ago. Fortunately, we, and many religious people, have evolved.
- d) Everyone should take responsibility for themselves and, if possible, seek objective arguments for their respective judgments. Considering that every other person and every living being, like oneself, is a valuable, random manifestation of being, judgments should at least not encourage the exercise of violence against other people and other living beings.
- e) With regard to conflicts between people, it must be considered objectively that every person has experienced different imprints in their life, for which they cannot be held solely responsible. This applies even more to the randomly acquired genetic predispositions of every person.