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1. SCANDAL IS AMUSING

Both scandal and gossip have value. Each serves to amuse. A fair-to-middling cyclone may make front-page headlines and get a column write-up in the daily press—if the editor is short of more exciting copy. A good third-class scandal will get box-car headlines and plenty of space. And why not?

Not long ago newspapers were grabbing for every piece of copy they could get on the accusations of one set of dogs against another set of dogs. Men elected to high office by John Q. Public were being accused of war-time grafting. Little war lords were also being accused. Even high ranking generals were within vibratory reach of the breath-of scandal. And all of this would have paled into insignificance—newspapers would have doubled in size—and extras would have been printed, had someone produced a nice, juicy authentic story concerning some general who had ravished the wife—the beautiful wife—of some GI, and then had the soldier shot.

Of course, nothing like that happened. But its sequel happened once—only, instead of being just a common general, the adulterous one was a high and mighty king.

The story isn’t new to those who have read it. It’s safe to say that no great number of people living today have read the story. It can be found in a book which is reputedly a best-seller—and doubtless the least read. The title reads “Holy Bible.”

The Bible has never been barred from the United States mails. Less offensive material than much contained in the Bible has been barred from the mails. That material will not be found in this book. If, however, you have an authorized King James version, you might turn to Isaiah, the 36th chapter and the 13th verse. Read it and you may wonder why ministers are never inspired to open at random for sermon texts and light on that one.

Scientific sex is one thing; sexiness another. Those seeking a “sexy” story may find an abundance in the Bible. The modern rendition will no doubt be preferred. This book will give its readers the scientific and humanistic side of sex by comparing modern knowledge and humanistic principles with the often savage and near-aboriginal practices of so-called biblical days.

2. DAVID’S ADULTERY

The Bible explains, in the 11th chapter of Second Samuel, that when a year was expired kings went forth to battle. Obviously the object of the battle was loot, women and power. Such a practice would today be regarded as banditry. It seems that King David sent his commander and soldiers out to battle while he remained in Jerusalem.

After a nice long afternoon nap, doubtless so that he might be refreshed for the night, David arose from his bed (2 Sam. 11:2) and walked upon the roof of the king’s house. (He, himself, was king.) The roof must have been high enough to have been quite a vantage point with a commanding view of the settlement—or community—around about it. Evidently David did quite a bit of looking and was pleased
when his eyes fell on a beautiful woman "washing herself." David's action was something like the ancient version of the modern "Peeping Tom." David, however, did not peep. He spied. (Evidently the woman did not know that he was looking at her.)

Back in the time when historical records give us a chronology of the various dynasties, David and the clans of Jehovah were and are neglected. According to reputed practices in David's time, women were required to isolate themselves somewhat from other persons during their menstrual periods. When menstruation was over women were required to bathe before presenting themselves in "society." One can well imagine the "woman hours" which were lost to productive work by this practice. Had they but known of the modern sanitary napkin in those days!

Being pleased with what he saw, and being king and in a position to command, David inquired after the woman and learned that she was Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah—one of his soldiers. David "sent messengers and took her." She was "purified from her uncleanness" (her menstruation evidently) and so—David went to his bedroom and she "came in and lay with him." He then sent her away. Various biblical accounts indicate that this was by no means David's only adventure in adultery.

It happens to be a biological law that when male and female have sexual congress, a pregnancy may result. Thus, from all reports, David being a potent and fertile man, Bathsheba became pregnant. As is somewhat customary even today, she sent word to her seducer that she was pregnant.

Having plenty of wives and concubines, David was, perhaps, not averse to having more—but this woman had a husband and this woman's husband was out risking his neck or a spot below or beneath the fifth rib, while maiming, murdering and looting for his king. And the king's messengers knew of the king's adulterous act. They would hold their peace—but what about the woman? King David was in what we of today would call something of a pickle.

After carefully thinking matters out—and knowing that Bathsheba's pregnancy was not far gone—he did a gracious thing and sent word to Joab, his commander on the field of battle, saying "Send me Uriah, the Hittite."

The average soldier of today would, under similar circumstances, feel rather grateful for the furlough—and respite from the arduous duties of battle. This is perhaps the way Uriah felt—at first. But even the messengers of a king may have wagging tongues and somebody, somewhere, "ratted." Uriah knew what had been going on in his absence and why his king had sent for him. He knew, also, that if he went to his own house and slept with his wife he would be regarded as the father of any child born to his wife (and by his wife). Uriah respectfully reported to his king and the latter demanded of him information as to how Joab, the king's commander, did, and of how the people did, and how the war prospered. (The latter sounds much more like modern man than it does an aboriginal.)

After receiving Uriah's report David ordered him to go to his own house and "wash his feet." The king sent a mess of meat after him. But Uriah preferred staying at the door of the king's house and hearing the gossip (and truth, too, no doubt) of the king's servants. He remained away from his own house and made certain that there were plenty of witnesses to the fact.

One can imagine the pleasure it gave David's servants to convey to him the word that Uriah had remained with them in preference to visiting his beautiful wife. And David, disturbed, sent for Uriah. He wondered if Uriah had not been tired from his journey and why Uriah had kept away from his own house.
Uriah explained, "The ark, and Israel and Judah, abide in tents; and my lord, Joab, and the servants of my lord, are encamped in the open fields; shall I then go into mine house, to eat and to drink, and to lie with my wife; as thou livest and as my soul liveth I will not do this thing." Strong words.

David then had Uriah "tarry" a day and he sent and had Uriah come in where there was food and drink and he made Uriah drunk. After this, Uriah went to bed with David's servants, slept, and kept strictly away from his own house and Bathsheba, his beautiful wife.

Came the dawn and David busied himself writing a letter to General Joab.

### 3. THE LETTER AND HOW THE KING COMMITTED MANSLAUGHTER

Uriah was either too honest to read the letter written by his king, or was unable to read, or was an extra brave and valiant man. He took the letter written by his king to the commander, Joab, and, with his own hand, gave the letter to Joab.

In the letter David wrote: "Set ye Uriah in the forefront of the hottest battle and retire ye from him, that he may be smitten, and die."

A brave man among brave men—Uriah, the Hitite, died. Joab had observed the city and had assigned Uriah to a spot where he knew there were valiant men.

From the biblical account it would seem that Joab made quite a few errors of strategy and feared that word of these "boners," as military men of today call them, would reach the king. He, therefore, prepared a neat report for the king and gave excuses for the strategic errors, well knowing that David would see through these excuses. As a coup de grace, he reserved the one thing he knew the king would want to know about until the very last of the report—the fact that Uriah was dead.

After learning that Joab had acted well as his agent in special murder, David sent consoling word to Joab to let him know that he was so pleased with the death of Uriah that Joab's errors were as nothing. In war, David reasoned, all men take their chances. What David said to Joab was: "Let not this thing displease thee. The sword devoureth one as well as another."

When Bathsheba learned of the death of her husband, she "mourned" the regulation period, whatever time that was, and then went to David's house when he sent for her. She became his wife "and bare him a son." The mourning period and the time between a dead husband and a new living one must have compared favorably with many similar practices of today.

Nathan, the prophet, desiring a little ego expansion (as happens with modern ministers and others, and is quite natural and sometimes commendable) called to see David and told David a little story. Rendered into easier English, this is what Nathan said to David:

Two men, one rich and the other poor, lived in a city. The rich man had many flocks and herds and the poor man had but one little ewe lamb. He had bought the lamb and nourished it and it had grown up with him and with his children. This little lamb was somewhat strange as lambs go because it ate meat with the poor man and drank from the poor man's cup, and even though the poor man did have children, the lamb was like a daughter to him and lay on his bosom. And when a sojourner came along and stopped with the rich man instead of sending out for an animal from his own flocks, he had the poor man's lamb taken away from him and dressed for the stranger to eat.
Nathan’s story made old King David pretty mad, and being the law, David ordered the death of the rich man and the restoration of a lamb to the poor man. What a chuckle Nathan must have had when he told David that the little story represented what David had done to Uriah. He then explained just what Jehovah thought about the whole thing (which was just what Nathan wanted Jehovah to think) and enjoyed David's discomfort greatly. He reminded David of the curses to which he, David, was subject, and then (because he knew of David's power both as a king and as a warrior) he calmly explained, “The Lord hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die.”

All of which sounds greatly like the 20th century—and leads one to think, in jest, that old Doctor Wonmug has been playing the devil with his fantastic time machine. Men still do much the same as old King David did—women do as did Bathsheba—husbands even die, in a manner as did Uriah, and the priests come along and after scaring the hell out of the offenders—for reasons well known to themselves—forgive their sins and get everything fixed up with the Almighty.

4. HUMANISTIC ANALYSIS

The modern psychiatrist, psychoanalyst, psychologist, or humanist, with a clear knowledge and ability not besmudged by a theory of “sin,” would look upon David and others and all that they did as near-savages, and as bandits—mere babes in intellectuality. David and others were the products of their times and just as life on this planet evolved upward for ages running into calculus, David and those of his time (admitting that they even existed for the sake of theory) were links in the chain of humankind leading from antiquity to modernity. That we still have Davids and Nathans and others is neither because of the book entitled Holy Bible nor in spite of it.

Why should David be painted as an immoral imbecile just because he was polygamous and adulterous? It was a low trick, one penologists and criminologists of today would regard as dastardly criminal, for David to have Uriah killed—just because it was so easy to do so. The psychiatric viewpoint would cover David’s fear and would probably recognize in him something of what is known as paraphrenia expansiva—even though David was a powerful person without depending upon a paraphrenic imagination to suggest his power to him. Should one take the time to follow the extremely dull reading (Bible-fashion) covering more or less the life of David, it would be admitted that David had some reason for being expansive in his aberrations—even though, measured by modern psychometric methods, his personality was decidedly a psychopathic one.

Parents of today who are inclined to be religious-minded even though they have never read a dozen chapters in the Bible and have only some second-hand information or misinformation concerning it, often advocate that they would prefer having their children remain at home on Sunday and read the Bible than to have them going to Sunday shows, ball games, and attending numerous other healthful amusements (especially dancing) youngsters get such a healthy “kick” from. Such parents would rather see their children reading the Bible than see them reading the confession magazines and various novels—especially on Sunday.

Once a pious man who worked at his blacksmith shop all week and rendered excellent and honest service to his patrons, and rested on Sunday, yet never read the Bible, inherited a sizable family of step-children. This man of “goodness and kindness” disliked greatly for his stepdaughters of “courting age” to go out with young men to Sunday
theaters and other amusements. He wanted them to stay at home and read the Bible. The children paid little heed, but each week they heard the same lecture.

Then, one of the stepdaughters married. Her husband was in the twenties and rather mature. He admired the stepfather of his wife—and this admiration grew out of a number of reasons. One was that he was an excellent provider. Another was that he was a master craftsman. Another was that he did honest work for an honest price. The older man amused him with his weekly lecture to the girls about their *beaux*, Sunday amusements, reading the Bible, etc.

Being of a psychological turn of mind, this younger man purposely humored the whims of the stepfather-in-law. He agreed that the older man was right when he explained that reading the Bible could give infinitely greater pleasure than numerous of the amusements the older man disapproved. And then—

On a summer Sunday afternoon, when youth was being served in its own way, the stepson-in-law got out two dust-covered older versions of the Bible.

He suggested that he and Mr. S do responsive reading as Mr. S had suggested the youngsters should do. The younger man, P, selected the reading. In doing this he merely selected some of the actual sex stories of the Bible in their unadulterated (and unexplained) biblical form. Presently the older man became much confused. He must have realized that some of the reading was quite suggestive to young minds not trained in sex science and to whom sex education at home and in the schools had been denied. Himself a rather inhibited and modest man, he blushed to read of pure and unadulterated (only somewhat in-toxicated) rape on the part of God's favorites, and incest in a like category. The story of how a daughter-in-law used woman's "wiles" to seduce her father-in-law, a patriarch and as such one of God's Holy Men, not, however, above bargaining with harlots.

As told by P, several times during the reading which did not last overly long, Mr. S examined his Bible to make sure he was not being hoodwinked. At times he spluttered while P actually read both parts—the lead of Mr. S, and P's response.

During a pause P suggested that he was thoroughly in sympathy (which, of course, he was not) with the ideas of Mr. S concerning the way young people should spend the Sabbath. P further suggested that he believed he could persuade the young couples and perhaps a few others to gather at the S home on the following Sunday for Bible reading and offered to lead or teach them.

They read further. Mr. S kept examining his Bible (an old one and one not readily mistaken for another), and eventually announced that he had never known the Bible contained such stories.

P suggested that it was good for young people in groups, and especially when older persons of both sexes were present, to study this hidden angle of the Bible.

Such was beyond the comprehension of Mr. S.

P commented at length upon those "good lectures" Mr. S had been delivering as a weekly routine. The youngsters would wonder what could be wrong were the lectures suddenly discontinued. And—being kindly disposed and of an accommodating nature—P made a generous gesture in offering to explain the matter to the youngsters but only in the presence of Mr. S, because P did not regard it as quite propitious otherwise.

The kindly-disposed and extremely uncomfortable fatherly gentleman begged that the whole matter be forgotten.

Bibles returned to their repose, dust-collecting; and their purposes as records of family births, deaths and marriages.
5. THE FATE OF ONAN

Peoples of all times have had customs peculiar to clans, tribes, and races. According to legend there was a family or tribal custom in biblical times, and among certain (probably all) Hebrews, that when a woman was widowed she was to become the wife of a brother of the dead husband.

Judah was the ruler or patriarch of a considerable tribe and he was apparently a man greatly favored by Jehovah. Judah took a wife for his first born son whose name was Er. The wife's name was Tamar. The Lord got on a rampage, judged Er to be a wicked man, and slew him, according to Genesis 38:7. Judah then sent his son Onan in to Tamar, telling him, "Go in unto thy brother's wife and marry her, and raise up seed of thy brother."

Onan apparently did not fancy the idea but he dared not disrespect his father's wishes altogether. It is just possible that Tamar did not appeal greatly to Onan. It happens in this day and time that not every man appeals to a woman and that not every woman appeals to a man. There seems to be such a thing as a desire, at least, for personal choice.

Onan obediently went in, and, using the story as a hypothesis, gave the world a much-indulged practice which is highly prevalent today. Moderns call the practice coitus interruptus. It has been called Onanism. And Onanism is a term which has likewise been applied to masturbation (also known as pollution and by the better and more applicable term, self-gratification), and to various means aimed at parenthood control.

The biblical report states that when Onan went in to marry and have sexual congress with Tamar, he knew that the seed should not be his. The Bible states that he spilled "it" on the ground. Modern interpretation is that the "it" referred to as seed is what today is called semen.

Onan's act displeased the Lord and so, the Lord slew him also. One might think that Judah would have, by the time the Lord had slain two of his sons, been a little fed up with the whole affair—but he appears to have gone about his business calmly, taking some precaution, however, for his son Shelah, who was still quite young.

Evidently Judah felt that Tamar had something to do with the slayings of his sons because he advised her to remain a widow in her own father's house until Shelah should be grown, "lest peradventure Shelah die also as his brethren did."

As advised, Tamar went to her own father's house and remained a widow.

6. PLAYING THE HARLOT

Time passed and Shelah grew up. To Tamar he appeared to be fully capable of acting the part of a husband. Perhaps Judah was still a little concerned—fearful of what the Lord might do to Shelah should Shelah bungle the job of husbandry. Possibly he was occupied with other matters and had let his widowed daughter-in-law slip somewhat from his memory. During the time of Shelah's growing Judah's wife died. He had reached an age and acquired power to the end that had
he so desired he might readily have had any eligible woman as a wife. He was still a widower, however, and planned to take his men to the mountains to shear sheep.

Word reached Tamar that Judah was preparing to go to the mountains. She was well aware of the road by which Judah would travel and being tired of the garments of widowhood, she put these aside and wrapped herself with a garment and put on the veil which seems to have been a part of the costume of harlots (more appropriately called prostitutes today), and went and sat by the wayside.

It is easy to understand Tamar’s insight and the fact that she knew her father-in-law’s nature. She knew that others would not dare supersede Judah in bargaining with her. And so, she sat in an open place and waited.

When Judah approached he observed that Tamar wore the veil of the harlot, and, not knowing that she was his daughter-in-law, he bargained to go in and lie with her. She merely asked what he would give. Doubtless she wanted no material remuneration. Judah offered a kid from his flocks. It was then that shrewdly (or luckily) Tamar sought a pledge that Judah would send the kid as promised. No doubt she merely wanted to make the matter appear businesslike to Judah and to impress him that she was not an amateur. Judah readily complied by giving as a pledge his signet, his bracelets and his staff. The biblical reading, Genesis 38:18, is: “And he gave it to her, and came in unto her, and she conceived by him.”

Evidently pleased with herself Tamar arose and went her way and put away the veil with which she had played the harlot and donned again the raiment of widowhood.

Judah sent the kid—but his friend who carried the kid could not find the harlot. His inquiries brought protests from the men of the place where Tamar had waited for Judah that there had been no harlot there. Judah decided to let the harlot keep his pledge. Assuredly he had kept his part of the bargain. He said, concerning his pledge, “Let her take it to her lest we be shamed.”

Temporarily, at least, the whole affair slipped from the mind of Judah.

7. A HARSH JUDGMENT

Gossip had a way of getting breathed about as far back as several hundred centuries ago. Modern means of communication do not appear to have increased the certainty of gossip being spread. Just as soon as Tamar began shouting up, as pregnant women have a way of doing, the gossips got busy and wagged their tongues and word reached Judah. The way the story has been set down the gossips told Judah, “Tamar, thy daughter-in-law, hath played the harlot; also behold, she is with child by whoredom.” Judah commanded that Tamar be brought forth and burnt.

It seems strange that such an austere man had no apparent thought of anyone being burned when he was bargaining for the privilege of possibly making Tamar pregnant—nor later, especially when he “went in unto her and lay with her.” The old fellow must have been rather sadly humiliated when Tamar produced his pledge, articles beyond a doubt familiar to all who saw them, and gently stated: “By the man to whom these belong am I with child.”

Judah was rather magnanimous. Instead of having Tamar burnt he merely had her led away. And to appease the whole matter he “knew” her no more. In modern language it would be said that he had no further sexual relations with her.
8. MODERN CONCEPTS

In the United States today some 50 million people have their names inscribed on the rolls of some church. By no means are all of these names those of mature adults. It seems a good guess that two-thirds of these names represent children. A large proportion of the remaining third are child-like adults. Some who are actually regarded as adults solemnly profess to believe the Bible and all that is in it. Many fanatics regard it as a sin to misread one word of the Bible. They profess to believe every word of it. This is indeed a sad state of affairs. But with it there is a sort of redeeming grace, and it is that practically none of those who profess have read the Bible. Most of those who profess the loudest and who, perhaps, attempt to read the most, are poor readers and make little of what they read. Many of them haven't the slightest idea of pronunciation of biblical terms and names. Many, indeed, have a poor idea of the pronunciation of their native, or even adopted, tongues. Men and women donate large sums to the shrines erected to what the Bible is believed to represent—and millions of dollars to the “conversion of foreign pagans.” Some of them join “reform” organizations and go about preaching their own particular brand of ignorance and superstition. Some of them become censors. They are unfamiliar with the so-called stories of smut contained in the Bible, nor are they aware of the fact that the Bible is rich in four-letter words not infrequently banned from polite conversation and often banned from the mails if appearing in certain books other than the Bible.

Should that which occurred to Judah and Tamar occur today it would have greater value as gossip than as anything pertaining to moralistic concepts. Prostitution has been called the oldest profession, and men have consorted with prostitutes since the beginning of history—or before. Had Judah and Tamar desired sexual relations—their desires should have been their own affair. The practice of having a woman in Tamar’s position burned was a brutal one. Women are not burned under similar circumstances in modern civilization.

Compared to modern glamorized scandal these old scandals from the Bible are sordid and dull. It is not our purpose here to glamorize them. Nor is it our purpose to ridicule the Bible. It is our purpose to incite people to think. And would it not be well if those people who go about advising others to “read the Bible,” should themselves become interested enough to follow the advice they so freely give?

9. THE CRY OF RAPE

Rape, in the sexual sense, is regarded as the sexual violation of a woman. One popular and authoritative dictionary defines rape as “the violation of a woman without her consent.” This seems to be a strange definition. How can a consenting woman be violated?

It has been contended, and frequently at that, that were the sexes so constituted as to permit it, man would be raped more often than woman. It is well known that woman is often pleased with man’s advances and not only invites but seeks sexual congress with man. It is likewise well known that woman has often consented only to change her
mind if surprised in the act—and in the latter event—cried rape. Men have been sent to prison in such cases. And it is quite likely that no one in particular set the original pattern. A pattern is, however, to be found in the Bible.

Genesis 39 gives a good example of this. Potiphar was a captain of the Egyptian guards—an officer of the Pharaoh and reputedly a eunuch. No statement as to his eunuchism, however, is to be found in Genesis 39, which concerns other matters.

According to the chapter Joseph had been made the practical master of Potiphar’s house. He was well favored—so the story goes—and the “favor” may be regarded as something general. He kept an account of the business matters of his master and his master was well pleased.

In modern terminology, Potiphar’s wife got a crush on Joseph. And why not? He must have been handsome—he was well favored. Anyway, the master’s wife “cast her eyes on Joseph, and said, ‘Lie with me.’” The expression meant that she desired sexual relations with Joseph and about the meaning there can be no doubt. Men were apparently quite fertile in those days and when they “lay” with women, women conceived and bare children. Joseph refused and bragged about having such a high position with Potiphar. He boasted about the authority over all that was Potiphar’s except his wife. Why should he want the mere wife of his master? One of Joseph’s boasts was, “There is none greater in this house than I.” This must have included his master’s wife. Joseph asked how could he do this “great wickedness and sin against God?” Men in God’s favor of that day and time, it is to be observed, when they found an actually desirous and desirable woman, acted as though God were thus favoring them and took advantage of the opportunity. They served their own desires first and settled with God later. Doubtless Joseph either was not interested in Potiphar’s wife or he feared losing all of the material good things which were his to possess.

Day by day Potiphar’s wife spoke to Joseph and entreated him for his favor—but he heartened not. Finally, the woman became exasperated and took hold of Joseph’s garment (the rendition is singular) and repeated her request. Joseph left his garment in her hand and fled. The woman then called in the men of her house and told them: “He came unto me to lie with me and I cried with a loud voice.” She reported that Joseph had left his garment with her and that he had run away. She put the garment away to show to her husband to whom she repeated her story. Joseph landed in prison.

The modern sisters of Potiphar’s wife, who have never read or even heard of the biblical story, have repeated her antics and tactics. It is probable that were truth known concerning all of the “false cries” of rape, prison doors would open and many men who were innocent of rape and in instances too numerous to mention incapable of it, would walk out into the free air of the outside world.

The story as recorded in the Bible is scandalous. It is scandalous not only when it is repeated today—but that it is repeated at all. That is—in action. It would be scandalous were it not repeated now and then in words to remind humanity of what it does to itself—and of what it did back in the ages presumed by many to have been the golden age or the law of perfect morals.

10. CIRCUMCISION AND TWO MEAN TRICKS

The Bible legend has it that somewhere far back along the chain of a civilization which waited thousands of years to dawn, a young lady “went out to see the daughters of the land.” Just what her purpose was other than to see is not clear. Instead of daughters, she encountered a
son of the land—a royal prince—no less. The daughter or fair maiden who went out to see the daughters, was Dinah, borne by Leah unto Jacob. The prince was Shechem—son of Hamor, the Hivite.

The Hivites were an uncircumcised people. Dinah’s tribe were of the circumcised. The legend says that Prince Shechem saw Dinah, took her and “lay” with her, and defiled her. There is no explanation of what constituted the defilement. Anyway, he loved the damsel and spoke kindly to her. (Strange? It must have been a somewhat unusual practice in the day of morals to end all morals.) Shechem told his father, “Get me this damsel to wife.” The matter of getting wives must often have been like modern man asking a friend to stop at the drug store and pick him up a package of cigarettes.

Dinah’s brothers were pretty sore about the thing although they did not accuse Shechem of rape. They did accuse him of dealing with their sister as with an harlot.

Scheming had its inception and Hamor and Shechem planned to get possession of the cattle, herds and possessions of Jacob and his sons. Jacob and his sons had plans, likewise, to get possession of Hamor’s and Shechem’s wealth—and women.

The Jacobians made much ado over Shechem’s treatment of their daughter and sister. Shechem had wrought folly in Israel—“Which thing ought not to be done.”

The Jacobians considered an offer of the Hamorians. Hamor offered to let Jacob, et al., dwell and trade in his land and to permit Jacob and his tribe to take wives from among the Hivite women of Hamor—in exchange for similar favors.

Jacob and his sons finally agreed on the grounds that the Hivites must be circumcised. Hamor agreed and told his men that what they would gain in return for sacrificing a little bit of foreskin would be great. He reasoned, “Shall not their cattle and their substance and every beast of theirs be ours?” And so, the Hivites were circumcised.

The sons of Jacob calculated coolly and knew that by the third day the Hivites would be sore and not much in fighting trim. They bided their time and on the third day fell upon Hamor’s city and slew all the males. They slew Hamor and Shechem with their swords and took Dinah from the house of Shechem. They took the wealth and women and little ones (girls—all of the males had been slain) and spoiled whatever they could not take with them and readily appropriate to their use.

Jacob appears to have had nothing in particular to do with the acts of his sons although he doubtless did not hate gain. He did feel that he might be blamed and he accused his sons of making him “stink” with various tribes. The answer of the sons was: “Should he deal with our sister as with a harlot?”

Neither Jacob nor his sons seemed to think of how they were dealing with the Hivite women—the women of Hamor and Shechem.

There are people like Jacob and his sons and Hamor and his son today. They find it easy to justify themselves and to blame others but they can hardly be accused of having taken their pattern from the Bible. It is a book unfamiliar to the great masses of people and is apparently less read among professed religionists than among Freethinkers who, being unbiased in matters which have to do with the study of mankind, are by no means averse to reading the Bible.

11. FATHER AND DAUGHTERS

Many have heard something about the story of Lot. Many who have heard about the story have never read it. It is certainly best to treat the story as legendary.
Angels are legendary except as figures of speech. Biblical reports speak often of angels who were supposed to have appeared often on earth in the dark and distant past. Has anyone ever gone about explaining why angels suddenly ceased to appear on earth? Or, for that matter, why God disappeared so many years ago—and stopped visiting the earth in person?

Let's consider the legend of Lot a story anyway. According to the story two angels went one night to Lot's house. In fact, they did not go directly to Lot's house but encountered Lot at the gates of the city. Lot insisted that they go to his house and they insisted on spending the night in the streets. Lot finally persuaded them and made a feast for them. (Angels are strange. Some eat and some don't. Some have wings and some walk. No wonder mankind understands devils better.) After the feast, and presumably before bedtime, a crowd gathered outside Lot's house. They called to Lot and asked where the men who had gone to his house earlier were, and said, "Bring them out unto us that we may know them." According to the biblical use of the word, know, that crowd certainly did not want to get acquainted with the angels. They wanted to know them and it is perhaps from this legend that we now have a legal term—regarded in law as felonious—Sodomy. (The scene of the legend was Sodom.) A popular medical dictionary defines sodomy as: "Unnatural sexual relations between persons of the same sex, especially males, or between a beast and a human."

Lot understood just what was meant, for he termed it "wickedness." Listen to what Lot said to the gang: "I pray you, brethren, do not so wickedly." It is notable that Lot addressed them as brethren. And then, Lot made a suggestion which, perhaps to him, did not seem in the least wicked: "Behold now I have two daughters which have not known man; let me, I pray you, bring them out unto you, and do ye to them as is good in your eyes; only unto these men do nothing; for therefore came they under the shadow of my roof."

Even a large group of sodomists would, it seems, have found it good in their eyes to know virgin women. However, they still demanded the men.

If strange things happen today it seems that stranger things are said to have happened thousands of years ago and no doubt this is true because a great evolutionary process was going on in Nature. The story of Lot is strange reading indeed.

There are those today who rant about the Bible being such a masterpiece of literature. Literature? Maybe. But if those who thus rant mean that the Bible is literary, then read this disconnected material from Genesis. Beginning at the 19th chapter and the 24th verse, the King James version reads: "Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven; (25) And he overthrew those cities and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground. (26) But his wife looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt."

If there is anything literary about that—anything is literary. It is understood that the 26th verse refers to Lot's wife, but it reads as though it was the Lord's.

After Lot had escaped from Sodom, the legend tells us that he went eventually with his two daughters to live in a cave. The daughters seem to have conspired to no longer remain virgins. The story has been told many times and needs but brief reference here. The daughters are supposed to have made Lot drunk and to have "seduced" him while he was drunk in order to "raise seed to him." The Bible states that he neither perceived when each lay down with him nor when she left.

Ask any prostitute and she can tell you how incapable a man is of performing sexual intercourse when he is so drunk that he does not even know he is with a woman.
Lot made his daughters pregnant and there does not appear to have been any divine disapproval of the incestuous relationship.

There is nothing in the sexual side of the story here depicted which could not be told to quite young children and with all propriety by a person capable of giving the children the right kind of instruction. On the other hand, as rendered by the Bible—the terminology is vague, yet not too vague for pre-adolescents to understand. They look upon such a story as given in the Bible as “cloaked,” and naturally when un instructed see the vulgar side of sex therein. It is for just this reason that some of the breeze-like sexy stories and motion pictures of a similar brand afford cleaner and healthier amusement for youngsters than does the Bible.

12. BROTHER-SISTER—HUSBAND-WIFE

Like Father, Like Son

Moderns have an aversion to incestuous marriages. In biblical times brother-sister marriages were quite common. The biblical legend records that Abraham, one of God’s favorites, married his half sister, Sarah. It appears that there were more half-brothers and half-sisters in those days than those of a full relationship. Men of power had numerous wives and many concubines.

There came a time when Abraham and Sarah went for a journey in a strange country. Abraham was of the opinion that Sarah was of such physical charm as not to be despised by a man of power and supererogism. He was also aware of the fact that few, if any, rulers had any more scruples against disposing of an unwanted husband, than did King David when he arranged neatly for the murder of Uriah. As would be said today, Abraham and Sarah made it up between them to deny their marital relationship and to tell the truth—that Sarah was Abra ham’s sister.

When Abraham and Sarah came to the land of King Abimelech, the king saw Sarah and “sent out and took her.”

The story goes that before having sexual relations with Sarah the king had a dream in which God told him that he might have relations with Sarah but that he would be as a dead man, meaning that Sarah would not respond in the least because of the fact that she had a husband who pleased her.

As was usual, Abimelech made his excuses to God and explained quite thoroughly that he was innocent of any wrong because he had been told by Abraham, himself, that Sarah was his sister. Of course, it had been bruited about that God saw and knew everything, but it is highly probable that Abimelech hadn’t heard about that yet. And so he made a thorough explanation.

Even today one can turn on the radio almost any Sunday morning and hear some preacher saying, “O Lord, God Almighty, Father Omnipotent and Omniscent, we know that thou knowest all things—even before they happen, but—and then they go ahead and tell God all about it. It is to be doubted that they have any idea of the words omnipotent and omniscient—two words which are false to the core.

After Abimelech had made peace with God according to Abimelech’s own ideas, he explained his dream to his servants and the members of his household. He rebuked Abraham after a manner, yet gave him a considerable amount of wealth in sheep, oxen, and menservants and womenservants—and a thousand pieces of silver. In explaining about the silver to Sarah, he referred to Abraham as her
brother (Gen. 20:16), and his giving of the silver was meant as a re-
buke to Sarah.

Later, Isaac, son of Abraham, took a wife who was the daughter of his father's brother. This wife, Rebekah, the legend explains was a woman of beauty. When she and Isaac journeyed into a strange land, (he also happened unto the land of old Abimelech), men asked him concerning his wife and Isaac followed his father's tactics and claimed Rebekah as his sister. After a long time old King Abimelech of the Philistines looked out at a window and saw Isaac "sporting" with Rebekah. He decided that surely Rebekah was Isaac's wife and sent for Isaac and demanded a confirmation. Perhaps Rebekah appealed to Abimelech, but he wanted no more dreams and hard bargains with God. Isaac admitted that Rebekah was his wife and received Abimelech's blessing. Abimelech made Isaac and his wife welcome and Isaac sowed in the land of Abimelech of the Philistines and reaped in the same year "an hundredfold." Even in that legendary age wealth was a req-
quisite to greatness in certain persons and Isaac "waxed great and went forward, and grew until he became very great; for he had possession of flocks, and possession of herds and great store of servants; and the Philistines envied him."

As they appear in the Bible these stories are practically pointless and senseless. They do seem to show in a way that in man's invention of sin, he overlooked in those biblical versions to include incest in the category although moralists, pseudo-moralists and self-styled reformers of modernity have branded incest as one of the terrible sins.

The stories involve a pattern often followed today—even by persons who have never heard of these biblical stories. The legend does not ex-
plain what the "people" thought of those affairs. Under similar circum-
stances today gossips would impute chicanery to the man in Abimelech's position—that is, a man of wealth, power and influence—and would re-
gard any such settlement as Abimelech made in the case as evidence of a little "affair" between the parties involved. And, except in the case of a frame-up between man and wife, this would, doubtless, be true.

When one reads history, the authenticity of which has been ex-
amined into at great labor and expense, and then compares present civilization and its practices in various categories, well knowing that those compared do not know enough about the Bible to use it as a pat-
tern, it may be readily believed that (1) there has been a lot of boon-
dogling in the interpretation of the Bible, and (2) that many of the Bible stories have been based upon the conduct of the human family as of a date much later than the date ascribed.

The earliest historical records go back to some 6,000 years ago. These pertain to the civilization of that time in Egypt and Mesopotamia. His-
torical dates up to 1580 B.C., it is generally agreed, are the nearest ap-
proximation. From 1580 B.C. onward, chronology is regarded as being within a year or two of correctness—a matter historians regard as not being worthy of serious dispute. These historical records give data on the "Pharaohs" of Egypt—yet nothing indicates evidence in support even of biblical veracity.

It is in order to explain that the Christian answers that his Bible is the New Testament, and his religion is based on the teachings of Christ. He finds it convenient to forget that Christ constantly referred to the "scriptures," and that matters were so arranged that the Old Testament prophets prophesied the "Coming of Christ."

13. THE ONE HE LOVED

Some of the so-called sexual scandals of the Old Testament were side-
stepped in the New Testament. History gives no hint of the authenticity
of the "happenings" recorded in either of the testaments. Jesus was supposed to be God, and somewhere along the way the two of them picked up the Holy Ghost. By some freakish twist the three of them appear to have become mixed into one.

Legend says that Christ was God and that both were perfect. One may well ask, Perfect what? God slew and murdered at will and will seems to have been ad lib. There was no end to his slaughter—even when he killed the firstborn of Egypt. It hasn't ever been explained why One who knew everything and was everywhere at once had to have the Israelites smear their premises with the blood of animals (Feast of the Passover) in order that God might distinguish the Israelites from the Egyptians—but how can anyone explain an unintelligible conglomeration of gibberish? Through hundreds of years men of like minds put the gibberish together and it is for the reason that it represents human thought thereby offering a possible link in man's mental and social evolution that it is of interest.

Long before the time of Christ, that which we of today refer to as homosexuality, was known and practiced. This was, of course, seen in the story of Lot and the references to Sodom and sodomy. A reference will likewise be found in Leviticus 19:22, which reads: "Thou shalt not lie with mankind as with womankind: it is an abomination."

Any Christian will tell you that Christ (now dead if there was such a person) loves you. Christians will likewise explain that Jesus loved everybody. It causes one to see in a passage of scripture a strange penchant. The passage is John 21:20, and reads: "Then Peter turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on his breast at supper."

The rational person is led to recall an admonition ascribed to Jesus: "Let him who hath eyes, see and him that hath ears, hear."

The person of vision, when hearing the reference, "the good book says thus and so," and who has really read THE BOOK (the Bible) cannot be blamed for asking: "What's good about it?"

14. COMPARATIVE HUMANOLOGY

Humanology is the science which studies humans—and humans as persons and the science which treats of this study is known as personology. When we speak of persons as being human, however, we mean, as a rule—humane or kind.

It is true that we have our "scandals today." And it is true that but the faintest glimmering of the scandals of the Bible has been covered in preceding chapters of this book. It is equally true that even the misguided of today who believe that they derive their sense of moral values from the teachings of a book which has no authenticity in fact or in history, do not advocate inscribing our "modern scandals" in a book and offering it as a guide for generations who may live hundreds of centuries hence.

Staunch Christians and deistic believers of today laugh at old Greek, Roman and other mythology. Such mythology, they say, was pure heathenism—paganism. There never were—these people will tell you—all of the gods the old Romans, Greeks, Egyptians and others taught concerning. They know that they have the last word.

People who advocate the reading of the Bible either do but little reading of it or have no idea of the meaning of what they read when they read it.

Recently, at a community meeting which was not supposed to have anything to do with religion or religious ceremonies, a "devotional" was held. A woman whose actual schooling was probably the equivalent to
the fourth grade, was called upon to lead the devotional. She arose and stated that she felt that the hand that opened the Bible should be guided by God, and so—she opened her Bible at random—explaining, meanwhile, that she would read the chapter her "guided" hand opened at—and it happened that the chapter was a "begat." The woman solemnly read, or tried to read, the chapter which consisted of So and So begat So and So and So and So, begat So and So—through—ad nauseum. She was unable to pronounce the names so that one listening could have made sense of them. When she finished she felt much inspired by the reading and prayed, thanking God for having inspired the opening of his blessed book at such an inspiring chapter. The majority of those present quite approved and so, among them, there was mutuality.

One may well say, "Let these children have their consolation." It is unfortunate that many of these same children are not willing to permit others to have their consolation. As an example, among this particular clan, members made an agreement to "spy" on other members of the community. Action was to be taken to humiliate everyone possible not conforming to the brand of religion by which the clan "claimed" to live.

When some person was found doing anything other than ordinary chores on Sunday that person was visited by various members of the clan and each sought to convince the offending person that he or she was doing a great wrong and committing a great sin. The conspiracy against humanity failed to gain great headway.

The folklore of the community was rich in so-called sexual scandals. A girl who had led the B.Y.P.U. happened to get pregnant outside of wedlock—and she was thoroughly ostracized. "None of the great forgiveness babbled about so much was even thought of by any of the ostracizers and persecutors." They did not want their own daughters to even speak to this "hussy." One of the leaders was the mother of a recalcitrant child which she conceived in extra-marital relations. Fortunately for the ostracized one, she found greater consolation and joy in her child than she had ever dreamed of finding in the dreary B.Y.P.U. basement.

Scandal is unknown among primitive tribes of today. It was, no doubt, unknown among primitive tribes of the most ancient times. According to the time in which old King David was supposed to have lived, adultery was common enough. As a rule kings appropriated women whom they desired to themselves, regardless. Bathsheba, we may reason, submitted to David through either desire or fear. Old David's method of disposing of Uriah, Bathsheba's husband, would be regarded as repulsive—a blow below the belt—by decent-minded so-called criminals of today. According to theology, however, David was a king by divine right. And no matter what David did, he redeemed himself by "repenting and asking God for forgiveness." Persons entirely ignorant of the contents of the Bible gladly and quickly swallow the "repentance and forgiveness" theory.

A freethinking woman with rational views would have been greatly amused had she been, in a manner, in the "same boat" as two women the writer heard conversing in a hospital ward.

One of the women was a Catholic, the other a Protestant. Both had been operated on in order to save them from the results of personally attempted abortions.

Said the Catholic woman: "How I envy you. All you have to do is to repent and pray for forgiveness and everything concerning your act is over. But me—I've got to confess and do penance—and heaven only knows what that penance will be."

Said the Protestant woman: "I'm glad I'm not a Catholic and have the right to take my troubles straight to Jesus. I've already repented and asked forgiveness and I feel assured that my blessed Lord has forgiven me. All I'm worried about now is getting well and out of here."
Lot's incest with his daughters has been repeated countless times since Lot's time. It would seem that the worst thing about such affairs is the fact that known incest brings social ostracism, and robs the daughters of the happiness they might otherwise enjoy with suitable husbands.

As to Abraham and Sarah—they were apparently satisfied. So have other brothers and sisters been likewise satisfied. Who should be concerned about such relationship—and why? Rarely do such relationships contribute to the betterment of humanity and a heritage for posterity. It is unfair for those practicing such relationships to bring children into being who may have to suffer ostracism and humiliation because society frowns on incestuous relationships.

Those who "know their Bible" will recall that Sarah was barren until the Lord came along many years after she had supposedly passed the change of life and made her pregnant.

If Tamar wanted sexual relations with her father-in-law, and especially, herself being a widow, that was her own affair. The scandal of such matters in ancient days was that Judah, the father-in-law who "lay" with her, could have ordered her killed. Tamar was in no way related to Judah by blood.

When various sexual relations outside marriage occur, and the participants keep the matter to themselves and are not caught, nothing (if pregnancy is avoided) comes of it. The world goes its way—humanity goes about in its own way of living—undisturbed. But let knowledge of "clandestine sexual relations" be found out, and the breath of scandal waxes hot. Who are the actual offenders? Scandalmongers incite murder. Of course, there are people who enjoy murder—just so long as they are not the victims—either of murder, or the possible consequences to the murderer. How many people do you know who do not enjoy scandal?

Judging the scandalous affairs of the Bible how can modern man advocate the Bible as a guide by which to live? And considering that the Bible and those who profess to follow its teachings have subjugated woman—have held her in bondage and in submission to man's will for thousands of years—how can woman even tolerate the Bible and its supposed adherents who, figuratively, delight in seeing woman bound in chains—subject entirely to the will of man? How would woman accept the biblical test for jealousy? There can be no doubt but that it was an exceedingly bitter dose. It was supposed to make the belly of the guilty to swell and her thighs to rot. In these modern times any sane person knows that such a test would have a like effect upon all who were compelled to take it. Any difference would be in the degree of severity. Occasionally there might be immunity which would signify nothing as to sexual faithfulness or sexual faithlessness.

What was this test? How was it administered? On what grounds could it be brought about?

15. BITTER WATER—BIBLICAL TEST FOR SEXUALLY FAITHLESS WIVES

The biblical bitter water test for sexually faithless wives would be easier to read were it rendered into modern English. Because of the significance of its unfairness, it is given as it appears in the King James version of the Bible. It begins with the 11th verse of the 5th chapter of Numbers:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, if any man's wife go aside, and commit a trespass against him, and a man lie with her carnally,
and it be hid from the eyes of her husband, and be kept close, and she be defiled, and there be no witness against her, neither she be taken with the manner; and the spirit of jealousy come upon him, and he be jealous of his wife, and she be defiled; or if the spirit of jealousy come upon him, and he be jealous of his wife, and she be not defiled; then shall the man bring his wife unto the priest, and he shall bring her offering for her, the 10th part of an ephah of barley meal; he shall pour no oil upon it, nor put frankincense thereon; for it is an offering of jealousy, an offering of memorial, bringing iniquity to remembrance. And the priest shall bring her near and set her before the Lord; and the priest shall take holy water in an earthen vessel; and of the dust that is in the floor of the tabernacle the priest shall take and put it into the water: and the priest shall set the woman before the Lord, and uncover the woman’s head, and put the offering of memorial in her hand, which is a jealousy offering; and the priest shall have in his hand the bitter water which causeth the curse: and the priest shall charge her by an oath, and say unto the woman, if no man hath lain with thee, and if thou hast not gone aside to uncleanness with another instead of thy husband, be thou free from this bitter water that causeth the curse: But if thou hast gone aside to another instead of thy husband, and if you be defiled, and some man hath lain with thee besides thy husband: then the priest shall charge the woman with an oath of cursing, and the priest shall say unto the woman, the Lord make thee a curse and an oath among thy people, when the Lord doth make thy thigh to rot, and thy belly to swell; and this water that causeth the curse shall go into thy bowels, to make thy belly to swell, and thy thigh to rot; and the woman shall say, Amen, amen. And the priest shall write these curses in a book, and he shall blot them out with the bitter water: and he shall cause the woman to drink the bitter water that causeth the curse: And the water that causeth the curse shall enter into her, and become bitter. Then the priest shall take the jealousy offering out of the woman’s hand, and shall wave the offering before the Lord, and offer it upon the altar: and the priest shall take an handful of the offering, even the memorial thereof, and burn it upon the altar, and afterwards shall cause the woman to drink the water. And when he hath made her to drink the water, then it shall come to pass, that, if she be defiled, and have done trespass against her husband, that the water that causeth the curse shall enter into her, and become bitter, and her belly shall swell and her thigh shall rot: and the woman shall be a curse among her people. And if the woman be not defiled, but be clean, then she shall be free, and shall conceive seed. This is the law of jealousies, when a wife goeth aside to another instead of her husband, and is defiled; or when the spirit of jealousy cometh upon him, and he be jealous over his wife, and shall set the woman before the Lord, and the priest shall execute upon her all this law. Then shall the man be guiltless from iniquity, and this woman shall bear her iniquity.”

*********

The whole quotation is a garbled mess of nonsensical repetition, yet it conveys the general idea and it is likely that the intelligent woman of modernity can read it and deduce its implications without feeling resentment. And this in spite of the fact that women unhesitatingly state that the commandment or whatever it was supposed to be does not apply to them.

No one of common sense needs to be a physician in order to at once realize the fact that a nauseous draught will have a similar effect upon women and men alike regardless of their "guilt" in certain matters, or
their "innocence." Now and then a person with healthy "insides" may be more or less immune to the damaging and nauseous effects of an otherwise poisonous concoction.

The vague and more or less unintelligible language of the passage leaves a great deal to the power of deduction. It does not make it clear to all whether the "holy water with dust from the floor" constituted the bitter water, or whether this was used in addition to some other concoction.

The modern woman is not incensed so much at the dose as because of a suggestion that woman be subjected to such indignity.

When the above passage is read to a group of women or by a member of a group of women—few women register anything more than either boredom or inattention. But if the passage is handed to a woman privately and she agrees to read it—either silently or aloud—her resentment will be plainly evident—and this will be true even though the woman be a fanatical religionist.

Such a test tells nothing, and some of our modern "truth serum" treatments and "lie detector" devices tell little more.

Women are quick to observe that according to the practices advocated in the legend—a husband had merely to be suspicious, in order to have the test invoked. Women observe also that man was not subjected to any corresponding test.

Fortunately for humanity many persons who believe themselves to be devoutly religious, take their religion in but occasional and minimal doses—and then with plenty of salt. There is consolation in a realization of the truth of this—otherwise, the most demonistic humans alive or who have ever lived, have failed in constructing their pictures of a "hell after death," by comparison to the hell there would be right now throughout the world. The old Inquisition of the Roman Catholic Church and the practices of various religious sects including the Protestants of burning heretics at the stake were tame by comparison to what we would have today except for the good people who, humoring tradition, have a faint idea that they are religious and that they perhaps believe a great deal concerning which they know practically nothing, and for which, in actuality, they care less.

Parents of the present are inflicting far less religious perversity on their children than did parents of a generation ago inflict upon theirs. Still another generation will see still greater improvement.

It is strange, however, that living among us today, there are large numbers of superstitious men who may be easily led to believe that a certain shot, medicine, pill, draught, or electric or other odd-looking gadget, can prove whether their wives are sexually faithless. More concerning this will be explained in the final chapter of this book.

Deceptive practices have not gone into the discard. There are innumerable persons who believe that a "little magic" can deceive husbands, wives and others. It should not be difficult to sell, at a near fabulous figure, such person's actual charms against being caught in their deceptions.

One neat little lesson is to be found in the Bible, wherein a friend suggested a method of deception to a young man who was lovesick for his half-sister and who had incestuous desires toward her, by those persons who are (1) strictly opposed to, or (2) who are in favor of, rape.

Normally no one should suppose that anyone else is interested in knowing how to approach the act of rape. The Bible would seem to show a young man how to have an opportunity to rape his sister—while the end of the story is patterned after the modern story in which the "villain" always pays.

The story with which perhaps few readers are familiar, is here given. It may serve as an example of what those uninstructed in sex matters and who would hardly, therefore, understand the story, and who might
misconstrue or misconceive, may find, if they but turn to the Bible for the old-time "dime" novel form of entertainment. Here, also, one may recall Mr. S and his stepson-in-law P, and build an idea of how it would be to have uninstructed youngsters to select various accounts for responsive reading.

The story concerns children of David, the man who seduced Bathsheba and had her husband murdered.

16. HOW AMNON RAPED HIS SISTER

Tamar appears to have been among the famous names for women of the Bible, although not quite as common as Mary, Sue and Sal, so popular today. Amnon was a son of David, the king, and Tamar was David's beautiful daughter by a woman or wife not the mother of Amnon. Absalom, another of David's sons, was doubtless the whole brother of Tamar. It was Absalom who saw to it in time that Amnon was killed for raping Tamar, and also Absalom who arose against his father and caused the old king to take flight. In time Absalom's armies were defeated and Absalom was slain, and although old David did, as he so often found it convenient to do, he went on to other acts and penitences. David lamented because Absalom was slain.

The biblical reading is not easy, yet, there are persons who would believe that a rendition into sensible English served to distort the story. It is difficult to understand how the story could be distorted insofar as readable English is concerned. For the sake of unquestioned "veracity" the story is quoted as it appears in the Bible. It will be found in the King James version, 2 Samuel 13:

1. And it came to pass after this, that Absalom the son of David had a fair sister, whose name was Tamar; and Amnon the son of David loved her.
2. And Amnon was so vexed, that he fell sick for his sister Tamar, for she was a virgin; and Amnon thought it hard for him to do anything to her.
3. But Amnon had a friend, whose name was Jonadab, the son of Shimeah, David's brother, and Jonadab was a very subtil man.
4. And he said unto him, why art thou, being the king's son, lean from day to day? Wilt thou not tell me? And Amnon said unto him, I love Tamar, my brother Absalom's sister.
5. And Jonadab said unto him, lay thee down on thy bed, and make thyself sick; and when thy father cometh to see thee, say unto him, I pray thee, let my sister Tamar come, and give me meat, and dress the meat in my sight that I may see it, and eat it at her hand.
6. So Amnon lay down, and made himself sick: and when the king was come to see him, Amnon, said unto the king, I pray thee, let Tamar my sister come, and make me a couple of cakes in my sight, that I may eat at her hand.
7. Then David went home to Tamar, saying, go now to thy brother Amnon's house, and dress him meat.
8. So Tamar went to her brother Amnon's house; and he was laid down. And she took flour, and kneaded it, and made cakes in his sight, and did bake the cake.
9. And she took a pan, and poured them out before him; but he refused to eat. And Amnon said, have out all men from me. And they went out every man from him.
10. And Amnon said unto Tamar, bring the meat into the chamber, that I may eat of thine hand. And Tamar took the cakes
which she had made, and brought them into the chamber to
Amnon her brother.
11. And when she had brought them unto him to eat, he took
hold of her and said unto her, come lie with me my sister.
12. And she answered him, nay, my brother, do not force me;
for no such thing ought to be done in Israel; do not thou this folly.
13. And I, whither shall I cause my shame to go? And as for
thee thou shalt be as one of the fools in Israel. Now, therefore, I
pray thee, speak unto the king; for he will not withhold me from thee.
14. Howbeit he would not hearken unto her voice: but, being
stronger than she, forced her, and lay with her.
15. Then Amnon hated her exceedingly; so that the hatred
wherewith he hated her was greater than the love wherewith he
had loved her. And Amnon said unto her, arise, be gone.
16. And she said unto him, there is no cause; this evil in
sending me away is greater than the other that thou didst to me,
but he would not hearken unto her.
17. Then he called his servant that ministered to him, and
said, put now this woman out from me, and bolt the door after her.
18. And she had a garment of divers colors upon her: for
with such robes were the king's daughters that were virgins
apparelled. Then his servant brought her out, and bolted the door
after her.
19. And Tamar put ashes on her head, and rent her garment
of divers colors that was on her, and laid her hand on her head,
and went on crying.
20. And Absalom her brother said unto her, hath Amnon, thy
brother been with thee? But hold now thy peace, my sister: He is
thy brother; regard not this thing. So Tamar remained desolate
in her brother Absalom's house.
21. But when King David heard of all these things, he was
very wroth.
22. And Absalom spake unto his brother Amnon neither good
nor bad; for Absalom hated Amnon, because he had forced his
sister Tamar.
23. And it came to pass after two full years, that Absalom
had sheepshearsers in Baalhazor, which is beside Ephraim: And
Absalom invited all the king's sons.
24. And Absalom came to the king and said, behold now, thy
servant hath sheepshearsers; let the king, I beseech thee, go with
thy servant.
25. And the king said to Absalom, nay, my son, let us not all
now go, lest we be chargeable unto thee. And he pressed him:
howbeit he would not go, but blessed him.
26. Then said Absalom, if not, I pray thee, let my brother
Amnon go with us. And the king said unto him, why should he
go with thee?
27. But Absalom pressed him, that he let Amnon and all the
king's sons go with him.
28. Now, Absalom had commanded his servants, saying, mark
ye now when Amnon's heart is merry with wine, and when I say
unto you smite Amnon, then kill him, fear not: Have I not com-
manded you? Be courageous, and be valiant.
29. And the servants of Absalom did unto Amnon as Absalom
had commanded.

There are some frank impressions in connection with the confusing
lingo in which those who seek solace in mythology seem to want their
literary hash dished up. Amnon wanted to rape his sister. His sister did
not seriously object although she disliked the shame which would go with the rape. She could have been quiet about it, but she was outraged because Amnon was none too well pleased with her and ordered her from his house. According to the impressions given of marriage in those days, permitting her to remain in his house would have constituted marriage and no stigma would have been attached had Amnon permitted his sister to remain.

Such an occurrence—or a similar occurrence—would today bring about a number of reactions. Sociologists—real ones—would understand and would realize that man is still a creature of instincts—some of which revert to the primitive. There are many who cannot conform to the most minor standards of herd. The clergy would yell “sin—terrible sin.” Reformers and sanctimonious perverts would cry “scandalous.” Hounds of the law would yell “crime.” Genuine psychologists, if asked, would label such an affair as having occurred principally because of ignorance. Psychiatrists should say, “Bring all concerned and let us determine who is and who is not sane—or whether all concerned are sane.”

Admittedly reading the Bible is a thing much neglected. If parents who admonish their children to read it would but read it themselves they would defer reading on the part of their children until the children were sufficiently well grounded in the various facts of life, and properly instructed in sex science, that they might read anything whatsoever they desired without running the risk of endangering their morals, their health, and their freedom, by reason of reading.

Were the Bible actually read as advocated by radical and other religious leaders, organized religion would decline, and the Bible might well become that which it is well suited to be—a relic of barbarity. Thus it might find repose in dusty attics with out-of-date magazines and such rubbish as sometimes accumulates in attics. Forgotten or accepted in the same manner and with the same attitude which applies to other mythologies it could do no further harm to the human family.

17. RATIONAL VIEWS AND HUMANISTIC CONSIDERATIONS

Not infrequently we refer to “civilizations” of the past and often many of us wonder why we even speak of civilization in the present age. Perhaps there shall never be such a civilization as the idealist is inclined to visualize. People of the present age may well accept the civilization we have and be content about it. If anyone can build a better mouse trap than someone else and can thereby contribute to the betterment of humanity and the advancement of civilization—let him. If the world wants to make a beaten path to his door—let it. And if someone invents a poison that is better than a mouse trap—let the wise accept it and use it.

If untold millions of people want to cling to the beliefs of magic which were so popular even in these United States not so long ago—let them cling to their magic. After all—it will take other centuries of progress to see superstitions weeded out—and rationality holding sway as does the law of gravity find general acceptance today.

Only a small section of humanity is ready to exercise rationality as against subterfuge, superstition and a retreat into the realm of magic and imagination.

It is true that no shrines have been built to the greatest philosophers who have lived and taught and contributed to the advancement of humanity, and that shrines to the tunes of billions of dollars have been built in honor of the mythical magicians, sorcerers, et al. Philosophers built their own shrines—shrines which will stand yet for thousands of years. Temples to Jehovah and “His Son” and Ghost will crum-
ble to dust or be converted to humanitarian uses—yet the teachings of the great philosophers will remain and be practiced.

The affairs of adulterous and murderous old King David should have no influence upon civilization today—and there is no doubt a belief that most people have even forgotten that such a man as David is said to have lived.

Those engaged as consulting psychologists, physicians, psycho-analysts, psychiatrists, sexologists—humanists—know that the myths of the Bible still influence the mind of man—and unfavorably. The writer's files can yield not scores, but hundreds of case records which offer mute testimony of the fact mental sufferers are the victims of biblical teachings. And this is true whether there was an abnormal condition of the mind before or after biblical teachings were propounded to the victims.

Persons have asked: How severely will God deal with adulterers—or adulteresses? Many have asked: What does the Bible say about homosexuals? Women have gained the idea that intercourse before marriage or outside of marriage is "the unforgivable sin." Men have believed that physical illnesses were a "punishment from God" because they had practiced "Onanism." Onanism as used refers to masturbation (auto-eroticism or self-gratification). Marriages have been wrecked because one or both partners to the marriage had been taught and believed that sex and everything pertaining to it is an "unclean and sinful thing." These persons do not stop to realize that sex makes of them either men or women. Even being either man or woman is an unforgivable thing in the minds of many. They believe that they were "conceived in sin," meaning that they regard it as having been sinful for their parents to have indulged in the procreative act which brought them into life.

It would be surprising to members of the general public to even grasp a slight idea that couples living among them suffer mental torture because of fear based on biblical teachings (and church teachings) after every indulgence in sexual congress. Doctors whose particular practices cause their patients to try to "act" normal when with them, have but little idea of how many of their patients seek treatment and advice elsewhere because of their fears and unnecessary inhibitions.

Now and then clergymen shout the name of David—the holy man of God, and point out his shining example of repentance and pleading—his supplications for forgiveness. The average person has but to think for a moment and he or she may know how many times—how many scores of hundreds of times—the names of the great philosophers are heard and read to hearing or reading the name of David, even once.

Some of the acts imputed to the legendary characters of the Bible, although not good, were probably exemplary for the ages and time they are claimed to have represented.

Old King David once swapped a bunch of Phillistine foreskins for a wife—a wife who was already the wife of another man. The biblical reference is brief and much clearer than many other passages.

It will be found in 2 Samuel 3:14 and reads:

"And David sent messengers to Ishbosheth, Saul's son, saying, Deliver me my wife Michal, whom I espoused to me for an hundred foreskins of the Phillistines.

"And Ishbosheth sent and took her away from her husband, even from Phaltiel—the son of Laish.

"And her husband went with her along behind her, weeping, to Bahurim. Then said Abner to him: Go, return. And he returned."

* * *

Who has ever heard a clergymen weeping with Phaltiel? Ministers and other biblicists read the words with complete stoicism insofar as the losing husband is concerned. With them the important thing is that David, the king and holy man of God, had what he wanted and his commands were obeyed.
Clergymen do not stop to discover that what they are reading about represents other cruelty far greater than the cruelty to Phaltiel—or even David's cruel act in having Uriah, Bathsheba's husband murdered.

In that day and time, if any credence is to be given to legend, fore- skin means identically the same thing that scalps later meant when the North American Indian, resentful at the intrusion of "foreigners" upon his lands (and this often included ravishing his women) scalped the in- truders—our forefathers. The Philistine foreskins were "trophies of war" and meant that 100 Philistines had been slain—and this no doubt was a wager between David and Saul.

All in all, David's criminality, his "repentance" and his wearing sackcloth and ashes while "atoning" is reminiscent of the story of a pious man of years ago who had two daughters whom he forbade to have beaux. The daughters had clandestine dates—and their mother favoring them, assisted them. The pious old man went away often for days attending "meetin's." At such times his daughters enjoyed their young men friends normally—always of course, with a weather eye out for "Pa."

When the old fellow would return home, he often "stropped" the girls for good measure for fear they had had "courting company" in his absence. Now and then the girls ran and at such times their father chased them—old muzzle-loading shot gun in hand. He never even shot near them—they were his field hands. They were his slaves. But as the old man chased the girls he was often led over the roughest routes about the farm—through bushes, briars, bramble vines, over rail fences, and across footlogs. The old fellow often became entangled in the vines, stumbled over the rough terrain, and otherwise wore himself out and returned to his house—put the gun away—and all was calm and forgot until the next time. In stumbling or falling or being delayed, the pious old creature cursed—and his style was said to go like this: God-dammit, God forgive me, goddamit, God forgive me, etc. Such represented the tactics of David.

Once the girls decided to play a trick on their "Pa" and, removing most of the charge from his muzzle loader, stuffed clay down the muzzle (open) end. At the time of the next chase, the old fellow let out one of his usual "goddamit, God forgive me's" and pulled the trigger. The gun blew up in his face and he forgot to add the forgive me.

Perhaps "Pa" had been studying the story of David rather intently. These are both men and women today who could easily be persuaded that a concoction of "bitter water," or a sugar-coated pill, for that matter, would tell whether their mates are true to them—sexually. Such persons frequent the places of Gypsy fortune tellers, soothsayers, etc., and wisely, the fakers keep peace.

The writer once attended a "Spiritualist-mediumistic" meeting. The medium was relaying messages from "spirit-land," and from the dead, when her questioners from the audience used the word. She was answering questions. One young man spoke rather timidly to ask a question. "Yes?" inquired the medium. Said the young man, "Well—uh—I gotta girl. She-sa-long way from me." He paused. "Go on," prompted the medium, "what did you want to know?" The young man faltered, "Well—uh—ruh I jist sorta wanted to know—that is—I sorta wonder is she true to me?" The answer came like a flash. "Yes. She's just as true to you as you are to her."

Perhaps, fakers that they are, we can't call all of the soothsayers bad.

At this moment a thoroughly responsible newspaper (as newspapers go) carries a classified advertisement which reads:

**METAPHYSICIAN**

Unnatural influences. Bad luck. —— can help you.

* * *
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Can anyone say that our present civilization is far removed from the "mystery and magic" of the dark ages? And it's dollars to lemon snaps that the metaphysician bases his magic power to help upon the "Bible."

Years ago a fanatic took a shot at a soap-box orator for making an Atheistic speech. The man was detained by policemen. He missed his mark and police finally persuaded him that "God" was capable of dealing with such men as the orator.

At that same period the writer often learned greater truths concerning life and the universe from the soap-boxers in an hour or two of an evening than he learned about medicine after listening to hours of lectures.

The old biblical characters had their day—they still wield an unhealthy influence over unhealthy people—but the world has no need for worry. A few thousand years hence the various gods of today will either be forgotten or will be treated along with whatever other mythologies which may be preserved as fairy tales to be told to children and others who may find entertainment in them.

Gods may come and gods may go, but mankind will no doubt go on and on.

18. CONCLUSION

A writer, Jack Woodford, has said that there are many ways of writing books. In his book, "Why Write a Novel," he admonishes, "Write it for the hell of it." He goes on to explain that what he means is that the writing should be done for the fun one gets out of it. Jack maintains that many bad books have been best sellers and that many good books have stuck the publisher and left him holding the well known bag for the expense of publishing and for his pains. He further maintains that books may be written in the "person" most convenient. He explains that books have broken into sex-transmutations without any explanation whatsoever as to how or why the transmutation took place—right in the middle of the book—and that books have been written so that in telling whatever he had to tell the author switched from one person to another from chapter to chapter. It must be admitted that the authors of those books either wrote the books for the hell of it or had a hell of a time getting them written.

All of this reaches a point not of confession—but of admission or acknowledgment of facts.

Admissions, like confessions, call for first person writing.

The material for this book was originally scheduled for three separate books. All of the biblical material dealt with—and much more—involves data with which I have long been familiar. When I got out my Bible and planned the title ideas I thought the writing would be a push-over. Just think of the preacher who can take one little verse as a text and can preach until he has no listeners left—the only reason for their remaining being that they feel that their backs and sitters and the benches are in one piece. As I began reading already familiar stories before beginning to write I could see no reason for repeating "begats, amens, wherefores, etc." to the confusion of my readers. When these were carefully deleted there wasn't anything like the material left I had previously believed there would be. And so—I just included the data meant for other titles in this book.

It is true that I have had a lot of fun writing it. And I hope that my readers will have a lot of fun reading it. No one has fun when he permits his toes to be stepped on. I can read with my toes tucked safely under me. Frankly, 15,000 words have been quite enough for me on
biblical subjects. Lloyd C. Douglass (a minister—active, before he became a writer) wrote a long book about the “Robe” called Christ’s Robe. I read the book and I imagine Douglass would have appreciated the fact that I got so many good chuckles out of it. Sholem Asch wrote a long book called “The Apostle.” I read that and had a great deal of fun reading it. Both writers were in their element—giving, actually, some interesting historical data—and no doubt enjoying their retreat from reality while writing. Their books were supposedly “history-fiction” books. They were able through the medium of the use of the word fiction, to draw freely on their imaginations. And what imaginations! I admire them for being able to construct so much out of their imaginations.

But this book—well—it certainly isn’t based on fact—yet it can’t be called exactly fiction. Instead of drawing upon my imagination, however, I have found that I couldn’t even imagine the various biblical references as being other than legend—and sometimes the simple word “folklore” seemed to be more applicable. The various references offered a means of comparison. Through their use it was possible to point out what people often think they know about the Bible—yet do not know. People who profess to live according to the Bible would be shocked to know just how they actually would live if they did—and the chances are that many would not live long if they and others did actually live according to the Bible. At the same time many of the stories of the Bible are being lived in principle today.

When, for example, the Israelites were ready to depart from Egypt where they had been in bondage, the Lord, through his appointed (they were self-appointed if they were anything at all) representatives, agents and executors, told the Israelites to borrow everything possible they could borrow of the Egyptians. Naturally it was not expected that they would return what they borrowed. And it seems that the worst of it was that the Egyptians from whom they were to borrow were actually their friends—not their oppressors. That little act is repeated often today. It is possible that someone took the pattern from the Bible—yet it is just as possible that many who have borrowed from “neighbors” and then moved on never to return, never heard of the biblical pattern.

Persons desiring to commit adultery are not prompted by the stories in the Bible to do so—they are prompted by their natures, and often by the fact that they are inadequate—or just plainly that they are seeking something which they have failed to find. And no threat of punishment here or hereafter in the Bible would deter them.

Men and women do not commit murder because the Bible gave them a neat pattern and because Jehovah killed right and left—not do they refrain from committing murder because of anything the Bible says about it.

Conceivably young persons who should be taught the actual truth about sex, but who are left to find out the best way they can—and this is nearly always a poor way and invariably below par to say the least, may, in reading much that is contained in the Bible—get some ideas—and, unfortunately, the wrong ideas.

It is true that biblical sex stories are not set forth in salacious language—yet, the misguided young mind can readily create the salaciousness.

I firmly believe that a book of this kind can be read by young minds to great advantage because I believe firmly and sincerely that it will cause young minds to inquire—because they will be able to see that Bible patterns are not according to civilization—and not up to acceptable social standards—and that the qualities and values of sex and the sexual relations of mankind are not to be found in the Bible.

Older persons—mature persons who have been misguided by parents and others who professed to be something they were not—and who lived miserably because of false conceptions, may be able to understand
some of the reasons for their own unhappiness after reading the pages of this book, and, in turn, they may pass the advantages gained on to their own young children.

Quite frankly I believe that there was and is a need for this book. Letters from hundreds of persons and my replies have indicated a need for such a book. I feel certain that some of the material I have presented has been presented by others—but in their own particular ways, and for this reason I see virtue in the manner of my own presentation. As I wrote it occurred to me that a chapter such as this could have value—that it could stimulate an interest in my readers causing them to re-read the book, and by re-reading, catch ideas, and see reasons which could readily have been passed over lightly in a first reading.

Being thoroughly serious I have had a lot of fun writing every word herein. I have been aware that readers would not all agree with much that I said. Frequently I read a great deal that I do not agree with—yet get a lot of good fun out of reading it—and by no means infrequently do I get a great deal of mental stimulation out of reading that to which I am personally diametrically opposed.

We who live today feel that we live in a great civilization for all its barbarity. Humanitarianism at least outweighs the barbarity. Whether we agree upon the savagery of countless characters depicted in the Bible, we at least agree that we do not need a ride in a "Time Machine" back some 60 centuries ago, in order to find and witness savagery.

For my part, I can take a leisurely stroll about my own community almost any day and at almost any time of day and see a great big mother or father savagely whipping the whey out of a tiny, helpless child. And, at that, most of the people are known as good people who go to church and Sunday school on Sunday to repent and pray and get forgiveness. They take their little children and those who can and cannot read get a lot of cheap pictures of God and Christ and the Patriarchs and the Disciples, with a few angels (just to make the infants want wings), and the parents being forgiven are then ready to start a new week with a clean sheet—a week in which to beat their "younguns" and raise a lot of hell otherwise so that they may go to church again the next Sunday and pray and weep and shout and sing and expand their egos—so that there'll be no breech in the links of the chains that bind them and their ignorance together.