

**Thatness & Whatness**

Copyright: Kelli Jae Baeli

ISBN: 9781301554577

Published: 20 JUN 2013

Updated 18Sep2017

Publisher: Indie Literati Press



**Kindle Edition License Notes**

The right of Kelli Jae Baeli to be identified as author of this Work has been asserted by her in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in retrieval system, copied in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise transmitted without written permission from the publisher. You must not circulate this book in any format.

All rights reserved, including the right of  
Reproduction in whole or in part in any form

Created in the United States of America, one nation, not necessarily under God (unless you choose to be UNDER a mean deity) where we can freely create and distribute things.

**Classification:**

1. Atheism
2. Religion
3. Humanism
4. Christianity
5. Bible Study
6. Secularism
7. Women Authors—non-fiction
8. Bible-Science
9. Biblical Criticism

#### **ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION:**

This is an excerpt. This is only an excerpt. If it was the actual 1000-page book, you would have been informed, and there would have been many pages of references, indexes, footnotes, a more expansive context, and quite a few more words. Please read this out of the purview of religious zealots, as they are prone to violence when reminded that others don't always buy into their god-thing. Thank you and enjoy your beverage.

#### **Summary:**

Directed at agnostics and those struggling with the inconsistencies in Christianity in particular, and religion in general, an author struggles to find her own Personal Cosmology by examining and sharing her beliefs and discoveries about God, the Bible and Christianity.

"The only way one can, theoretically and according to theists, know God to any appreciable degree, is after death when our souls ascend to Heaven-which is reportedly the domain of the Deity himself. But since death prevents any of these people from reporting back to us-and if they had, it would still be a case of improvable speculation-then this is never something any of us can know for certain.

How convenient...

If God is not made of matter or of anything humans can comprehend, then God, is in a very real way, NOT REAL. If we cannot perceive God, then, why would we believe in him? If we cannot experience God, since God is non-matter, how could he possibly exist to begin with? And why don't Christians who peddle this, while simultaneously admitting they don't really know, just admit that they are agnostic?

Slippery slope, that.

There are the common ideas about the nature or essence of God. These attributes are at once a conundrum of "Godly" proportions. There are also the lesser-known, or lesser-mentioned attributes of God that have arisen from various ad hoc situations in which a contradiction appears, and an explanation is then provided to explain that contradiction. It's rather like the situation a pathological liar finds himself in: one lie is told, and another is inevitably added to cover the discrepancy that arises from the previous lie, so that another lie must eventually be told to clear up that discrepancy, and so on, ad infinitum. The irony is that the explanation is almost always a contradiction in itself, and so the debate continues and the confusion gets compounded..."



## How Convenient

*Cop-outs about God*

Merely by using the same reference material that Christians use to justify their blind allegiance, you can truly know God. Let's look at some of that information...

The only way one can, theoretically and according to theists, know God to any appreciable degree, is after death when our souls ascend to Heaven—which is reportedly the domain of the Deity himself. But since death prevents any of these people from reporting back to us—and if they had, it would still be a case of improvable speculation—then this is never something any of us can know for certain.

How convenient.

According to Saint Thomas Aquinas, God is also "infinitely knowable" but it is impossible for humans to know God to that infinite degree, since we are finite beings. He could thus be known only to an infinite intelligence like himself, and there is no one like himself. Especially not when we're talking about Christians who parrot such nonsense. This one becomes one of those absurd circular propositions made by believers to avoid admitting that they cannot know this God, and cannot claim to know him, and thus cannot claim anything other than agnosticism, which they continue to deny.

How convenient.

In what George H. Smith calls "The unique epistemological process of 'knowin' in one's heart." (Smith. *Atheism: The Case Against God*) Christians and clergy alike opt to ignore the atrocities of the Bible's God, since they are so unpleasant.

How convenient.

In the Gospels of the New Testament, we read about miracles performed by Jesus. It's probable that Gospel writers may have invented the miracles of Jesus after the fact, just as they did the Gospels themselves, which science has shown were composed 40 to 90 years after the death of Jesus. But we are also told in the Scriptures that Jesus did not perform miracles in his native country "because of their unbelief." The verse in Mark 1:43-44 also tells us, "See that you say nothing to anyone" after Jesus cures a leper. Perhaps this was because those who knew him might later say they saw no miracles and the Gospel authors could use this "unbelief" excuse as an escape hatch.

How convenient.



## Thatness And Whatness

*What is God?*

"God is the invention of Man. So the nature of God is only a shallow mystery. The deep mystery is the nature of Man."

~ Nanrei Kobori, *Buddhist Abbot*

Christian theology, in all its ambiguity, states that God is incorporeal, which is to say, nonmaterial. This means God is not composed of matter. Which renders the reference to God as a being, meaningless. For if something is non-matter, how could it matter? We are beings who are made of matter (in the simplest terms) and thus our understanding of everything is predicated on matter. All else is both immaterial in a literal and figurative sense, and negligible.

And what of ideas and concepts and immaterial things like enthusiasm or kindness? Might the theist argue that these are real to us, though not made of matter? Of course the theist could argue that, but the argument would dissolve under the powerful force of reason; kindness is not being touted as an entity, as well as something immaterial. If God is not made of matter or of anything humans can comprehend, then God, is in a very real way, NOT REAL. If we cannot perceive God, then, why would we believe in him? If we cannot experience God, since God is non-matter, how could he possibly exist to begin with? And why don't Christians who peddle this, while simultaneously admitting they don't really know, just admit that they are agnostic?

Slippery slope, that.

In *Atheism: The Case against God*, George H. Smith explains:

...either we can use human language to speak meaningfully of God (in which case, God cannot differ in kind from finite existence), or human language cannot be applied to God at all (in which case, the word 'God' becomes meaningless). By stipulating that God is supernatural and unknowable, the Christian effectively removes God from the domain of language and communication—hereby removing himself from the context of rational consideration. Since God is incomprehensible, we cannot examine God's characteristics, and then conclude that God and man have certain traits in common. Anyway, if this were possible, we would already have direct knowledge of God's nature prior to the comparison, which would eliminate the need for analogy. How, then, can the Christian claim a resemblance between God and man? (Smith, *ibid*, 57]

Late night television will often garner you an unwanted advertisement for some Gospel album. (Advertisers must believe that the faithful are up at all hours, perhaps fretting about their impending flinging into the fiery abyss). One such ad featured a song entitled, "God is in control"—and my first thought was, "Well he ought to step down, then, because he's doing a rotten job."

How can we begin to know what the Christian God does, if we don't or can't understand what he reportedly is?

Existence and essence—two things we are prevented from knowing about God from within the Christian faith. Why would we adopt a lifestyle, belief system, code, or any other guideline that has no basis in rational thought nor empirical proof? To say, as many Christians do, that the reason we should believe is because God must be accepted “on faith” is just another circular argument.



## The Omni-Everything

“Is God willing to prevent evil, but not able? Then he is not omnipotent. Is he able, but not willing? Then he is malevolent. Is he both able and willing? Then whence cometh evil? Is he neither able nor willing? Then why call him God?”

~ *Epicurus*

The problem with religion in general, and the Christian mindset in particular, is that when all words and ideas can be modified or overtly changed, there will never be the opportunity for logic, clarity, understanding or consensus, and this is why the debate rages on throughout millennia.

If we insist, however, that the agreed upon definition be adhered to, the religious adherents lose their footing, and it becomes impossible for them to defend their position in any logical way.

By way of illustration, imagine we live in a world where it is acceptable and commonplace to change definitions at will. You are approaching an intersection in your car, and the light is green, and you keep going. An accident is caused because the oncoming traffic has a red light, but one car's driver decided that red means keep going, and you are killed by that driver. Is this sort of ambiguity likely to insure the survival of our species?

Thus, when we examine the definitions the Christian religion uses to explain their God, one of these points must be true:

the person who puts down that definition does not understand the meaning of the words, (either through mental defect or self-delusion) or,  
that information is a lie.

Let me clarify what I mean.

There are the common ideas about the nature or essence of God. These attributes are at once a conundrum of “Godly” proportions. There are also the lesser-known, or lesser-mentioned attributes of God that have arisen from various ad hoc situations in which a contradiction appears, and an explanation is then provided to explain that contradiction. It's rather like the situation a pathological liar finds himself in: one lie is told, and another is inevitably added to cover the discrepancy that arises from the previous lie, so that another lie must eventually be told to clear up that discrepancy, and so on, ad infinitum. The irony is that the explanation is almost always a contradiction in itself, and so the debate continues and the confusion gets compounded.

Let's look at these alleged attributes of this being no one has ever met, and can only guess the nature of:

### *Omniscience*

If God knows everything all at once, then aren't we helpless to change our fate? Isn't it all pre-determined? And why are some lives deserving of good things, so full of pain and unfairness while others undeserving are not? To address this, you must use another ad hoc ploy: it is not our place to question God, he knows best.

George H. Smith, asks, "how can an event be free in the first place if God has infallible knowledge of it before its happening?"

To know all, means that our definition of knowledge must be redacted. How can you "know" something that has no empirical evidence of existence? No one has really seen this god, they have only seen what they interpret as evidence, and this interpretation is founded on a wish or a notion, but not on tangible fact. The very foundation of religion is predicated on faith, which is the opposite of fact. It is a choice to believe in something that has no empirical evidence, and thus, no one can claim to have knowledge of this god. Only interpretations of feelings and ideas.

The nature of omniscience is such that it has to be explained outside the realm of what we know in human experience. Since we are not, ourselves, omniscient, then to make sense of it, we must depart from knowledge in its truest sense and invent a paradigm of fantasy in order to grasp any sort of coherent set of ideas.

Free will also contradicts the omniscience of God. If God knows all with no restraints, then we do not have free will. For we cannot act in any other manner other than what God has created, and seen ahead of time. So either free will does not exist, in which case we are in a determined existence, set up by God, or God does not exist, and we have free will because we are the only ones directing our own behavior (aside from parents, who direct—or should direct—the behaviors of their small children during the maturation process).

But if you believe God created everything, then he created me, and I'm an atheist. That's only because I have free will, you say? Then God cannot be omniscient, because the fact that I have free will, means that I could have chosen to be a believer, and I didn't, and that implied choice means that God could not have known which choice I would make.

Is your brain burning yet?

### *Omnipotence*

Omnipotence means all-powerful. The attribute of omniscience, according to Smith, also contradicts the attribute of omnipotence...

...if God knows the future with infallible certainty, he cannot change it—in which case he could not be omnipotent. If God can change the future, however, he cannot have infallible knowledge of it prior to its actual happening—in which case he cannot be omniscient. (This is similar to the issue of in what sense, if any, God can be said to have free will. Does God know his own future decisions? If so, how can those decisions be free? Perhaps God does not make decisions. If so, how can the idea of volition apply to a being with no decisions—and hence no choices—to make?) The major problem with omniscience is that the "knowledge" of God bears no resemblance to the concept of knowledge as we understand it (which is, by now, a

familiar problem). Consider the prerequisites of knowledge. In order to know anything a being must be conscious, and this presupposes a living organism. If God is said to know everything, therefore, we must presume that God is a conscious, living being.

In what sense can God be said to be alive? God is not even a material being, much less a biological organism with metabolic processes. The concept of life has no meaning when applied to God. (Smith, *ibid*, 74-75).

Recall the popular thought experiment, "Can God make a rock so big even he can't lift it?"\* If he can't create that rock, then he's not all-powerful. If he can, but can't lift it, then he's not all-powerful either.

\*When I was asked this question in my Philosophy 101 class in college, my response was "Who says God is a man?" The professor rather liked that answer and even exclaimed, "That's what philosophy is all about!"

Similarly, the Archangels exist to carry out God's will. Why would God need assistance? Can't he just snap his Omni-fingers and make anything happen? Isn't his will at once already fulfilled? God, the argument goes, is not temporal or constricted by linear time—he must exist in all time, outside of time. Thus, the will of God must be enacted spontaneously, and to us, would already be there waiting for us in our linear time at any given moment.

To use Archangels to do God's bidding is an immediate contradiction of the supposed nature of this God.

So we once again find the concept of God fraught with contradiction. And the contradictions don't end there. The Omni-everything God is one which conflicts with reason and even good sense. He often cannot be one thing without negating the other thing. Take the problem of evil...

Briefly, the problem of evil is this: If God does not know there is evil, he is not omniscient. If God knows there is evil but cannot prevent it, he is not omnipotent. If God knows there is evil and can prevent it but desires not to, he is not omnibenevolent. If, as the Christian claims, God is all-knowing and all-powerful, we must conclude that God is not all-good. The existence of evil in the universe excludes this possibility. (Smith, *ibid*, 81).

At every turn one finds logical fallacy, contradiction, cognitive dissonance and absurdity.

### *Omnipresence*

We are told that God is omnipresent—always there watching you. This smacks of a stalker-god, does it not? Again, a fear-factor associated with religion.

Also, if Satan is omnipresent, in that he can suddenly be blamed for the evil deeds of people everywhere at odd intervals, with no discernible limits to this influence, then what's so special about God? There is apparently another being in possession of the same attributes.

Additionally, if God is everywhere, then he is in Hell, too. And he's in the figurative hells we all too often experience in our lives. Think about what that

really means. Your God is there when everything happens. Everything. He's there when women are raped, when children are abused. (How does that feel, Christians?) Statistics are enough to show us that a tragic number of women and children meet with that fate\* and most of us know someone who's had those experiences. Maybe it's even you, dear reader. If God is everywhere, that means he's there when the bad things happen too, and yet bad things still happen, so that leads to all the other problems with that concept—like his omnipotence. He let those things happen, though he had the power to prevent them, and in fact, according to your own dogma, he knew these things were going to happen, and did nothing to prevent them. Is that acceptable to you?

\*Nearly 70% of all reported sexual assaults occur to children ages 17 and under. An estimated 39 million survivors of childhood sexual abuse exist in America today (darknesstolight.com). In regard to women, 1 out of every 6 American women has been the victim of an attempted or completed rape in her lifetime (14.8% completed rape; 2.8% attempted rape) 17.7 million American women have been victims of attempted or completed rape (National Institute of Justice, Survey).

But here's the main problem with a god who is "everywhere." If God is neither a physical being, nor empty space, then how can he be anywhere? Much less, everywhere?

### *Omnitranscendence*

Dictionary.com defines transcendence as:

1. exceeding or surpassing in degree or excellence
2. a. (in the philosophy of Kant) beyond or before experience; a priori b.(of a concept) falling outside a given set of categories c. beyond consciousness or direct apprehension
3. theol (of God) having continuous existence outside the created world
4. free from the limitations inherent in matter

Since God is incorporeal, he does not exist in space and time. So how can he be present everywhere, too?

A being cannot be omnipresent and transcendent at the same time, for if he exists, he is not above and beyond everything. He is part of everything. This is a logical fallacy, and can never be solved unless you're willing to forget what the definition of transcendent is.

If God is this perfect transcendent being, and always has been a perfect being, what caused him to create the world and humans? The state of being perfect means that nothing is lacking. So why create something if you don't need to? And humans are obviously imperfect, yet created by a perfect God; this is also illogical, as nothing imperfect can come from something perfect in that sense, or else it would not really be perfect.

Likewise, if the Bible is supposed to be the perfect word of HIMSELF, and we know the Bible is imperfect, then it makes no sense. If God created imperfection, then he is not perfect to begin with. Thus, he is not transcendent.

This concept is further complicated by another attribute assigned to God—that of immanence, or omnipresence. A thing cannot be both everywhere and nowhere.

The point here, is that if defining a being becomes an exercise in contradiction and futility, then the subject matter becomes unintelligible, and so loses both its clarity and its significance.

### *Omnibenevolence*

Additionally, if a god is omnibenevolent—infinately compassionate and loving—then the problem of evil arises again. He cannot be both omnibenevolent and at the same time allow pain and suffering and also often be the source of that pain and suffering. A morally good and perfect god cannot be those things only sometimes, or this is not all-good or perfect. It is sometimes good and sometimes perfect. A perfectly loving god could not allow (nor command) the slaughter of innocents, the rape of women, the abuse, neglect, and murder of children, the rejection of the disabled, the sacrifice of a human to appease him, nor the sacrifice of even an animal for the same reason.

A perfectly loving god would not be capable of sending plagues, ordering the stoning of a man who collected firewood on the Sabbath, nor condoning (or commanding) the enslavement of people.

A perfectly loving god could not, would not, send his son to die for a concept that would not be necessary, had he not created the problem to begin with; i.e., God created Hell for those who denied him, and then ordered the death of his son to save those who would otherwise be doomed to this Hell. An omnibenevolent god would not create a problem and then offer a repulsive, cruel, or ethically reprehensible solution.

Other attributes given to God also make no sense or are absolutely false, according to the only book we have about him. The Theopedia graciously provided the definitions for these attributes, and I use them here because they are the very foundation of the Christians' understanding of the god they worship.

**He is reportedly immutable:** "this means that God never changes in his being (who he is) or promises (Malachi 3:6; James 1:17; Hebrews 6:17)." (Theopedia). And yet there are myriad examples of this god being angry, then compassionate, then making promises, then breaking them, as you will see in the other sections of this book.

One example, though, can be found in Jonah 3:10 "...and God repented of the evil, that he had said that he would do unto them; and he did it not."

**God is also supposedly impassable:** "God is without passions. He is not overwhelmed by any emotion, he is not incapacitated or weakened or stifled by any event or any amount of grief or love. Rather, God is totally self-controlled. While God does grieve, and does passionately love, he does so completely on purpose." This one is laughable, for many of the same reasons, as the Bible cites a slew of examples that the Judeo-Christian God is very passionate, constantly overwhelmed

by emotion, though I admit, seldom incapacitated or weakened or stifled, as he is much too angry for that. Again, these examples will be covered in some detail later.

**God is said to be holy.** "To say that God is holy is to say that he is eternally separate and distinct from all impurity. The term holiness in Hebrew, *qodesh*, has the notion of separation, of uniqueness, of one-of-kindness as it were. (Bruce Ware)." If we use the derivative definition of *qodesh*, then this is also not accurate, as this god's behavior belies any unique nature; the gods of mythology behave in the same manner, perform the same actions, perpetrate the same atrocities, and generally terrorize their adherents just as completely as the Christian God does.

**God is claimed to be infinite.** "having no limits or boundaries in time or space or extent or magnitude." (definitions.net). If God is in everything, or is everything, unlimited, with no beginning and no end, then why does he need measly humans to worship him? Why did he create the boundaries of the Earth and other planets? Why did he supposedly create the boundary of time?

Then there's the old stand-by, **God is Love.** "*He who does not love does not know God, for God is love.*" 1 John 4:8 (NKJV). *God is concerned for his creatures, and especially his people. He is tender toward them, and does not take pleasure in their suffering or condemnation. He seeks the best for us, and he offers up his Son in love as a substitution for sin. He loves to love people through Hi[m].*" Need I repeat the reasons why this proclamation is absurd? Tenderness is rare in this god. So is his lack of condemnation, or that he does not pleasure in human suffering. And what of the contradiction that killing his son is a loving act? Same goes for his alleged tendencies to be merciful, just and gracious. Theology admits that God is jealous, and this of course contradicts the other attributes which are considered positive.

**God is self-existent.** (related to self-sufficient, which is primarily the same pretense, with primarily the same rebuttals). "*God's self-existence means that he does not need us or the rest of creation for anything. While everything other than God depends on God for everything, God depends on no one for existence. He is absolute reality, with whom we have to reckon.*" Here, it says God does not need anything. But in the singular book about him, he needs us to worship him, he needs us to obey him, he needs us to do his works, he needs us to sacrifice a lamb to him, he needs us to do battle, he needs us to turn ourselves over to him...for a self-existent god, he certainly is needy.

Also note the usual redefining of the word "reality." The dictionary defines reality as "that which is real; an actual existence; that which is not imagination, fiction, or pretense; that which has objective existence, and is not merely an idea." God is none of those things.

An issue that I continue to point out, because it is at the crux of all other issues in debate, is that definition is paramount. We have dictionaries precisely because language requires common, agreed-upon definitions of words and ideas, so that we can communicate clearly. When a person changes definitions to suit his own needs, he deviates from this common ground that allows us to communicate with clarity,

and then all progress is lost, and there can be no possibility of reconciliation of understanding.

Let's look at other aspects of that fundamental Christian tenet that God is Omnipotent, and then in the pages of their own holy book and from their own devout lips, offer contradictions to this assertion. To wit:

**God Rested.** God created the world in 6 days and then RESTED on the 7th day. Why would a God need to rest? I thought he was omnipotent?

**"My God is an angry God."** In the "Good Book", (which I find a blatant oxymoron) Isaiah 5:25 says that because of rejecting the law of the Lord,

On this account the anger of the Lord has burned against his people. And he has stretched out his hand against them and struck them down, and the mountains quaked; and their corpses lay like refuse in the middle of the streets. For all this his anger is not spent. But his hand is still stretched out.

Does God need to go to anger management classes? How does this behavior make him any less evil and callous than, say, Osama Bin Laden or Saddam Hussein? Never mind the example it sets for followers. This is just the sort of verse that Fundies like Tim LaHaye and Jerry B. Jenkins\* love to use as fodder for their hatred and psychopathic genocidal babble toward unbelievers.

This verse becomes even more nonsensical when we find that in James 1:19, humans are told not to be angry. God can be angry, because that's a human emotion, and He's not human, but man is human, yet cannot have the human emotion of anger. Humans must behave like...God. Who doesn't behave that way – still another slew of contradictions.

\*Authors of the bestselling end-times novels known as the "Left Behind" series.

**"God created man because he was lonely."** An oft-parroted declaration which is another effort to cater to simplistic explanations, and to also humanize God. If God was lonely, why didn't he just create company to exist with him wherever he was? Why create them, and place them in a universe with a time-space continuum that would require billions of years before he could even begin to have a meaningful conversation with his creations?

On a planet in a vast solar system (ostensibly also of his own making), why create billions of other planets and stars and moons and galaxies if he only needed that human species to keep him company? Why not just create one planet? And why a planet? Why not just suspend them somewhere? Why not create sniveling little servants who would sit at his feet and tell him how great he is in his own time-space, or make them smart enough to engage him in stimulating discourse across a great celestial table? Makes no sense to me, but maybe I'm just being a hard-ass.

Is the cognitive dissonance setting in for you, yet? Because when I considered these points, it certainly did set in for me.

## Books by Kelli Jae Baeli



### AKA INVESTIGATIONS SERIES

Also Known as Armchair Detective {1}

Also Known as DNA {2}

Also Known as Syzygy {3}

Also Known as Rising & Falling {4}

Also Known as Sleepy Cat Peak {5}

Also Known as Blue, Dark & Bright {6}

### RAIN FALLS SERIES

Rain Falls {1}

In Absentia {2}

Pariahs & Prodigals {3}

### NEW HARBOR WITCHES SERIES

Keepers {1}

Ravens {2}

### NORTHWOODS TRILOGY

Throwing Caution {1}

Building Character {2}

### SHAMROCK COVE SERIES

Run the Risk (#1)

### NOVELS

Achilles Forjan

Another Justice

As You Were

Baggage

Plethora

Pitfall

Go. Leave. Stay.

(with Melissa Walker-Baeli)

### NOVELLAS

Saturation Point

Somewhere Else

Quintessence

Random Act of Blindness

Curse of Cache La Poudre

Powerful Things

FICTION ANTHOLOGIES

Trustplaces

(Erotica for Women Who Love Women)

Speed of Dark

(Bold Erotic Stories)

Flash Fiction (Vol. 1)

NONFICTION

God on a Stick {Vol. 1}

(Cosmology of God& Jesus)

God on a Stick {Vol. 2}

(Cosmology of the Bible)

God on a Stick {Vol. 3}

(Cosmology of Christianity)

God on a Stick {Vol. 4}

(Cosmology of the Dark Side)

God on a Stick {Vol. 5}:

(Cosmology of Science)

God on a Stick {Vol. 6}

(Cosmology of Atheism)

NONFICTION ANTHOLOGIES

Nerve

(Selected & Neglected Poetry)

Venetian Blinds

(Because I Couldn't Effing Think of Another Effing Title)

Face Down in the Low Road

(Essays, Articles, & Rebuttals)

Bettered by a Dead Crustacean

(Humorous Essays)

Diction Déjà vu

(Reading Writing & No Arithmetic, vol. 1)

The Truth of Fiction

(Reading Writing & No Arithmetic, vol. 2)

Literary Loitering

(Reading Writing & No Arithmetic, vol. 3)

Sullied Pajamas

(Misadventures in the Dating Pool)

Immortality or Something Like It

(Essays)

Too Much World

(Essays)

Brainmatter: Tidbits from my Cranium

(Essays)

Wear a Helmet

(Inflammatory Essays)

Strictly Academic  
(Essays)  
Crossing Paths  
(Essays)

ON TAP FOR 2017-18  
{Untitled, Book 2, Cross Pollination Series}  
Synaptic Circus: In the Marrow  
(Quips and Quotes from a Bestselling  
Genre-Hopping Indie Author)  
After Words  
(Thoughts on Each of my Novels)  
{Untitled, Book 3 in Northwoods Trilogy}  
Rain Falls series, Book 4  
AKA Investigations series, Book 7  
New Harbor Witches series, Book 3

WITH MELISSA WALKER  
Life Everywhere  
(memoir of our travels)  
Frequent Crier Miles  
(The Misadventures of No One Famous/

(  
A Comedy of Errors)  
Cruise Control  
(Romantic Family Dramey  
for the over-50 Crowd)  
Things to Save America  
(Essays from each of us  
on ideas for the betterment of society)

REWRITES  
Falling Through the Cracks  
ISO - In Search Of  
(Dating, Relationships & Sex for the Discerning Lesbian)

OTHER WORKS IN PROGRESS  
Behind the Left  
(Authoring the Apocalypse)  
Noble Arcanum  
(Sequel to Powerful Things)  
The Girls in the Band  
(Novella)  
Circling Uranus  
(Short spoofy Sci-fi story)  
Go to [kellijaebaeli.com](http://kellijaebaeli.com)

## About the Author

Even after 54 books, Kelli Jae Baeli always tries to write the sort of book she would want to read. She says her favorite thing to do in her novels is take a common trope and turn it on its ear. Where you expect a zig, she gives you a zag. In her pages, you will find strong female characters, ethical dilemmas, realistic romantic storylines often filled with adventure and intense pacing, tempered by witty dialog, and happy endings. All are hallmarks of her work.

Indie publisher and author of 22 bestsellers, Baeli enjoys a sales position in the top 5% of lesbian authors, also penning numerous essays, short stories and silly, serious and vitriolic Facebook posts and Twitter tweets. She and her wife, Melissa, a budding author in her own right, are on their way to a memoir-worthy *Life Everywhere*— traipsing around America in their travel trailer for a year, taking pictures and enjoying all the beautiful things life has to offer.

*NOTE to Reader: This Essay included in God on a Stick.*

## COSMOLOGY OF GOD & JESUS

Education Begets Questions

Cognitive Dissonance

The Quest

The Shift in Consciousness

The Trepidation of a Godless Paradigm

Religion Revealed

So, Why Do We Feel We Need a God?

Seeking Sense

## COSMOLOGY OF GOD

How Convenient: Cop-outs about God

Thatness And Whatness

The Omni-Everything

Playing the Part of God: Hannibal Lector

To Er is Human: Mistakes Were Made

God the Father AKA The Godfather

Dash Them Against the Rocks or Eat Them

My God is on PETA's 10 Most Wanted List

Old Abe Never Batted an Eye

God Encourages Human Sacrifice

God Needs Anger-Management

God as Trickster

You are the Devil's Gateway: God the Misogynist

Kinder, Kuche, Kirche

Immaculate Deception: God Raped Mary

Enough Memetic Incredulity

Cosmology Of Jesus

Mary Had a Little Lamb Who Fleeced Us With His Snow

Born Without a Birthday: The When of Jesus

Away in a Manger...er, House...uh Cave?: The Where of Jesus

Not Far From the Tree

The Go-To Guy: Did Jesus Gave Bad Advice?

The Son of God was a Holy Brat

Thus it is Written...NOT: Prophecies of Jesus.

Confusion in the House of David: The Who of Jesus

Jesus, the Spokesmodel for God

The Hashin' of the Christ

Lost in Transliteration

Disease to Diocese

To Rise or Not to Rise: It's All in the Leaven

Eyes Are Bad Witnesses

Imperfect Prefect

## COSMOLOGY OF CHRISTIANITY

The Seduction of Falsehood

Groupthink

Ignorant, Stupid or Both

Mibber Who?

Roots From A Borrowed Tree

No More Hall-Decking for You Guys

72 Virgins With a Side of Levity

Religion is a Business

Supernatural Hypocrisy

Hedging The Bet

Voluntary Subjugation

Is This Seat Saved?

Sort of a Tired Feeling, Really

"God Said-"

Ask, & You Shall NOT

Ad Hoc Wash

"It's a Mystery Because it's Mysterious."

"God Did It."

Free Swill

Rational Agents, Choosing

The Enigmatic Rapture

The AI of Theists: (Or, "Who's the Pinhead, Now, O'Reilly?")

The Obtusely-Driven Life: "It isn't about you."

The Universal Archetype of Pastor Peanut

Ministry For All

Lies & The Lying Christians Who Tell Them

## COSMOLOGY OF THE BIBLE

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

The Bible Tells Me So

Alleged Creation

The First Family

The Fall of Man

Oh, Kill Me Now!

The Second Book of Adam & Eve

The Rook of Adam

Apparently you ARE Supposed to Keep Your Brother

The Great Gilgamesh Nut Cow: Or, The Great Flood Fib

The Stuttering Murderer Who Was God's Bitch

The Sword is Still Mightier Than the Pen

The 10 or 14 Afterthoughts

The God-Satan Merger: Downsizing the Corporation of Loyalty

Other Nonsense Found in Job

Kill All the Gay People: Sodom, Gomorrah, the Levite & the Concubine

Hands With Differing Agendas: Biblical Mistranslation & Fraud

Hysterical Historicity

Old as Methuselah

Biblical Brutality  
Draconian Laws in the Bible  
Old Testament Law of Indiscriminate Murder  
Servant of Servants: Slavery in the Bible  
Bizarre & Dangerous Scriptures  
Eeny Meeny Miney Moe: Prophecies We Didn't Know  
The Revelations of Revelation

#### COSMOLOGY OF THE DARK SIDE: HELL, SATAN & MISGUIDED ADHERENTS

Gnashing of Teeth  
The First Spark  
The Metaphor of Hell  
Cultural Punishment  
Vice And Virtue  
The Evil Landlord  
The Devil is in the Details  
Lucifer Who?  
The Fall of Satan  
Being a Nonsensical Being  
Lost Inferno Paradise  
Satan, the Ultimate Conspiracy Theory  
The Devil in a Red Leotard  
Historicity of Christian Complicity  
Dirty Laundry  
Poisonous Priests & Pastors  
Pitiful Saints & Popes  
Historically Heinous Pontiffs  
Religious Wars & Rumors of Wars  
The Clarity of Charity: Inheriting the Earth, Tax-Free  
Iconic Colonic: Cleansing the Paragons  
Insidious Indoctrination  
Father Likes the Furniss  
Jesus-Camp  
Jael. In a Tent. With a Spike.  
"Yes, Hate is Good."  
Rap Sheet for God's Assassins  
Suffer the Children  
Other Kills for Christ  
Life is so Sacred, I Will Kill You  
Onward Christian Soldiers: The Religious Reich  
Recap

#### COSMOLOGY OF SCIENCE

Science Heals, Religion Steals  
The Anatomy of Adamance\*  
Cosmology, Cosmogony & Abiogenesis: What & How of the Universe  
First Cause & Infinite Regress  
One Singular Sensation

Entropy & Thermodynamics  
Anthropic Principle  
Apples & Oranges...and Watches  
Formless and Void, Except for Water  
Flatheads Rejoice  
Science vs. The Flood  
Creationism with a Face-Lift  
The God Banana  
Rock of Ages  
Tectonics & Drift  
Geologic Column & Fossil Record  
Young Earth Absurdities  
Holy Spirit or Darwin's Ghost?  
Survival Of The Fittest  
Theory but Not Theoretical  
Lipstick on a Straw Man  
Irreducible Complexity

#### COSMOLOGY OF ATHEISM

What Good is Faith?  
Philosophy, Reason & Intelligence  
Logical Fallacies  
Antonyms That Vex Us  
Unreasonable Ideas  
Religion and IQ  
Etymology of Ignorance  
Herding Cats: The History & Nature of Atheism  
Atheism is Myth-Understood  
Atheist, Unaware  
Benefits of Atheism  
Atheists, Skeptics & Infidels, Oh My  
What are Atheists like?  
Morality Vs. Ethics  
Immortal Christians, Immoral Atheists  
Morality of the Godless  
Infidels Worldwide  
Giving Infidels  
The Political Machine  
Obama, the Foreign Muslim Satanist Antichrist  
Separation of Church & State  
The Christian Taliban  
Proof of God (NOT)  
The Odyssey of Theodicy  
The 5 Stages of Loss  
Embracing Pariah Status  
Milestone or Millstone?

Appendix A: The Flying Spaghetti Monster

Appendix B: Scary Christian Quotes  
Appendix C: Scriptural Contradictions  
Appendix D: Phrases from the Bible  
Appendix E: Clergy Abuse List  
Appendix F: Dissertation Hovind Doesn't Want You to Read  
Appendix G: Implications of Evolution\*  
Appendix H: Index to Creationist Claims\*  
Appendix I: Comic Relief-The Thermodynamics Of Hell  
Appendix J: Noah's Ark  
Appendix K: Transitional Fossils  
Appendix L: Terminology  
Appendix M: Giving Infidels  
Appendix N: Celebrity Atheists  
Appendix O: The Atheist Platform  
Appendix P: Practical Significance of IQ  
Appendix Q: Comic Relief  
References

