

THE ABSURD CONSEQUENCES OF THE DOCTRINE THAT BREAD CAN BECOME JESUS WITHOUT A PHYSICAL CHANGE

Transubstantiation is the Catholic doctrine that priests can turn bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus without any physical change seeming to have happened. Jesus is thought to have taught the doctrine in John 6 and in the stories of the last supper.

The doctrine needs to a complicated series of new doctrines which shows it only has the Church tying itself up in knots. Father Slater wrote, "A priest in one room could not consecrate bread and wine in another, or behind his back, or, as it would seem, locked up in the tabernacle. Moreover, the matter must be determined by the intention of the priest ; he would not consecrate a host which had been left on the altar for him to consecrate, but about which he knew nothing, and which he had no intention to consecrate." Jesus is limited to the Church's intention.

Protestants complain that since there is no detectible miracle in transubstantiation it must be false for God only does miracles that can be verified. They accept the Bible miracles as real so if Jesus who did many of them says that bread is really his body then that should be verification enough for them unless there are other reasons why Jesus cannot do that. Catholics say, "There is no law that says God can only do miracles that we can verify except when they are signs. The Eucharist is not meant to be evidence for Christianity like the verifiable miracles. We were not around to do scientific tests when the world came into being. The miracle of forgiveness of sins is an invisible miracle." But when you see that there is no point in turning the bread and wine into flesh and blood you see that the miracle must be a sign and so would have been meant to be detectible.

If Jesus taught transubstantiation in John 6 then he did not mean undetectable transformation as you have in the Catholic Church. Also, Christians do believe the miracle of God creating all things out of nothing is verifiable in so far as they think they prove that creation is a miracle. And forgiving sins is not an invisible miracle for the penitent supposedly experiences God forgiving and guiding her or him to life a better life – forgiveness causes grace to flow into the soul. The life change causes is visible to others and a visible miracle to them. A God that needs to do invisible miracles or miracles that are not signs is a failure. If he had his creation set up properly he wouldn't need to secretly alter the laws of nature to do things.

Some Protestants tell the story of the Protestant lady who was married to a Catholic who was anxious to convert her. The story has been made into a poem called, The Lady and the Priest. She was unable to believe in transubstantiation and it was decided that the priest would perform the miracle on bread she had made. Everything happened as planned. But the lady confessed that she had poisoned the bread and she asked the priest to eat it for if it was Jesus it would not do him any harm. The priest ran off in horror evidently believing that it would still poison him. The fact that the poison was not rendered harmless after the alleged change is supposed to disprove transubstantiation. It does not for Catholics hold that only the bread and not the poison was changed and that there is no visible physical change in the bread though it has become Jesus Christ. The Catholics believe that even if bread were poisonous it would not become safe when the priest makes it become the body of Christ. Nevertheless, the poem shows that the sacrament makes it possible to kill kings and queens by giving them poisoned communion wafers. Someone tried to kill Louis XIV that way. Would God then create a sacrament that risks lives? Would it be right for him to change bread into Jesus meaning that that bread has to be protected from sacrilege even at the cost of your life just like St Tarsiscus gave his life to protect the Eucharist?

The Roman faith believes that you should worship the communion wafer. They store the wafers in a tabernacle so that you can pray to Jesus in the tabernacle. So when you take communion you become a tabernacle yourself and owe yourself the same respect as you would give to the tabernacle. To masturbate after communion while Jesus is in you is considered to be an extremely dreadful sacrilege. So it follows then that if a priest wants to murder you he can remove from you the right to defend yourself by taking communion first. You have to let him kill you. you would have to do it just like you would be ordered by the Church to choose death if somebody wanted you to spit the wafer out on pain of death.

The Church says all of Jesus' body and blood is in every part of the communion wafer. So it follows that you can safely say that the communion wafer is the penis of Jesus. To have sex with it is to take Jesus' virginity. The wine is said to be the body and blood of Jesus as much as the wafer is. So what do you call it blood for? It could be called the semen of Jesus as well. Do you see now who blasphemous the Catholic Church is being? Do you see now how an intelligent child forced to take communion could feel sexually violated? Indeed they are being sexually violated.

Some say that transubstantiation cannot be true when it requires that Jesus must be expelled from the body. Stercorianists are people who follow the revolting heresy that the body and blood of Jesus are not only eaten and drunk in the Mass but that they come out the other end to be flushed down the toilet. Catholics say that as long as the accidents of the bread and

wine last they are the body and blood of Jesus. This is how Catholics can say that Jesus is not washed down the toilet. For example, if you burn the host to ashes it will cease to be Jesus when it stops smelling, feeling, looking, tasting and sounding like bread. So God must transubstantiate the matter back into ordinary substances when it is no longer edible. Many of the atoms are still the atoms that compose bread and can only be changed back into bread by another miracle. It is all awkward, complicated and absurd. When many of the atoms that make up bread that have been changed into Jesus still exist when the appearance of bread is lost for the appearance of bread still exists at the atomic and molecular level and below that it creates problems for the claim that the loss of appearance means loss of presence. Yet they claim that Jesus is as much in the atom of the host as he is in the whole of it.

We know that when we eat or drink anything there is a piece of what used to compose say Abraham Lincoln in it because nature recycles all the time. There will be molecules of communion bread and atoms in everything we eat. So it follows then that everything is holy communion because there must be molecules of holy communion in it. The fact that the Church holds that communion rites are necessary and unique for the power they give and what they bless shows the absurdity of saying that communion is the body and blood of Jesus Christ.

It is an error to imagine that a host lost in a forest where it will never be found will remain the body of Jesus until it melts or rots. It is saying that God does miracles which make no sense for to keep the Eucharist being Jesus is to do a pile of new miracles for a new one has to be done every moment to keep the host in existence and another one to keep Jesus in it. If God does this then he is right to so Jesus must really come out of the body by excretion. Jesus wouldn't mind being in the septic tank when he has been in a stomach which is not much nicer. The vitamins and the proteins in the bread are Jesus and they become a part of you so he who eats Jesus has Jesus as a part of his body.

When God changed the host into Jesus in the first place and then has to change it back into something like bread again when it is unfit for consumption is the Eucharist a good system? It sounds like it keeps God busy. What does it turn back into: the bread it was before or does it turn into different bread and bad inedible bread at that? Worse, the change happens in a split second of time. Is it not madness to hold that if you divide a second into thousands that it is part 501 that the host is still enough of a host to be Christ and then at 502 that it is not and so has to be transubstantiated into something else and is Jesus no longer? Why would God even bother turning it back into bread or bread gone bad when turning it into a tree would do?

If you burn a host to ashes you can still eat it and I don't see why God would reverse the transubstantiation.

Don't tell the pope about this chapter for he will be putting red lamps over septic tanks and commanding people to genuflect before the presence of the Blessed Sacrament in them.

When protein and vitamins and whatever else become Jesus it makes no sense to insist that you must have real bread to have a real valid Eucharist. If Jesus really said that bread is necessary for the conversion then he made a scientific blunder and was not a true prophet of God but a fraud. And the Church does say that he did. Coeliacs have to receive communion from the chalice for the Church holds that wafers made without the substance that makes them sick are not proper bread and cannot turn into Jesus.

In chapter 23 of his book, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, Ex-Fr Charles Chiniquy related the story of how a rat made away with the body of Christ after it was created by a blind priest in Beauport. Chiniquy told the priest that if he were God he would have struck the rat dead instead of letting it eat the god of Rome. This argument is unacceptable to a believer in God like Chiniquy for God has seemingly strange purposes. Yet he claimed that God put this argument in his heart to show him the madness of belief in transubstantiation. God can work out his plans without letting rats steal Jesus for their dinner because he is all-powerful. He could make us holy by letting us experience Heaven for a brief and miraculous moment so that we would endure any pain or loss rather than sin so that we might have him again. Once the notion of divine purpose is abandoned then it is seen that rats eating the host proves that it is bread and not the body of Jesus Christ.

If the rat is making back to the sewer with Jesus inside and a toddler is crossing the road and you can stop the rat or save the toddler you have to stop the rat instead for you cannot have the saviour taken down to the sewers. He is more important than the life of a child for he said that God comes first.

If I write an essay and somebody comes along and says it is stupid they are saying that I am stupid. If I tell them that they will inevitably say they are not saying that but they are. That is undeniable and we all know it is right. But yet the Church says we are all sinners and have some sin in us no matter how good we are and that we can love one another because we must detest the sin but not the sinner. Communion means uniting with God and one another by partaking of the unifying body and blood of Christ. But it cannot work for loving the sinner and hating the sin is a deception just as much as it is a lie to say, "John did bad work doesn't mean John is a bad person." Of course it does as far as John did this work. Communion only gives out the appearance of unity by making people fool themselves. Communion then is dangerous for there has to be a better way than this and Humanism offers that way to the world by denying that we have free will so if we don't have free

will the harm we do cannot be classed as sin but as sickness. We believe that it does not matter if you are free or not. What matters is wanting to do good and you get yourself to want it by developing your self-esteem. To love yourself results in what is best for others. It is the only way to love others if you take love to mean doing good for them. Communion cannot work. It seeks to block real self-esteem and give out a veneer that will not last for it is not deep enough. Frankly, communion expresses conscious hypocrisy.

The doctrine of transubstantiation implies that lead can be pure gold and should be sold for the price of gold.

It says that what is lifeless can be actually alive.

Transubstantiation is thought of in relation to material things. For example, bread. But why should it be? If the bread changes into Jesus without anything being different materially then the best we can do to describe this is to say that the spirit of the bread is changed into the spirit of something else. When you see an image in your head say of a sweet, the image is real in your own head. There is something there. The sweet is not real but the image of it is. Why then not argue that the image you see in your mind's eye has been trans whatevered into whiskey? Why not say that its appearance does not reflect what it is an image of? In other words you are not really seeing a sweet. Transubstantiation should work better with mental entities than material ones. You can even transubstantiate a lie, a mental entity, into the truth!

The Church says there is a problem with transubstantiation if the bread is not turned into Jesus' risen body but into Jesus in the condition he was before his death. But it is not saying the bread is unable to be turned into the pre-resurrection body of Jesus. The problems are theological. It would be strange for Jesus to change it into his unglorified body instead of his perfected glorified risen body. So in theory, the Church says that marble plinth in your garden could actually be the body and blood and personhood of your dead father!

There is so much complexity in attempts to show that Jesus turned bread and wine into his own body and blood that clearly either he has been misunderstood or consciously misinterpreted or he was simply wrong. When it is too hard to defend a doctrine such as transubstantiation there is something amiss.

Children and the vast majority of Catholics think that a new Jesus is made every time a wafer is consecrated. That is what they worship. The Church itself sees this as idolatry. The Church says we are to worship the one Jesus in Heaven when we worship the Eucharist - we are not to worship a duplicate. When most Catholics and when children worship the Jesus in the form of the communion wafer they intend to worship a new one. St Paul said that those who had a different idea of salvation from his were receiving a different Holy Spirit and following another Jesus. The Catholic Church through its dangerous doctrine has people going further than that! God would not reveal a doctrine that is too easily misunderstood and inaccessible to the men and women on the street. Also they will believe that God tricks their taste so that they don't taste the flesh and blood of Jesus when they take communion. This can be very disturbing for people. It makes them mistrust themselves, mistrust their senses, believe in stupid miracles, believe in a deceitful God and believe themselves to be cannibals. The Church denies that its doctrine does these things. But when the Church itself says it doesn't understand the mystery it can hardly be said to be making much of a denial!

Some say that if eating Jesus cannibalistically were a grave evil then it would be evil to eat bread as if it were Jesus even if you think it is not. Catholic theologians say it would be cannibalism if the bread were meant to be Jesus' pre-crucifixion body. They say his body changed so much in the resurrection that it is not cannibalism to feed on his body. The Church says that cannibals kill and eat a bit of their victims but with Jesus we do not kill him and instead of eating a bit of him we eat all of him. Now to this it can be said that Jesus never says the bread is his changed body but always says it is the dying natural body he had until he died. Also even the New Testament does not argue that Jesus was really that transformed so that he resembles a ghost more than a man. A transformed Jesus does not necessarily mean a Jesus who could become bread! And if it is cannibalism then eating all of Jesus at Mass penis and rectum and intestines is far more cannibalism than any lost tribe ever practiced.

When God is supposed to come before all things and be made the reason we do all we do it must be blasphemy to bend the knee before a wafer for it could be that the priest only mimed the Mass and invalidated the consecration by making the intention that the bread would not change. To adore the wafer as God you would need to be 100% certain that it was indeed the God-man Jesus. Christians and their saints don't care about God as much as they act and to bow before the wafer of the priest who makes a new god is to put that priest before God for he is the one being trusted and God is not being put first when the transformation cannot be certain. Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount that he hated people making themselves out to be something special and that is what the priests are doing proving that Jesus was not behind the Mass if he was the son of God.

It is thought that God forbade idolatry and so if he allowed transubstantiation he would be paving the way for anybody to claim that some material thing was God. Catholic theologians have objected, "But only a person who never erred while speaking in God's name could do that. If Jesus managed that then he could have instituted transubstantiation. This would

not be idolatry for there is a real change into God and also because it is verified and attested by a prophet who is undoubtedly a real prophet of God." The trouble is that all the divisions of the religious world prove that people cannot agree on what is error or if a specific prophet did indeed show that God was speaking through him by not making any mistakes. So we are really back where we started. And no educated people believes that prophets can't err and blame their errors not on God but on human frailty. Jesus never clearly instituted the Catholic Mass of transubstantiation. The Bible teaches that God loves and values simplicity for his message is principally for the simple people. That is why God makes it simple for us to tell when a false God is in fact a false God, it cannot protect itself from harm. So a statue that is supposed to be a divine being is not divine at all if it can be knocked off its shelf and broken. The Old Testament uses this line of reasoning to convince pagans that their gods are not gods therefore it teaches that if the consecrated host of the Catholics cannot avoid burning in fire or being desecrated or digested then it is not God.

Transubstantiation Marriage

Roman Catholicism is against same sex marriage. Why not transubstantiate a man into a woman and perform the marriage? That way the gays would be a bit happier and the teaching that sex and marriage are only for men and women would be sustained! The Church will say God has given no authority for turning a man into a woman through transubstantiation. But what can it say if some new form of religion comes along saying he has? Surely other opinions about transubstantiation should be encouraged as much as the Church's is?

Finally

Do you like Catholicism as much when it would class you insane if you believed your dead cat is now your keyring but without any of the physical components having changed? Kettles and pots. Some Mormons have argued that Joseph Smith might have forged what looked like golden plates and transubstantiated them into real ones that carried the word of God as in the Book of Mormon.

Plus that Catholic transubstantiation doctrine has too many miracles. There is the miracle of bread turning into his body and blood - bread a liquid? There is the miracle of wine turning into his body and blood - wine a body? There is the miracle of how they don't change as regards our experience. And that is not to mention how God gets Jesus to fit. Even the taste of the bread does not change. Then there is the reverse-transubstantiation of how they have to turn back into ordinary things in the bowel. As the food will be digested at different rates this will be a piecemeal transformation back into whatever makes up digested bread and wine. And the miracle is that they are either the old bread and wine back again in digested form or God makes them into digested new bread and wine. Another miracle is how it makes sense to feed on Jesus for a few minutes and how physically eating and drinking affects your soul! Another miracle is how grace is seen as a substance for a soul to feed on. The sacrament gives that kind of grace. Grace in the Bible just means relationship with God. In reality it is like saying mathematics is a substance. Anybody saying that is just inventing something and calling it mathematics. It is absurd. This miracle transformation of grace into what it cannot be is the biggest miracle of all for grace is vital according to the Christian faith. Grace is metaphorically spiritual food - but it is not food in any sense any more than a parent bonding with her baby is food. The mass is blasphemous for it turns grace into magic. It is pure occultism and counterfeit spiritual food.