

JESUS WAS MORALLY DE-SENSITISED AND SPREAD THAT COLDNESS TO SOCIETY

We can get angry at this for it is about society and not just religion.

We can object strongly to a man being that cold and yet honoured as the image of God and his son. That is blatant approval of his evil.

The Bible which Jesus declared infallible and to be of divine authorship as much as human has God commanding his people to stone certain sinners to death.

God and Jesus commanded corrupt rebellious Israel to kill and administer extreme capital punishment. That says it all! Bad enough to ask a holy nation to do it!

Here are the crimes demanding execution by divine command. The execution was typically performed by stoning. A naughty daughter of a priest was however burned to death.

Murder (Exodus 21:12-14; Leviticus 24:17,21)

Attacking or cursing a parent (Exodus 21:15,17)

Kidnapping (Exodus 21:16)

Failure to confine a dangerous animal, resulting in death (Exodus 21:28-29)

Witchcraft and sorcery (Exodus 22:18, Leviticus 20:27, Deuteronomy 13:5, 1 Samuel 28:9)

Sex with an animal (Exodus 22:19, Leviticus 20:16)

Doing work on the Sabbath (Exodus 31:14, 35:2, Numbers 15:32-36)

Incest (Leviticus 18:6-18, 20:11-12,14,17,19-21)

Adultery (Leviticus 20:10; Deuteronomy 22:22)

Homosexual acts (Leviticus 20:13)

Prostitution by a priest's daughter (Leviticus 21:9)

Blasphemy (Leviticus 24:14,16, 23)

False prophecy (Deuteronomy 18:20)

Perjury in capital cases (Deuteronomy 19:16-19)

False claim of a woman's virginity at time of marriage (Deuteronomy 22:13-21)

Sex between a woman pledged to be married and a man other than her betrothed (Deuteronomy 22:23-24)

Christians are not disgusted enough by the murderous laws of the Old Testament in which God commanded that gays and other "sinners" be stoned to death to hate the Bible.

God in Numbers 23:3-4 wants people impaled - so why don't we consider declaring that Vlad Dracula the Impaler was divine or God's servant?

The first step to religious violence is in justifying religious violence that has already taken place or that is happening.

Christian peace is not real peace. A religion condoning great evil cannot boast even if it is not that violent. What about the principle? Is the reason it seems to behave most of the time because it deals with its desire for blood by condoning?

Condoning can be passive aggression. Violence in spirit is nothing to boast about. It is still violence. It is only chance that is stopping it turning into actual raw and physical violence. A religion of peace that is passive aggressive is not a religion of peace at all. It is a religion of cold war.

Jesus supported and enjoyed the Jewish Festivals which glorified suffering sent by God and violence. The Passover celebrates how God's angel murdered the firstborn of Egypt.

Jesus took responsibility for writing the Old Testament through divinely inspired men despite its commanding in the name of God that homosexual men who have had sex and other "sinners" be savagely murdered by stoning. He said that not a dot of it would pass away until God fulfilled it - meaning God fully approves of it. If God changes a law, it is not because he thinks it was wrong before.

It is not true that Jesus dropped the murderous obligations laid down by God. Jesus celebrated the feast of death, the Passover and based the Eucharist on it according to the Church. The feast praised God for killing innocent children in Egypt and was based on that event. God was trying to force Egypt to let Israel go free from slavery. Neither Jesus or the Eucharist deserve any respect for honouring evil.

Jesus told the Jews off in the gospel of John for not believing the books of Moses - the lawbook that commanded stoning. "But do not think I will accuse you before the Father. Your accuser is Moses, on whom your hopes are set. If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote about me. But since you do not believe what he wrote, how are you going to believe what I say?" See John 5:46-47. Here he makes Moses as much the word of God as himself. The idea is that the same Father, God, tells both what to say.

Jesus said in Mark 12:24 that if you don't know the [Old Testament] scriptures you will be mistaken about what God does.

Jesus Christ: "I tell you that to everyone who has, more shall be given, but from the one who does not have, even what he does have shall be taken away. But these enemies of mine, who did not want me to reign over them, bring them here and slay them in my presence." (Luke 19:26-27)

"Anyone who rejected the law of Moses died without mercy on the testimony of two or three witnesses. How much more severely do you think a man deserves to be punished who has trampled the Son of God underfoot, who has treated as an unholy thing the blood of the covenant that sanctifies him, and has insulted the spirit of grace? For we know God who said, "It is my job to avenge and I will repay!" - Hebrews 10.

Christians boast that they do not have to keep the law from God about stoning homosexuals and others to death for Jesus did away with it. But the text above tells them that such an abolition is no consolation for God will still have them punished if not by others then he will do it himself. And indeed the text says a fate worse than stoning awaits.

The law of Moses claimed to be divinely inspired. It required that gays who had sex and adulterous people and murderers must be put to death by stoning without mercy. The above New Testament text says that they deserve it. It also says that those who know Jesus and who sin deserve worse. The sins listed in Hebrews are purely religious ones - insulting Jesus and treating his blood with contempt. God said he will take revenge. The text does not say he will take revenge himself without using us to do it. In fact, he said it when he was using Israel to punish people by application of the law of Moses. So the text means he will use the Church to destroy his enemies.

Paul wrote in Romans 1 that everybody knows that homosexuals and other sinners should be destroyed - deserving to die means they are forcing God to kill them. "Knowing the judgment of God, that those who commit such things are worthy of death, they not only do the same, but have pleasure in those who do them". The text could be speaking of God's law that homosexuals are to be murdered by stoning. It probably is - he was speaking to the Jewish Christians of Rome who are obviously familiar enough with the Old Testament for he talks to them as if they know it well.

The death penalty under divine law is not optional nor a maximum penalty. Whoever kills any man shall surely be put to death.... You shall have the same law for the [foreigner] and for one from your own country; for I am the Lord your God." Lev. 24:17-22.

'Moreover you shall take no ransom for the life of a murderer who is guilty of death, but he shall surely be put to death... So you shall not pollute the land where you are; for blood defiles the land, and no atonement can be made for the land, for the blood that is shed on it, except by the blood of him who shed it.' Num. 35:31-33

Christians then do not oppose the stoning in principle. They do not see it as wrong in itself. When God takes life, it is easy to take the next step and say stoning cannot be wrong in principle. He might command you to stone when he is master of death and life. If you think you can kill and God approves and you are wrong it is not very wrong! Not when God is okay with killing in general and uses your mistakes in his divine and all-wise plan.

The Christians approve of keeping the rule about stoning but up to when Jesus (allegedly) abolished it.

Jesus even if he did abolish it, did not state that the rule was wrong. Changing the law, does not necessarily mean it was wrong before but only that it is time for a change. And it could be that the law was not abolished but just didn't apply in Jesus' day. A law going out of date does not mean the law is being changed. And God keeping the law to kill for us means it is in force.

Jesus supposedly abolished the stoning law in John 8 when he told people who were going to stone a woman to death for adultery that the first stone should be cast by the person without sin. But this case had nothing to do with the law. It was a lynch mob who wanted to stone her not the proper authorities. And he did say the sinless person had a right to stone her. The episode confirms the validity of the stoning law.

Christians are not disgusted by Jesus who refused that stoning adulteresses was wrong and who said that stoning is fine as long as you shouldn't be stoned yourself! The woman was so traumatised that you cannot assume Jesus let her go scot-free. He did not say he did but told her not to sin again in other words rubbing it in.

According to Jesus, Matthew 10:28 New International Version (NIV), Jesus was so desensitised to executions that he said, "Do not be afraid of those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. Rather, be afraid of the One who can destroy both soul and body in hell." One would wonder that when Jesus would have at least as an ordinary Jew before his ministry believed that cutting people's hands off for stealing was God's will, if he did not mean it literally when he said that if you sin with your eye you must cut it out.

The claim that the murderous Old Testament laws were only for people living centuries before Jesus is easily refuted. Jesus told the Jews off for not stoning people to death if they cursed their parents, "Why do you also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition? For God commanded, saying... 'He who curses father or mother, let him be put to death.' But you say..." Matthew 15:3-4. "For laying aside the commandment of God, you hold the tradition of men..." [Jesus] said to them, "All too well you reject the commandment of God, that you may keep your tradition. For Moses said, 'Honor your father and your mother; and 'He who curses father or mother, let him be put to death.'" Mark 7:8-11. Note that he was very angry that they annulled the murderous command.

We must remember that the command in the ten commandments to honour your father and mother is the positive version which is prompted by and related to the negative versions, "Whoever hits father or mother shall be put to death". "Who so curses father or mother shall be put to death." The commandments are all the same so the one in the ten is endorsing the death penalty.

In Luke 19:27 Jesus speaks of himself as the one who is going to have those who do not want him to rule them slain. He even says he wants to watch them being killed and for them to be brought before him. You might say he did not mean it literally. But then why did he not speak of having those people expelled from the nation or society or something? Why killing? If you think you can imagine it is not literal don't think you have the right to tell somebody not to take it literally and to start lusting for blood.

The notion that the stoning command was abolished is based on the idea that the law was a civil law. But there is no evidence for the law being merely civil law at all in the Old Testament. It was religious law. There is nothing that indicates that the law only applied in the day it was written. That God put it in the Bible implies that it wasn't. If you were God, you could imagine yourself giving such awful commandments by revelation to a prophet but you would keep them out of the scriptures if they were temporary. It is not the kind of thing that should be in a holy book.

Even if the stoning law was a civil law, it was also a moral law. In other words, if there is no civil law demanding stoning, then stone them for the sake of the moral law. Civil and moral laws may at times be identical. The Law of Moses has God stating that if homosexuals are stoned to death their own blood is upon them. In other words, it was not the law to blame for stoning them but themselves for doing something so evil. They are morally intolerable.

Christians use the God has mysterious ways excuse a lot for terrible doctrines. Jesus said that God was like a human father, daddy, meaning that he rejected far-fetched excuses and doctrines about mysterious ways as showing how a good God could allow or command evil. He assumed it was straightforward. To him, God was obviously right to have say gay people stoned to death. Jesus in Matthew 7:9-11 said that God is actually better at giving good things to his child than a human father is. He will not give you a stone if you ask for bread.

Significantly the Jewish leaders tell Jesus he does not change God's teaching to suit man and truly follows the Jewish faith (Mark 12:14). In other words, he supported the law with its predominately nasty rules from God to the hilt.

If religion commands you to condone violence thousands of years ago can the religion be used as an excuse for violence? No it is not an excuse - it is a reason. You cannot put violence in people's hearts and then pretend that it is not your fault if they act on it.

Good is not good when mixed with evil for that is what evil does. It likes to hide and sting unexpectedly. That is why the Bible should be called evil instead of pretending there is good in it. The good in the Bible is not the Bible's good.

Christians say God now punishes and gives the death penalty himself but that is them being violent by proxy. That is the most important lesson to take away from reading this page.

And it is Jesus' fault.