

## DECEIVING DOCTRINES OF JESUS CHRIST

Jesus first and foremost duty was to deliver what he called true doctrine unto the world. He claimed to be God's definitive communicator. With such a heavy job he could not afford to tell doctrinal lies and discredit himself completely.

Somehow or other he did it. I suppose he saw how stupid or evil his fans were.

Jesus said that the Sabbath was made for man and man was not made for the Sabbath (Mark 2). It was to be the day of rest and prayer for people. But God owes himself all his love and not us so anything he does is for himself. And don't object that God cannot be selfish. Philosophy says that as God is perfect he has to love himself only for he deserves it. It is only justice so he is not selfish. Anything else would be injustice and therefore immoral. If love is sacrifice then God is doing us a favour by making us for the sacrifice of offering prayer to him. People are to pray all the time on the Sabbath which is why it is a day of rest from work. It is a day of spiritual communion. People were made for the Sabbath for they were made for prayerful sacrifice. The Sabbath couldn't really be made for people when people are urged to rest on it regardless of what is best done. A man who rests most of the week and finds Saturday the best day to work hard is condemned though he is doing what is best for himself and then Jesus comes along to challenge this! Slander. The man is accused of blasphemy for saying that the Sabbath was not made for him. Jesus definitely espoused the making of rigid rules regardless of whether they were good or bad or ideal for everybody.

Jesus said that the law and the prophets, in short, the Old Testament, is enough to persuade people to convert to his ideas and that if they will not heed it then even a person rising from the dead to talk to them will do no good (Luke 16:31).

People in his day could not utilize archaeology or anything to prove that the Old Testament was truthful and a miracle of a man returning from the grave would be stronger evidence of the need for faith and obedience to God than that the Old Testament was true. But he denied that here even though at other times he said it was faithless to look for signs from God. What was he doing rising from the dead and demanding faith in him when he said that a man who crawled out of his grave and went back to his brothers after being dead for a while would not be convincing?

Jesus said that the Devil who likes to appear to be a gentleman and send prophets who falsely claim to have been sent by God would do false signs and wonders so great that they could mislead even his chosen people (Matthew 24:24). The miracles might be faked rather than be supernatural wonders. But no matter, he is declaring that miracles were not to be considered evidence for anything all the while appealing to his own miracles which are probably natural ones as opposed to supernatural, as evidence that he was God's Son (Matthew 9:6; 14:26,33; Mark 1:44). Jesus' lies cast doubt on whether the miracle stories are true or correctly reported by the gospels, for only liars write books to get liars taken at face value.

Jesus said in Luke 16 that a servant who dishonestly undercharged when selling his master's goods was right. The Church says he didn't say that but only that the prudence of the servant was good but not the dishonesty of it. But to praise dishonest prudence is to praise dishonesty for the two go together. And Jesus said that you have to make friends for yourself with bad money so that when it lets you down you will go to Heaven. The context is about bad dishonest money so Jesus is commending opportunism. Even though Jesus condemns dishonesty in the next breath it is clear that the person who put the dishonest servant story in the gospel did not understand it when he put this condemnation into Jesus' mouth.

Jesus said that even the weakest faith had the power to do miracles if God willed it (Matthew 17:20). He said that God willed Peter to walk on water but when Peter sank he told him it was because his faith was so weak (Matthew 14). A complete contradiction!

We hold that if a person should be made happy and helped, that the person is more important than happiness. It is because the person is so important that we have to make the person happy. The person is more important than quality of life.

Jesus said that birds are cared for by God so we should feel safe in God's arms. If God made animals just for us then Jesus' deduction would be incorrect. Jesus implies that wanton cruelty to animals is bad. If you should not be cruel to an animal then an animal should be happy and an animal should be happy only if it is more valuable than happiness. Therefore the reason for saying that a person is more valuable than quality of life also implies that animals are absolutely valuable. Still, Jesus was as two-faced as the world has always been for he said our lives are more valuable than those of conscious animals (Matthew 10:31). That is one of the lies that you have to tell to avoid being a fish out of water in this world. He supported the cruel practice of kosher meat for the Law said that flesh with blood in it could not be eaten so the animal had to be bled to death. Jesus supported the Law.

When the Jews suggested that Jesus' exorcisms were just tricks of the Devil, Jesus said they were not for Satan could not cast out Satan and destroy his own kingdom. This tells us that the Devil cannot have a kingdom without possessing people.

It is implied then that most people must be demon-possessed for Jesus described the devil as the prince of the world and the devil even offered Jesus all the kingdoms of the world as if he owned them. This suggests that when he tempts all he must possess all. They can blame the Devil and not themselves then for their sins. Jesus used fear and terror to derange people and manipulate them so that they hardly knew what was real. Moreover, Jesus knew the Devil could cast out demons under certain circumstances for he would only be sending them to somebody else anyway. Jesus lied. Whoever is not against the Devil is for him.

Not once did any gospel verify that anybody Jesus was cured of a Devil stayed cured forever or was really cured. Jesus said a demon will come back if a man is not holy enough which is a good excuse for a fake exorcist who fails so he must have needed the excuse. Jesus was a false prophet and when one of them does exorcisms is enough to prove that he is using the Devil to do them if the Devil exists. Jesus even went as far as to say that anybody suspecting that the Devil was doing his miracles would never be saved so he was going to make sure that people would be afraid to think about his miracles. He was the one that said the Devil is very crafty.

Jesus said that unclean spirits like to come back to the man they left behind because they can find nobody else to take over (Matthew 12). As if there were no sinners in the world! Jesus was denying that to sin was to serve the Devil and to give him consent that you will let him do as he pleases with you! Moreover, he said that if demons come back to a man it is because he had himself swept and tidied for them - that is, that he wanted them back. Just before that he had been accused of casting out demons by the Devil's magic, which implies that his teaching was an attempt to convince people that his failed and seeming exorcisms really had worked. No alleged victim of possession acts possessed all the time and Jesus was trying to tell people that if a person went quiet when he was around that it was because he put the demon out. He was capitalising on that. When there were few people in those days who were not dramatically possessed and hardly anybody these days it indicates that either that that generation was worse than ours – not true though espoused by Turton (page 367, *The Truth of Christianity*) – or more likely that Jesus sent the demons into the people in the first place in order to make it seem that he could put them out.

Jesus in Mark 9:42 said that it was better for anybody who caused one of the children around him to sin to be drowned if that child was a believer in Jesus. This implies it is not so bad to make other children sin. This is sectarianism and arrogance at its worst.

Jesus said that it was worse to ignore his message that the reign of God was at hand than to ignore a message to repent (Luke 10). He prescribed insults and curses for those who did not accept the coming of the kingdom. He never picked like that on people who would not repent. He commanded that his disciples must wipe of the dust off their sandals, the dust of the sceptical town. That was a major insult and implies that the townspeople are so hated that the missionaries cannot bear to have their dust on their sandals. Pure and utter bigotry. It was more important to believe something than to regret and make amends for hurting others!

Perhaps repentance and faith go together and saying the kingdom is near implies that repentance must be done soon? But repentance and a specific KIND of faith do not go together. What would thinking the kingdom is around the corner have to do with repenting? You can repent without it or any religious dogma. The extreme urgency of the message implies that the door to Heaven was soon to be closed and soon as in a matter of days. There would be no point in God keeping the world anymore in that case and it would be brutally devastated by divine power and some would be safe in the kingdom. Seemingly, Jesus thought the world was about to end. It didn't so he was just another maniacal fake prophet.

For a religious teacher to threaten anybody because they would not repent fast enough even though there was no immediate hurry would be counter-productive. Jesus seems to have realised that for he stopped the ranting soon after emerging on the early pages of the gospels foaming at the mouth. Jesus knew he had to be nice to sinners to change them. And he partied with them. It is still true that his initial warning about the kingdom coming near implied that immediate repentance was being called for.

The episode may suggest that time was running out for sinners. Christians say that Jesus died to save the people who wanted to be saved. If so, maybe he meant that nobody sinful could change after his death so everybody then would be barred from Heaven. The time to repent was at his death or before it. This would make impostors of Paul and declare Christianity since his death to be apostate and satanic for it still preaches repentance and tells us we can go to Heaven.

Jesus said that since sin deserved everlasting punishment that it was an infinite evil to sin against God. God would do infinite good to you so sin is infinite ingratitude. If sin is infinite it cannot be any worse therefore there cannot be degrees of punishment and Jesus was telling untruths when he said there were (Luke 20:47). So the sin of telling a small lie is as bad as murder in the sight of God.

Jesus told the people he cured that their faith did it. The Church says that sometimes when God sees it is fit to work a miracle he will do it if the faith is strong enough. Suppose miracles enable a person who experiences them to have true and

genuine faith. If Ann has a little faith, she needs the miracle. Why should Johnny with a strong faith get the miracle? Why would God indicate to Johnny, "I want to make you proud and arrogant of your faith which is so great that I had to do a miracle to honour it." It would contradict the doctrine of Jesus that the best thing to do if you have faith is not to show it off but to try and be discretely good. It would contradict the doctrine of Jesus that miracles are signs that God does to authenticate the mission of Jesus.

So the Church says God rewards strong faith with a miracle. Did Jesus did not teach that if you believe enough you will receive healing? Some theologians say that Jesus did not say that anybody who is sick is sick through their own fault or because they did not believe enough. Or did he? Jesus knew that one will trust in God without being able to believe in him and yet we read that he couldn't do healings for unbelievers. Jesus said people need faith to receive the miracle of healing. For Jesus, God is that which can be trusted so an atheist will have the attitude, "If God exists then he can be trusted and I trust him for I agree that he can be trusted. My problem is not trusting God but being sure that he exists". Jesus certainly meant intellectual adherence to the dogma of the existence of God and not mere trust. Jesus just cured people because they agreed with as much of his dogma as they were able. He condemned unbelief as sinful so he was saying that if the sick were not healed it was their own fault. He often complained that he lived in unbelieving times. Our generation is worse so the true Christian blames sickness on disbelief or weak belief. The sick deserve no compassion or help except a lecture in this view. At least, what Jesus said about faith curing people proves that he was not claiming to have the power to heal but that their faith did it. Thus the illnesses were psychosomatic, in the mind.

A man told Jesus to cure his son for he was his only child (Luke 9). Jesus did not condemn him for saying that and did what he asked. But it conflicts with the theistic law that Jesus should not help the boy because he is the man's only boy but only because it pleases God. Jesus said we are to love God as Lord with all our being - meaning we do all for him. This proves the miracle never happened and was invented by the Church. The man did not know of the principle that God comes first. Jesus told the man he had no faith. The gospel would have said that Jesus told him about the principle instead of saying that. So Jesus did not mention the principle. The story cannot be edifying for us without that. The gospels do not use the miracles to give us edifying lessons to help us get closer to God and see what he is like. It is all about the magic.

Perhaps the man meant that he should want his boy to live for being the only child God would want him to? But Jesus accused the man of having no faith. And the man would have known that Jesus wanted everything done for God's sake and would have said, "Jesus, God gave me this boy and he is the only one so God might not want him to suffer and die. Save him". But he didn't. Jesus supposedly used the cures to bring people to God and would not have healed a person unless it explicitly did that. The story is a fraud. Or perhaps the boy got better without Jesus's intervention and Jesus took the credit for it.

It was appalling that Christ had to get the boy brought to him and him kicking and screaming. Why didn't he take some of the crowd with him and go to the boy's house? It is odd that this miracle was done to impress the people when Jesus was being secretive about superhuman powers at this time according to Mark.

The Church today tells outrageous lies that Jesus never moralised in relation to any individual person and was radically critical of society and he was too loving to impute wrongdoing to anybody. They say he never criticised the Scribes and Pharisees for their weakness. And then they might admit that he gave out to them how they took the joy out of a relationship with God and put rules and laws in its place. What do they mean by a non-judgemental Jesus? If he regarded human evil as weakness then clearly there is no point in worrying about promoting rules about right and wrong. You will be no different in practice from the relativist who says that morality is rubbish.

A man whose doctrinal errors and lies made it even into his religion's scriptures must have told more lies than these and told worse – a lot worse. It just shows that the people who know and praise a man like that don't cherish integrity.

## JESUS' BAD MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Was Jesus an absolutist or a consequentialist in his moral philosophy? An absolutist ignores consequences while the latter does not.

Jesus said that it was always wrong or immoral to hate a person for we must love our enemy even when hate can lead to more good than bad. A battered wife can turn her hate for her husband into the urge and enthusiasm to get revenge by turning her life around and becoming confident and successful. Even then hatred is forbidden. That is absolutism. Only denial of free will can be a basis for always being against hate and make sense.

He caused trouble in the temple to stop the thieving there and heaped abuse and insults on the Jewish leaders. That was consequentialism for he taught that doing this evil would have results that would make it worth it. He said we must make peace with our accusers in case they jail us.

This switching back and forth was totally dishonest for consequences either count or they do not. He changed his ethics to suit himself.

Despite complaining about his apostles' sinful lack of faith he prayed with them though he knew a sinner cannot please God. It would be like them offering God a gift while cursing him inwardly. He even denied that motives were important though he said they were often enough.

Consequences either matter or they don't so Jesus was being careless with the lives of others. He did not give a toss. Most moralists are like him today. They preach absolutism and practice consequentialism. Their God is self-glorification dressed in the robes of humility.

It is wrong to think Jesus ever meant to contradict the evil cruel law of Moses. He could have done accidentally for the law contradicts itself so why would he be guaranteed to be consistent? There is nothing in the New Testament that says the law is ever wrong. Even when Jesus made all foods clean it could be meant to mean that he magically took away whatever it was that made them dirty or unclean. It would not amount to saying, "Food is clean no matter what the law says." Jesus told the adulteress that she deserved stoning - he just got those who were to stone her to see that they should leave her alone for they were no better themselves. The story only says she was saved then. The would be stoners were not going to kill her according to the law but were going to stone her without authority. But what about after that? If she had been in danger of being stoned and the law was applied correctly Jesus would have told them to stone her.

### *CONCLUSION*

Christians offer us a Jesus who is untrustworthy to be our God. It is a religion of deceit. The deceit must stop.

### BOOKS CONSULTED

- Catechism of the Catholic Church, Veritas. Dublin, 1995
- Christ and Violence, Ronald J Sider, Herald Press, Scottsdale, Ontario, 1979
- Miracles in Dispute, Ernst and Marie-Luise Keller, SCM Press Ltd, London, 1969
- Moral Philosophy, Joseph Rickaby SJ, Stoneyhurst Philosophy Series, Longmans, Green and Co, London, 1912
- Objections to Christian Belief, DM Mackinnon, HA Williams, AR Vidler and JS Bezzant, Constable, London, 1963
- Putting Away Childish Things, Uta Ranke-Heinemann, HarperCollins, San Francisco, 1994
- Reason and Belief, Bland Blanshard, George Allen & Unwin Ltd, London, 1974
- Robert Schuller, Satellite Saint or High Flying Heretic, Cecil Andrews, Take Heed Publications, Belfast
- The Hard Sayings of Jesus, FF Bruce Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1983
- The Resurrection Factor, Josh McDowell, Alpha Scripture Press Foundation, Bucks, 1993
- The Truth of Christianity, WH Turton, Wells Gardner, Darton & Co Ltd, London, 1905
- Why I am Not a Christian, Bertrand Russell, Touchstone Books, Simon and Schuster, New York, undated