

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, Scottdale, 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



