

APOSTLE PAUL WAS A LIAR AND THE TRUE FOUNDATION OF CHRISTIANITY

Paul is the most important witness to the resurrection we have for he is the only one who spoke of having visions to verify the resurrection first hand. So if we eliminate him as unreliable then we have nothing but gossip to base our belief in the resurrection on. How could the New Testament be infallible when it contains the writings of Paul who furnished us with zero evidence that he had prophetic ability and could write scripture? No proof of his sincerity was given either.

If Jesus really appeared to Paul to authorise him to be his messenger and keep his message correct and according to Jesus' will then if Paul falls Jesus falls too.

Paul went as far as to say that the gospel he preached back then was the truth so if even he changed it later he should be cursed and rejected.

2 Corinthians chapter 13 is where Paul quotes with approval the Old Testament Law of God that in the mouths of two or three witnesses all things must be established. He threatens then to discipline wrongdoers when he comes. Why did he quote the law? Was it because of the wrongdoers and to let the people know that it's God's will that they refuse to let them get away with it? No he was not asking for two or three witnesses for everything the recalcitrant did. That would be absurd. He said then that the people in Corinth wanted evidence that Jesus was really speaking through Paul. This was what the quoting of the law was about. He was applying it to himself. He was saying that he had nothing to fear from the law in terms of his own claims. Then he explained that the proof was how God and Jesus were working in the people. So they were his two witnesses. God and Jesus working in Paul's converts was supposed to prove that Paul was authentic - God was one witness and Jesus the other. The people weren't denying that they felt God and Jesus were working in them. They were denying Paul's claim to have the right to govern them in the name of God and Jesus. That he couldn't mention any affidavits from the apostles in Jerusalem or any testimony from them is significant. It proves that they were saying, "We feel that Jesus rose therefore he did." They could not appeal to evidence. The lack of evidence shows that he was understandably regarded with suspicion by them if not outright opposition. He was using a very subjective proof, "I feel that God and Jesus are working in me and therefore Paul speaks with Jesus' authority and Jesus speaks through him." Such proofs are dangerous and lead only to chaos for any religious teacher could use similar logic. It's no incentive for implementing effectual discipline.

In 1 Corinthians 15, Paul defends the doctrine that Jesus rose from the dead. Many of the Corinthian Christians had come to believe that the doctrine was not true. Paul argues that Jesus must have been raised for the dead would be lost forever if he did not - that is dishonest logic. It would only mean that someone else would have to rise and save.

According to Acts 21, Paul pretended to be a real devoted Jew to hoodwink his Jewish critics. He had to be deceiving for he taught doctrines that the Jews considered to be idolatrous, blasphemous and heretical. And Acts gives the story of his vision of Jesus on the road to Damascus no less than three times as if it were of supreme importance. How could it be, coming from a religious trickster?

Paul cynically taught that the whole world was capable of nothing only sin and that saved Christians alone could do genuine and good works. This slander, repeated by pathetic frauds like Martin Luther and John Calvin and their followers, denies that when we, the unsaved, sincerely do what we believe is good it is good. It accuses us of knowing that we are sinning. Anybody who has lived to ten years of age knows that we are not always sinful and that we deserve to be rescued from sin by God for doing good if we are free agents. Paul was able to lie as he and his audience pleased. Jesus said that you cannot get good fruit off a bad tree meaning the fruits look good. Jesus of course was not thinking of real fruit but of people. Fruit can look good and be bad inside. Jesus was denying that good works necessarily made one a good person. The other apostles were as wicked as Paul when they made him a brother. Paul even went on to command good works even though if there is sin in you they are not good.

Paul said that he worked harder than the twelve apostles (1 Corinthians 15:9,10). When the others who lived and worked with Jesus were less interested, it either suggests that they were lying and liars are often not that determined to advance their lies - though some are for it makes them feel big - or that they had never lived and worked with Jesus at all. The Christians reply that the Jerusalem apostles concentrated on Jews and Paul took on the world which was a bigger project. But that is no excuse for the former not working harder.

The original Greek of 2 Corinthians 12:14-20 has Paul admitting that he lived off the Corinthians by craftiness and guile. Christians say that Paul only said that they were saying that about him. But this is not in the original Greek and makes no sense anyway in the context. Paul simply says that when he goes back to them he will not take anything from them though

he had been crafty with them before. He says that he did not burden them in what he did or take advantage of them in a burdensome way and neither did his friends. Plus when these people were accusing them of burdening them and when Paul gives no evidence but only denials it implies what they were saying is right for he should be able to defend himself if he is innocent (Something's Fishy: Deception, Secrecy and the Gospel on the www).

Everybody in Asia fell away from the gospel according to Paul (2 Timothy 1:15). But the Book of Revelation praises the Churches there implying that the Jesus of the Book of Revelation did not approve of Paul. They had another kind of Christianity.

These guys could have made up everything they said about Jesus.

In Romans 14, Paul hypocritically forbade eating certain foods when it offends other Christians who do not know that God lets his people eat whatever they like. Yet he said that it is wrong to commit certain acts even if not doing them scandalises others like adultery or theft. He wanted people to be gullible.

If God really spoke through the prophets of Corinth as Paul maintained, Paul would not have needed to lay down rules for order (v14). He thought that God was well organised when he declared that God doesn't confuse. Paul's thinking is incoherent and childish or he wanted ours to be.

Paul said that unbelievers know fine well there is a God (Romans 1). A statement like that coming from a man who had to have had doubts about God himself for he was only human shows what a shameless slanderer he was. If you are an atheist then you know that the Bible is wrong to say everybody knows there is a God no matter how much they try to deny him. When this slander is sanctioned by the apostles and prophets of Jesus against us why then would they have no right to go further and persecute us? If there is a God then it is his business what we do or think for we are his creation and his property. We have no right to think anything other than what he decrees we should think. God and the idea that God has made one true religion are intrinsically bigoted and dangerous. There are literally millions of different forms of faith in this world so the concept of God will put us at the mercy of men who claim to represent God and who tell us what to think in God's name and since they stand in the place of God it is their business what we think and do.

In Romans 3 and 7, Paul said that we are all totally depraved and as bad as each other. He knew from his own heart that this was not true.

Paul sees symbolism in a Genesis story (Galatians 4:21-31) that is not in the original. The Church says he was not claiming that it was in it but that he could see a parable for what he wanted to say in it. That is a lie for all he had to do was just say what he wanted to say without the fancy interpretation. It would have been handier and he never gave any hint that the Church was right. This proved that when he said in the book of Acts that he never undermined the Law of Moses he was lying for this allegorical interpretation indicates that he wanted it to be possible to make it mean whatever you like.

He declared that our faith must not depend on philosophy or wisdom but on God's power (1 Corinthians 1,2). He commanded blind faith. The Church says he is only against false wisdom. But he said that the death of Jesus proved that the wisdom of philosophers though they were all intelligent and respected men is wrong and we cannot make sense of the death of Jesus. He is saying that when reason contradicts God reason must be ignored. These are the anti-intellectual hints. But Paul went straight for the jugular and forbade thinking when it was not his thinking.

Paul in Romans 3:7,8 condemns people who lie to glorify God though it means making sure they will be saved by lying to them when one can get away with it. It says that we can't do evil so that good may come. If it is wrong to save people from eternal damnation with a lie then it must be wrong to disguise your pockmarks with makeup for that is deception too. It must be wrong to use clothes to make your body look better than what it is. Those are action lies. Life would be impossible if the apostle was right. But he didn't care. He was only lying to his gullible and stupid audience and getting away with it.