

## APOSTLE PETER WAS TOO MUCH OF A LIAR FOR US TO TAKE HIS WORD ABOUT JESUS

The Christian religion is based on Jesus Christ being our saviour according to the word of the apostles. Jesus appointed 12 and one went astray and was replaced. Peter had a high rank among the apostles which reflects badly on them if he was not a reliable man in matters of religion.

The gospels let it slip that Peter told lies in matters of religion. Thus he cannot be regarded as an authority for saying that Jesus rose from the dead.

Jesus called Peter Satan and spoke to him sharply for saying that Jesus must not die on the cross. So Peter must have been trying to delude him into following the Devil (Matthew 16). Then Peter and the rest claimed that they did not know Jesus would die and rise later on when they gave up on Jesus.

Peter told Jesus that he would die for him. Jesus questioned this and informed him that he would deny him three times. Peter did just what Jesus said between the arrest and crucifixion of Jesus. He was lying against the doctrines that Jesus is of God and must be preached and is worthy of trust. And don't blame weakness for this for he could have denied it the once the first time he was asked about his association with Jesus and then gone away or better still walked away and said nothing. But he hung around for another couple of helpings! He lied under oath for the gospel says he called a curse on himself if he was not telling the truth (Matthew 26:72). In Acts 2:32 he subsequently appears and his supposed testimony to the resurrection is recorded and presented as evidence by Luke. Luke gave no proof that Peter really said all this which marks Luke out as dishonest and unprofessional. Peter is treated in many places as the chief witness and it is possible that if Jesus made Peter the rock the Church was built on that Jesus meant for him to be the chief witness to the resurrection. Peter's lying under oath that he had no need for doing would prove that he could not be a decent witness and actually useless and would show that Christ was a false prophet for having chosen him as witness on any level. When the chief witness was so bad what were the others like? Worse!

Peter risked his life by angering people by lying to them. Interesting. He would die for his lies then. Yet the Church says that Peter's alleged crucifixion for Jesus proves he was telling the truth about Jesus appearing to him to tell him he rose from the dead! It is only legend that speaks of Peter's crucifixion. And many gods and saints in what Christianity considers to be false also boast of their failings and yet Christianity claims that they were frauds.

Peter lied unnecessarily in the courtyard while Jesus was on trial. In front of people who recognised him he denied that he was a follower of Jesus a few times. He swore that he was telling the truth (Matthew 26:72). Peter did this between the arrest and crucifixion of Jesus. He was lying against the doctrines that Jesus is of God and must be preached and is worthy of trust and could rise again. He had no need to be there and could have hidden his head better and even admitted that he was a follower. Strange that a man who lied under oath should be considered a reliable witness to the resurrection of Jesus. And especially when we have only what amounts to hearsay that he was a witness and what he witnessed to. Even if he did witness to the resurrection of Jesus we don't know what he meant by that. For example, a mystic who has a strange experience could get a strong impression of a spirit like presence and take it to be an experience of someone raised from the dead who is now in a very different kind of existence than before. There is no need for tangible appearances of a risen Jesus or even audible voices to start off a resurrection report. Since Christian theology says Jesus was supposed to be very different when he rose and full of spiritual power and able to pass through walls, a witness report without them would bear more weight than reports about apparitions and voices.

In Acts 2:32 Peter subsequently appears and his supposed testimony to the resurrection is recorded and presented as evidence by Luke. Luke gave no proof that Peter really said all this which marks Luke out as dishonest and unprofessional if not in history then certainly in spiritual matters. Peter is treated in many places as the chief witness and it is possible that if Jesus made Peter the rock the Church was built on that Jesus meant for him to be the chief witness to the resurrection. Peter's lying under oath that he had no need for doing would prove that he could not be a decent witness and actually useless and would show that Christ was a false prophet for having chosen him as witness on any level. When the chief witness was so bad what were the others like? Worse!

In the Bible according to Acts 2, Peter said that a few lines from Psalm 16 predicted Jesus' resurrection from death though the Psalm does not even mention anybody dying (Acts 2). It only says that someone will be saved from death. It is too vague to read a resurrection into it and there is no need to. Remember, stick to the simplest interpretation. Peter's sermon converted a huge crowd which shows they were as bad as him in deceit or self-deceit or both. Peter was definitely showing great powers of self-deceit when he was willing to use the psalm in public. Self-deceit means you know what the truth is but you put it out of your mind and keep a lie in your mind instead. The note on the Psalm on page 550 of the New

American Bible states that some commentators render the words in the psalm, "to endure corruption" as to see the grave. This is because the word translated grave or corruption is shahath in the Hebrew original and can be translated either way. The Greek translation of the psalm used the word for corruption and so inspired the apostles to assume the psalm meant corruption. Thus they held that it predicted Jesus' being dead not corrupting for he rose again. Now the apostles were not Greek speakers. They knew from their Hebrew that the Greek translation was often a paraphrase than an accurate translation from the Hebrew. They were basing a doctrine on an inaccurate translation they knew was wrong. Even if the translation was right and the psalm was about Jesus' corpse it might only mean that he would never decay. Simply saying that he will not corrupt does not mean Jesus would rise again. Nor does it say when Jesus will rise again. The Jews would have thought that if the psalm referred to Jesus' resurrection it could mean the resurrection at the end of the world. The Psalm says that the Lord will not let his faithful one be abandoned to the nether world or his faithful one to suffer corruption or the grave. The netherworld was a place where the spirits of the dead were thought to go and it was a terrible place where they were only shadows of themselves. Can you imagine Jesus going there? He didn't believe in the nether world! And Jesus must have corrupted a bit if he was in the grave three days anyway especially with all the wounds and beatings and scourgings he is supposed to have had!

Paul in Acts 13 refers to the psalm and gives it the same outlandish interpretation as Peter did. Paul argued that the line from the Old Testament, you are my son and this day I have begotten you referred to the resurrection of Jesus. It says nothing of the sort. He argued from the line, "I will give you the benefits assured to David under the covenant", that the risen Jesus could never again suffer the decay of death. Again it doesn't help him at all. Also Paul took Psalm 16 to be denying Jesus would corrupt and then later he speaks of Jesus never again enduring the decay of death - a contradiction.

Peter commented that when God said in the Psalm that he wanted his anointed to sit at his right hand that it means that he wanted to take this mysterious anointed or king up to Heaven. Sit at my right hand just means be the second in charge and you don't need to be in Heaven for that. Peter even argued on the basis of the text that since King David who wrote it did not ascend into Heaven that it must be about Jesus who was supposedly a king too. A most fanatical suggestion not to mention fanciful! Then he added that this shows that without any doubt that God made Jesus the Messiah and the Lord, right-hand man (Acts 4). Peter certainly told many lies here. A man like that is not a reliable witness. He's no good. The apostles did not censure him so they incriminated themselves as well. The lies are reported in the Book of Acts whose author wrote the third gospel so that says a lot about him as well.

When Peter quoted the psalm he admitted that David could have meant himself and then he said that it could not have been himself he meant for he never rose again and his tomb is among them. But Matthew said that many saints had risen from the dead before Jesus did so how did Peter know that David was still in his grave? Either Peter was lying and pretending to know or Matthew made up the yarn about the saints and God knows what else. But we know that David's tomb and body have never been found and that Peter had no right to say what he said. It was a lie to make it seem that David had meant Jesus would rise for maybe David did rise. David could have been alive and well for the previous two hundred years for all Peter knew.

The epistle, 2 Peter, chapter 1, has Peter saying he is far surer of the Old Testament scriptures being the word of God and infallible than the message from God delivered during the transfiguration that he heard saying that Jesus was God's Son. So ancient old books have more authority than a miracle you see and hear yourself. This is illogical and fanatical. But it is an admission that Peter may have been deluded which casts the other testimonies he supposedly made – particularly that he saw or experienced the risen Jesus – into doubt.

It is an admission that the Old Testament has to testify to Jesus with complete clarity. This clarity does not exist because each prophecy about Jesus in it is capable of many different interpretations. The early Church abused the Old Testament to fake evidence for Jesus for it is obvious the clarity is not there.

After the alleged resurrection, Peter told Jesus to go away for he was a sinner. Peter practically called Jesus a charlatan to his face for Jesus had said he liked to be friendly with sinners and he was denying that. He was being spiteful for he had already met the "risen" Lord and didn't run away from him then.

Peter betrayed the gospel according to Paul himself in Galatians 2 by snubbing non-Jews to pander to Jewish racism. This was religious deception and Paul said as much. Peter was not ashamed to do it in public and though he knew that Paul would gnaw his head off for it for expressing approval for bigotry that way. Peter liked to deceive and let people know he did it for he knew Paul would broadcast it to all and sundry or could embarrass him in public by protesting there and then. An idiosyncrasy? Some would think that maybe he thought Paul being as big a liar as himself would say nothing. But Paul had to get involved for people would be asking him for his reaction to what Peter did. Peter just cared so little for truth that he couldn't stand by it even when it was in his best interests to. Nevertheless, it reflects badly on Paul that he would consider Peter an apostle.

The Christian answer to this is that I am calling everybody liars and then believing them when they call each other liars

which cannot be relied upon if they really are liars. Is that supposed to prove that they must not be liars?

Peter declared that anybody who does not listen to Jesus shall be ruthlessly cut off from the people (Acts 3:23). Yet he and the apostles continued to lick the boots of rebels. For example, they praised sinners though they said that everybody is sinful and nobody does good with sin in them for one sin defiles all.

Peter accused Simon Magus of sin for thinking he could buy the power to give the Holy Spirit (Acts 8). He said he could see into Simon's soul that this was a sin and told Simon that he wished he and his money would rot. This was slandering a man for being sincerely wrong for Simon knew that the Holy Spirit would not come if he was invited to be exploited. If all are sinners then it is worse to take the Spirit in that state than to pay for it. At least then you are making some sacrifice for it. Peter just hated sinners, that's all.

The Book of Acts says that the apostles lived a long time after the alleged supernatural happenings they saw. Yet their enemies are supposed to have been thirsting for their blood like men wandering through a desert. The apostles could not have survived so long without hiding and depending on people to tell lies for them. They must have commanded lies. This would prove that they did not expect God to look after them. In that case, they would have to be frauds.

The early Church had a policy of giving its devotees the milk of the gospel and only the solid food when they were ready (Hebrews 5:13-14). This is totally deceitful. The nasty and hard to believe doctrines were kept away from them to gain their membership. The Church still does this today. Most Catholics for example do not know or understand the more nasty tenets of the Catholic faith. From the apostles to today's pastors, it has all been deceit and stealing money off the people to spread something they would not support if they knew the truth.