

## Jesus: Sinner of God not Son of God

According to the Christian Church, we have a duty to accept the teachings of Jesus Christ because he was the Son of God and never knew sin. The Church says it finds this doctrine of Jesus' sinless life in the Bible.

### JOHN BAPTISES JESUS

The baptism of John was not about gaining forgiveness but about cleaning yourself of sin and then getting baptised to indicate that. It was between John, God and the individual - not the Jewish community. Baptism was not required by the Jewish faith. Jesus comes and gets baptised thus indicating repentance for sin. It is interesting how the Mark gospel says Jesus did that but does not try to explain it away. The baptism is rightly taken to embarrass Christian claims that Jesus was sinless all his life and claimed to be. The reader of Mark having only this gospel and Mark had no reason to think there would be any new gospels would have learned from it that Jesus was baptised for repentance for his personal sin.

### THE SINLESS JESUS TEXTS

Does the Bible really say that Jesus was always sinless? If it or the Church does then shame on them because that is just their view and they have no right ordering others to agree with them or saying that God orders it for it all depends on what we like and dislike and we are all different. What is considered good for one is considered bad for another. You cannot expect Roger to have the same perception of your wife as you do. You can't expect him to judge her as you do.

Jesus is not really a good example - we don't even know much about him. Nobody today knows the historical Jesus personally to be inspired by him. Allegedly, we can know the risen Jesus but it is easy to feel you are in a relationship with a god who does not in fact exist. The boast that Jesus is sinless is purely about scoring ideological points against other deities and religions and not about inspiring people in the best way. The good is the enemy of the best here. The okay, which Jesus would have been at best, is often the enemy of the good.

Nowhere does the Bible say that Jesus was impeccable. When it does not actually say that he sinned (except in the Mark gospel where Jesus objects to being called a good teacher - a good teacher not a good man) it might seem most likely that he never sinned. But then again it would not recount his sins when he was its hero and was focused on making an exemplar of him.

If you are God or wholly in touch with him you can do things that look evil like killing a child and still be good provided this was needed for a good purpose that nobody else can make out. Jesus could have been as evil as Genghis Khan and still have been considered to be the impeccable Son of God. Perhaps Jesus had to refrain from such deeds because if he behaved normally that would be nothing marvellous. But if Jesus had seemed to be a sinner that would be stronger evidence that he was God's Son than impeccability. Why? Because such acts would be what one would expect of one who had mysterious godlike purposes to take care of. If he abstained from such acts it would contain an element of showing off and being false. It makes his life into an immoral performance while he was supposed to do good for its own sake. Perhaps since Jesus might be good to impress us or might be seemingly bad for the purpose he could pick either one or the other. But it is clear that neither would convince us that he was indeed God's immaculate son.

Jesus did things as bad as murder if he was God or had supernatural power. He did not use his alleged healing powers on the dying. He then killed people by sending killer viruses to them. And yet Christians say they would not believe in him if he committed murder. He stated that sinful people should go to Hell forever. Such is the hypocrisy inspired by Christ that if he killed people with a knife many Christians would turn against him.

Isaiah 53:9 says that somebody was killed though he had done no wrong and told no lie. This is supposed by the superstitionists to be about Jesus. But we can say that a man who did wrong and died was executed though he had not sinned or lied meaning that he did not deserve what happened to him or that he didn't sin or lie so as to deserve to die. The other sins and lies are irrelevant and are not being denied - or affirmed either.

John 8:46 says that Jesus asked the Jews if any of them could convict him of sin. He meant that he was not a sinner but only as far as they could tell and they did not observe him all the time for the answer to this rhetorical question is no. But the line before and after shows that he meant sin in the sense of lying or contradicting what he knows to be the truth. He did not claim to be absolutely sinless here. You can convict people of certain crimes but minor acts of badness are often hard to prove and it is easy to put them beyond proof as long as one avoids meeting people when one is in a bad mood. Jesus took plenty of time to unwind.

And if he did say he was without sin, he could only have been referring to the teaching he gave at that time. He was saying that he was sinless at that time.

Romans 6:9,10 says that Christ will never die again because he died to sin by dying on the cross. Some say, "Since he never said that Jesus was a sinner he means that Jesus died to the sins we have committed and not his own". But Paul linked death to sin and if Jesus cannot die anymore because he is dead to sin then Jesus died to his own sins. Jesus could not die to other people's sins.

Romans 8:9,10 says that Jesus is dead to sin and now alive to God. The contrast implies that Jesus wasn't dead to sin before. Then we are instructed to be dead to sin like Jesus meaning we must abandon all the sins we have. So our situation and Jesus' are the same. Christians reply that Jesus being dead to sin doesn't mean that he sinned and turned away from it but only that he never sinned. But the contrast. Jesus is now described not as dead to sin but as alive to God. With their interpretation he would have been alive to God all the time and dead to sin now as well. The contrast incidentally implies that Jesus is not God for God cannot sin.

Paul said that we must be dead to sin in the same way that Christ was, meaning that Jesus repented and was forgiven. He contrasts Jesus' death to sin with his being alive to God in holiness now as if Jesus was not alive to God before.

In First Peter 2:22 Jesus was said to have been sinless and truthful in all things but the context is about Jesus' example during his passion. It may only be saying that Jesus was free from all sin when he was suffering under Pontius Pilate.

1 John 3:5 says that there is nothing sinful in Jesus Christ meaning now. A sinner who is in Heaven is sinless now according to Christian theology.

The verses are meaningless if Jesus is God for God cannot die to sin for God cannot even sin. Christians say they mean that Jesus died to temptation but temptation is not sin and if Jesus could not sin he could not be tempted. Some would say that Jesus could sin but did not and died to sin in the sense of becoming unable to sin when he died. But if Jesus has free will there is no such thing as becoming unable to sin. Paul did not mean that Jesus lost his free will. This answer says that Jesus was always dead to sin. Paul's declaration can only mean that Jesus had been a sinner. Jesus was forgiven and by becoming sinless and agreeing to die on the cross he saved us by his obedience.

Jesus said that nobody was good only God. And his disciple Paul preached that man was naturally antagonistic towards real love and towards God suggesting that Jesus did the same. With all this cynicism, we should not be expected to believe in Jesus' sinlessness on the basis of the skimpy New Testament accounts and the Church has a cheek to ask us to. If human beings are so bad then we need a lot of convincing before we can designate any man as sinless. It would be blasphemy not to.

Also, when the writers of the New Testament were sinners how can we trust them? If people are biased towards self and not God they would go to any lengths to destroy God's plan. They would be open to Satan and his genius to get inspiration to how best to do this.

Jesus said to the world, "Follow me" (Luke 18:22). He was not even raised from the dead at this stage so he was asking the Jews to break the commandment that trust must be put in God not even in Moses but in the God speaking through him (Jeremiah 17:5). None of the biblical prophets believed they had the right to ask people to follow them. Sinless and therefore humble? I don't think so!

## HOW LITERAL?

Job and Lot are examples of people who were called sinless but not regarded as literally perfect.

God said that David kept his commandments and that he did ONLY in his sight what was right. Read 3 Kings 14:8. It shows that though the Bible admits David's sins it talks as if he were sinless. Notably the commandments in those days were definitely interpreted as condemning homosexuality so that is important to note too. By the laws of interpretation, you read statements in the light of how David would have understood them, it is definite that homosexuality is condemned by the Bible.

## SAVIOUR?

Jesus did not save us by his teaching for we don't have much of it and can prove he was a liar. And it was not infallible either. Or original! And few have ever known what he was on about for he was as vague as they come.

Jesus did not save us by his death on the cross for that death was unnecessary and he refused to avoid it though he could have. It was suicide and an offering to the Devil for he as an evil man offering an evil life in sacrifice. If God needed somebody to atone by death but could get nobody then he would have to do without it and save all.

Jesus said his life would be given as a ransom for sinners. That insults the man who dies doing a good work for the man is trying to offer the best good possible and that man's death should be taken as atonement if God rewards effort not success. The atonement implies that God rewards success not effort or sincerity.

The Old Testament cannot prove that Jesus was the saviour for the prophecies in it are obscure and were twisted by the New Testament. And most of Jesus' miracles can be given a natural interpretation and there is evidence of trickery.

## NATHAN'S GOD CURSES JESUS

Nathan gave God's words to King David in response to David seducing Bathsheba so evilly. "I anointed you king over Israel, and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul. And I gave you your master's house and your master's wives into your arms and gave you the house of Israel and of Judah. And if this were too little, I would add to you as much more. Why have you despised the word of the LORD, to do what is evil in his sight? You have struck down Uriah the Hittite with the sword and have taken his wife to be your wife and have killed him with the sword of the Ammonites. Now therefore the sword shall never depart from your house, because you have despised me and have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife" (2 Samuel 12:7-10). The promise is that David's house or line will be cursed. Would David really have cared about descendants apart from those with progenitor rights? So the direct line was punished. It will suffer violence because of what David has done. God is decreeing and causing this punishment and it is not a natural course he is predicting. How could what David did necessarily lead to the sword hanging over those who have his inheritance? God punishes the fathers in the sons for the reason that the sons at some level will have sympathy for what the father did so the implication is that David's line is cursed and Jesus who belonged to that line was killed for sharing in David's sin. In fact Jesus' fate was so demeaning that he must have been worse than his predecessors.

If Jesus was a real Messiah he was not a real spiritual Messiah.

## JESUS AND SHOWING OFF

Jesus said that Christians must show their good works to the world (Matthew 5:16) which contradicts his commands later on in the Sermon on the Mount which demand that they must hide them for it shows they were selfless (Matthew 6:3). Christians say they can reconcile this by teaching that you must do good in public when you have no choice but try to do them in private otherwise. Jesus did not tell his followers to wear bags over their heads so that nobody knew who was helping them so the contradiction remains. How would other people know if you really had no choice? You could make it seem that you just walked into a situation that needed your attention.

Some Christians say that the solution is that good works done for God should not be hidden for they win him praise and that good works done to impress others and not God should not be seen. But that is absurd for nobody can see your motives. And if you do your good for God you will get praised too. So it is better to step over a dying person when you cannot help her for the right reason. It is best to help her for it is giving good example to those who don't know what your true motives are and for her own sake. When Jesus told us to pray and do good in secret how could he have meant when they are done for our own benefit? There is no difference in showing off in front of people and in doing it in front of God in private. Jesus certainly condemned the Pharisees for showing off their love for God and then told his gullible slaves to copy them!

Jesus said that if you do good secretly your father will openly reward you meaning in public (v 4). He did not mean in Heaven for he was speaking to simple people and would have made that clear for them. And anyway, if you are not supposed to do good openly unless you can help it and you are going to get a reward for it on earth that makes people think you are great what difference does it make of it is in Heaven not earth? What virtue can there be in it on Jesus' standards? Jesus was incoherent here.

Jesus did some of his miracles in secret presumably to practice what he preached. And then he did some in public to do the opposite. If he wanted his cures of lepers kept secret as he said then why didn't he get God to cure them before they set out to meet him so that he would not get the credit?

## MATTHEW 26:50

In Matthew 26:50, Jesus asks Judas who had arrived with a band to arrest him, "What are you doing here, friend?" The Hard Sayings of Jesus, page 243) tells us that the correct translation is "Friend, do what you came here to do". Jesus is encouraging Judas to do what is wrong. And what worsens it is that Judas was going to do it anyway so giving more

encouragement when it was unnecessary is disgusting.

It would be a problem if Jesus asked Judas why he came when it was so obvious.

The story says that Judas was not Jesus' friend. If Jesus called him a friend then he was saying that Judas was a good man though he was doing evil. Jesus is being contrary here. He will not admit the truth.

The gospel is telling us that Jesus was like that. It is a sin to lie to cover up wrongdoing that cannot be hidden.

If Jesus was being sarcastic then he was still a sinner and tried to lead the crowd into sin by speaking that way.

It is certain that Jesus wanted to encourage immorality. Peter once asked Jesus how many times he should forgive his brother if he sins a lot against him. He asked if seven times would do. Jesus said not seven times but seventy times seven (Matthew 18). That this was meant to be taken literally is shown by Luke 17:4 which commands that if one is sinned against seven times a day one should forgive when the person says sorry after each time. Jesus said one person was as good as another meaning nobody had the right to act superior and say, "I will not forgive you". So Jesus would have agreed with the Church forgiving pervert priests and moving them around. Or it could be that Jesus expected the end of the world to be nigh enough that there would be no time for his rules to be seriously taken advantage of by those who prove their lack of sorrow by re-offending. But the Church cannot admit he erred so it has to accept the former interpretation and it would have been just like Jesus to have meant the rule to be kept whether the world was to end soon or not.

## CONCLUSION

Jesus if he existed was far from sinless. To make him out to be sinless, the Christians look at the bad things he did such as his rudeness to the pagan woman who he told was a dog and pretend they are not sins. It leads to them making wrong and sin totally separate! Those who say he was sinless are unduly biased and have little concern for the truth. They are not being fair to the women and men who did more good than Jesus.

## BIBLE VERSION USED

The Amplified Bible

## 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

The WWW

Kooks and Quacks of the Roman Empire by Richard Carrier

[www.infidels.org/library/modern/richard\\_carrier/kooks.html](http://www.infidels.org/library/modern/richard_carrier/kooks.html)

THIS SITE ARGUES THAT JESUS WAS EVIL AND WAS NOT A GOOD EXAMPLE [www.nobeliefs.com/jesus.htm](http://www.nobeliefs.com/jesus.htm)