



/REFERENCE

Patrick H Gormley



Skeptical Dictionary

*** *Religion refuted at a glance* ***

A sceptic is merely one who checks if her or his beliefs are really true or if the evidence for them is sufficient and okay.

**If only half of what I write is correct then religion should be abandoned!!
Give it no money! Have your name removed from its membership list.**

ENTRIES, click to read the entry you want

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| ABORTION | EXORCISM | JOHN, GOSPEL | PRINCIPLES |
| ABSOLUTION | FAITH | OF | PROPHET |
| AGNOSTICISM | FANATICISM | JUDGING | PROTESTANTISM |
| ANOINTING | FATIMA | JUSTICE | PUNISHMENT |
| APOLOGETICS - CHRISTIAN | FORGIVENESS | KARMA | RATIONALISING |
| APOSTLES | FREE WILL | KNOCK | REASON |
| ASTROLOGY | FREE WILL | LOURDES | REINCARNATION |
| ATHEISM | DEFENCE | LYING | RELATIVISM |
| ATONEMENT | FRUITS | MAGDALENE | RELIGION |
| BAHAI'SM | GARABANDAL | MARRIAGE | RESURRECTION |
| BAPTISM | GOD | MARTYRDOM | REVELATION |
| BIBLE | GRACE | MARY | SACRAMENT |
| BORN-AGAIN | HATE | MEDJUGORJE | SAINT |
| BUDDHA | HEAVEN | MESSIANIC | SCIENCE |
| CANON | HELL | PROPHECY | SECULARISM |
| CATHOLIC | HINDUISM | MIRACLE | SELF-DECEPTION |
| CHARITY | HOLY SPIRIT | MORALITY | SELF-ESTEEM |
| CHURCH | HOMOSEXUALITY | MORMONISM | SHEMA |
| COMMUNION | HUMANISM | MORTAL SIN | SHROUD OF TURIN |
| CONFESSION | HUMILITY | MOSES | SLANDER |
| CONTRACEPTION | HYPNOSIS | MOTHER | SPIRITUALITY |
| CREATION | IDOLATRY | TERESA | SPIRITUALIST |
| CRUCIFIXION | INCARNATION | MURDER | STIGMATA |
| DECALOGUE | INDETERMINISM | MYSTERY | THEODICY |
| DEVIL | INERRANCY | NATURALISM | THEOFASCISM |
| DIVINE PROVIDENCE | INFALLIBILITY | ORDINATION | TOLERANCE |
| DIVORCE | INQUISITION | ORIGINAL SIN | TOTAL DEPRAVITY |
| ECUMENISM | INSPIRATION | PADRE PIO | TRANSUBSTANTIATION |
| EGOISM | ISLAM | PANTHEISM | WITCHCRAFT |
| EMPTY TOMB | JEHOVAH'S | PAUL | WORSHIP |
| ERROR | WITNESSES | PERJURY | |
| | JESUS | PETER | |
| | | POPE | |
| | | PRAYER | |

The religious person is a sceptic.

He is sceptical about atheism or attempts to debunk his favourite miracle tales.

She is sceptical about a right to abortion if the girl's life is in danger from pregnancy.

He is sceptical about masturbation being okay.

She is sceptical about the notion that the Catholic Church is a false religion.

If you are going to be a sceptic, then be a scientific one. A scientific sceptic investigates and though he may often fail, he keeps trying to correct his views. He lives by the principle that it is better to be sceptic when you are continually checking things out than to be a sceptic in matters that are based on what God supposedly said or stuff that cannot be tested to see if it is true or probably true. The risk of error is too high. Also he tries to avoid self-refutation.

The views of a dedicated scientific sceptic deserve more credence than those of the religious for the same reason that any person who tries to be objective does.

And remember, religions come and religions go but scepticism has been around forever and always will be.

We live in an age that has the power to send every religion on earth a terminal illness. The illness we send is called thinking. Religion, particularly Roman Catholicism, is the prevalent form of exploitation and mental illness and means of legalised theft through getting paid for providing sacraments and prayers that do not really work. As communication has advanced to an incredible degree, the information we need on any subject is present at the press of a computer button. It is important to stress simple refutations of religion for in this busy age people don't have the time for in-depth examinations. So to simplicity I dedicate this volume. In this age in which we have the power to destroy all life on this planet, religion has no right to reverence for it leads to division and division leads to war and could lead to our final destruction. Help preserve the world by promoting this work!

Much religion says that only God knows what is best for us and if he makes rules we must simply obey and not criticise. This attitude indicates that even if war is commanded by God or an alleged revelation from him then war must be declared. It is evil in itself, evil in principle and evil in its implications.

Much religion says that sin is the worst evil. The Roman Catholic Church says that all religion that is not Roman Catholic is sinful. Clearly, then when a Catholic nation thinks it needs to go to war it must consider the religious benefits of doing so. For example, will the war break the hold of Islam an untrue religion on the other nation? Will putting a Catholic government in place stop all the pornography? Indeed the spiritual benefits as understood by the religion would matter more than freeing the people or otherwise helping them. Can you imagine how much strife such a doctrine as the duty to hate sin would cause especially when what is sinful in one religion may not be sinful in another?

If people believed that we should only have a faith that plays it safe there would be no need for religion. Such people would argue that if a woman needs an abortion to save her life, then let her have one. They would object to the Catholic claim that even then abortion is wrong. They play it safe. There is no harm done if their faith is wrong. Religion then is intrinsically evil.

The true sceptic will have beliefs. The sceptic will be open to revising those beliefs if the evidence warrants that. That is because the sceptic bases beliefs on evidence. He or she understands that believing means seeing that something appears to be likely to be true.

The pseudo-sceptic will tend to reject all paranormal and religious claims even if they have good enough evidence.

And there is no good enough evidence.

USING THE DICTIONARY

The dictionary is in alphabetical order. If a word comes up that you do not understand, its meaning will be found elsewhere in the dictionary.

[Top of the Document](#)

ABORTION

The direct killing of a human foetus or unborn child. It is forbidden by the Catholic Church.

The Church says that a baby should not be killed in the womb even when it is necessary to save the mother's life for it is not an unjust aggressor. That this is motivated by malice is proven by the fact that the Church lets you kill insane people in self-defence. It permits you to kill an insane person who can't be an unjust aggressor because he doesn't know what he is doing. The Church alleges that its teaching does no harm. Even if that were true, would you want a religion that would prefer to sacrifice the baby and the mother to the natural course just because abortion is supposed to be a sin to have power in society?

[Top of the Document](#)

ABSOLUTION

The rite in the Catholic Church by which the priest takes sin away in the name of God. The priest doesn't ask God to pardon you when he absolves. He does it on his own authority for he says, "I absolve you from your sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." This is an extreme case of man standing in the place of God. It is blasphemy of the highest order to suggest that God would leave people at the mercy of men. The Church will answer that God has set up this system so that man is not forcing his hand. But if your wife said she will not forgive you for adultery until you fix the dripping tap you would know that she is only pretending to forgive. So it is with this God who does not forgive until you get absolved. You forgive or you do not.

[Top of the Document](#)

AGNOSTICISM

The denial that one can know if God exists or not or the assertion that one doesn't know yet if God exists or not.

If God existed he would make sure it would be observed that his existence is at least plausible. A person who believes there may be a creator but which is impersonal or amoral is not an agnostic for this being is not God for it is not all-good and all-happy. It is most likely the creator, if any, is not a loving God for there are hundreds of alternatives to the loving God hypothesis.

Agnosticism is very offensive for God is basically a misanthropic principle and it should not be suggested even that he might exist. At least Agnosticism tends towards the idea that God is just an opinion and accordingly that God should be taught in school as an opinion and not as a fact. Agnostics do not like the dogmatism of religious schools.

[Top of the Document](#)

ANOINTING

The Roman Catholic Church practices the sacrament of the anointing of the sick. This sacrament supposedly gives supernatural preparation for death and above all forgiveness of sins so that the recipient can go to Heaven forever. It has to be done by a priest. This evil rite has brought much terror. People have found themselves dying after a car crash and alone with no priest in sight and this has caused horrific trauma and even death at the thought that they are not ready for God for the priest cannot be had. And they have the pains of eternal torment in Hell – dying people will naturally feel terrified. They will think and fear the worst and there is no priest to save them from Hell. The rite discriminates against sinners for those who are about to be executed cannot validly receive it. So God is more worried about the sick than converting sinners by the power of a sacrament. This is the God who pities sinners most for sin is the worst evil. Again this is a mystery, the excuse with which the Church papers over all its implausible tenets.

The Bible, which claims it is authored by God, warns that though all sinners must be prayed for there is a kind of sinner who must never be prayed for. 1 John speaks of this sort of sinner. It is believed that the Bible speaks of the sin of those who refuse to repent of their sins on their deathbed. Since the Bible teaches that all sin can be pardoned, this sin can be the only candidate. Once such are dead, it is fruitless to pray for them for they will never repent and they will be damned forever. The Bible proves that the Church is merely pretending it can forgive people who have been dead for hours. 1 John implies that people who die when drunk, people who commit suicide and so on are damned. The Church knows that unless it ignores the text it will be held accountable for destroying half of the population with grief and despair about their loved ones being lost.

[Top of the Document](#)

APOLOGETICS - CHRISTIAN

Christianity claims that it can show that it has a reasonable, that is a non-contradictory - faith. A faith that is unreasonable is simply a faith that is not inspired by God assuming God is reasonable. If he is not then he is pure evil. For example, if it makes no sense to say that Jesus is two separate natures God and man united in one person then this doctrine isn't true. Christians feel that God gave us the power to think to help us work out the truth. They say that silly religions insult God who gave us the gift of reason and degrade our nature for we have the power to think for ourselves and it is given to be used and not as an ornament.

We will look at how useless and superficially convincing Christian defences of the faith are.

The Christian apologist distorts the facts to give his religion plausibility. The apologists are bigots. They ignore the rule that hearsay is no good in court to verify the resurrection accounts and then they laugh at accounts of miracles from other religions such as Islam and Mormonism. They dismiss those as hearsay!

Christian defences of the faith offend against the rule of plausibility. Using their standards, any contradiction at all can be fixed up and we will never be able to learn anything if we start doing that!

Christianity is notorious for ignoring the refutation of its arguments. Ideas that have been refuted centuries ago are still used today. Apologetics does little to make converts. It is just a trick to reassure believers that their absurd faith makes sense. It leads to believers becoming so cocksure that they set out to take away the civil rights of those who disagree with them. Remember how the Catholics of Ireland fought to stop the right to divorce and contraception and persecuted those who complained against clerical sex abuse?

Christianity argues that Jesus rose from the dead for many of his friends believed he did. That does not follow. Also, it is really putting faith in the testimony of people rather than in God. It would in fact be evidence then that God was not behind whatever happened. God wants to be honoured for being God. There is something sectarian about taking a group's interpretation of God and what he has done in preference to that of other groups.

[Top of the Document](#)

APOSTLES

Jesus left no writings behind so it was left to the twelve apostles he chose to preserve his message. The Church believes the apostles were appointed by Jesus because the apostles said so. Why should we believe them then and not the many modern apostles who have as much claim to authority from Jesus? Christianity is not about Jesus at all but about the apostles' interpretation of him. It is following men not God. The apostles were undoubtedly just out for the pleasure of telling people what to think for they had no reasonable claim to authority. Many in the early Church denied their authority. Christians have no right to say it was just sour grapes for nobody knows if their reasons were weighty or not.

[Top of the Document](#)

ASTROLOGY

The doctrine that our lives are mapped out by the heavenly bodies, eg, moon, sun and stars etc. Accordingly, it is

thought that it is possible to tell our future using charts and working things out from the position of the heavenly bodies. To protect themselves from being exposed as charlatans, astrologers say that their prognostications show what tends to happen in the future not what will happen. There are actually thirteen signs scientifically speaking but astrology always assumed twelve which shows that it is an irrational superstition.

Astrology with its stress on what zodiac sign you are born under is akin to racism. It would advocate discrimination against a person just because of what bad traits their birth chart should have. It is totally unfair to judge people according to their birth charts. It is no better than judging people according to their skin colour. It argues that any one sign has a good match romantically with some of the other signs. But not all. Teachings like that can cause trouble and indeed do.

And why birth charts? The time of conception or when the embryos became those persons would make more sense. After all, your birth does not create you. It is only you emerging from your mother.

[Top of the Document](#)

ATHEISM

The denial that gods exist or that there is a God is one form. The other form is that there is not enough evidence for the existence of these beings and thus no reason to believe. One form says you believe there is no God and the other says you believe there is no reason to believe. Both forms in practice advocate that one should pay no attention to alleged divine revelation.

Agnosticism is not a viable or possible option and neither is Pantheism therefore Atheism is true.

People believe in God out of habit and they tend to copy other people and believe what they believe. They believe because they want comfort. They think people who don't believe have bad morals. Habit is not a reason. You can get comfort without belief in God – belief in nature spirits would do. And belief in God has nothing to do with a good life because atheists can do much good therefore belief in God is not needed. Since God is supposed to be the supreme good it follows that to believe in him we have to pretend that taking comfort from the idea of nature spirits is bad if not sinful. We have to say that atheists are only pretending to be good people. That shows you that belief in God is intrinsically dishonest and bigoted.

[Top of the Document](#)

ATONEMENT

Jesus paying for our sins to God by dying on the cross so that we would be forgiven and not have to pay the penalty for our sins. This arrangement is totally unfair for you can only pay for your own crimes. The fact that the law lets people pay your fines does not mean that is fair. It is only tolerated by the law of the land because letting the person off altogether sends the wrong message. Christians know this but they still use the example of the law to pretend that what happened to Jesus was fair. Only the person who committed the crime can atone. Jesus consenting to pay makes the doctrine sillier and more unjust and is no improvement though Christians say it is! It makes Jesus a man who imagined that his suffering and death could pay for the sins of others, a man who demeaned himself.

The purpose of justice is to make real laws of laws. A law against something that does not punish you by paying you back fair and square for the evil you have done is not a law at all. With this insight, we clearly perceive that when God made Jesus pay for breaking the law when he was innocent so that we could get off that this was not justice but vengeance. The atonement is attractive to people who wish to believe that they are friends with a vindictive God.

[Top of the Document](#)

BAHAI'SM

An offshoot of Islam that seeks to unite all world religions. It was founded by manifestations of God notably Baha'u'llah. Baha'u'llah proved that he was not a manifestation when he insanely thought he could promote unity among the world religions by founding a new one that takes bits out of every religion and which turns Krishna, Jesus and Buddha into manifestations of God though they all contradicted one another. And its a strange

way of uniting religion to make another religion! Christianity cannot water down its view that Jesus was the only manifestation of God and who proved it by coming back from the dead and yet this cult claims to be compatible with Christianity. If the other manifestations, Buddha, Krishna, Moses and Jesus were really from God and interested in uniting people, then why did they form different sects with each one contradicting the other?

[Top of the Document](#)

BAPTISM

A sacrament rite which infuses the gift of faith and which removes original sin in which person is dipped into water or sprinkled while a magic spell, "I baptise you in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit" is recited. It is performed on infants as an excuse to get indoctrinating Christianity into them later on in childhood when they are so fragile and easily conditioned. The goal is to prevent them magically and educationally from enjoying the right to make up their own minds without undue and one-sided influence when they are old enough. Children do not need religion for they are innocent and things like death do not seem real to them. We may teach things to children say about other countries that they have to take on faith but that doesn't justify teaching religion to them and conditioning them for you can prove what you say about other countries but you can't prove your religion. Every religion claims that it has the best evidence and you would need a million brains to test every religion.

Baptism allegedly changes your sinful nature to one that is eager to please God. Experience shows that this is not true for there is nothing remarkable about the virtue that most sacrament takers have, so sacraments are wilful quackery. The rite facilitates racism for it implies that the unbaptised who are often of another race are in some way inferior to the baptised. Since they still have original sin they must be more dangerous - at least spiritually - than a person who has been baptised.

Communities necessarily put some pressure on members to conform. This is a form of force. Many Catholics are victims of forced conversion. Do not abuse your child by letting it be baptised! Children are made to undergo the rite of confirmation (ie confirming membership of the Church) even if they don't believe. The Church grows by forced conversion though it pretends to oppose it.

Catholics say they get their children baptised to give them a relationship with Jesus and it is not about making them servants of the pope. But if you look after a medium and give her money and persuade your children to believe in her simply because she claims to be in touch with your dead husband you can't say it is about your husband and not her unless you can prove beyond all reasonable doubt that she is in touch with him.

[Top of the Document](#)

BIBLE

A violent and spiritually pornographic collection of books regarded by Christians as the word of God. It claims to have God's actual words.

Christians when confronted with proof that the book has errors will start saying that the parts that err are in fact symbolic so there are no errors. That is how they get around the errors. It is a totally dishonest approach. As silly as the Garden of Eden story is now, it made sense to the silly people of thousands of years ago. The story was meant to be taken as literally true. It says nothing that demands a metaphorical interpretation.

Christians habitually twist the Bible to make it tell them what they want to hear. For example, Nebuchadnezzar and his men were predicted to do things to the city of Tyre. However, some of it happened and the rest didn't happen until the time of Alexander the Great. Because Neb and Co didn't do all the prophecy said, the Christians pretended the prophecy was not just about them but also about Alexander the Great and his armies. And this despite the fact that there is no indication in the prophecy or from its context that they are right. The prophecy mentions Neb and his men and then describes them as they or them without any hint that they and them ever refer to anybody else. Words mean nothing to Christians. The Bible Unearthed, Israel Finkelstein and Neil Asher Silberman, Touchstone Books, New York, 2002 proves from archaeology that many of the Bible stories are untrue and that its main characters may have been made up too.

The gospels say that Jesus told Peter how many times Peter would betray him and this prophecy came true. Nobody denies the prophecy and its fulfilment was written after the event. This is absolute proof that the gospels are not as truthful as Christians would like us to believe. If a man wrote a book of prophecies after the event you

would say he was a fraud. No God would inspire books like that. If we agree with the Christians that the gospels are right to expect us to believe they are truthful despite the problem with those prophecies, then we lose any right to complain that fortune-tellers are fakes if they write that they made prophecies that came true without recording the prophecies before the event. Jesus making such unimportant prophecies makes it all look like magic and superstition.

Liberals say that the Bible is God's word only because he influenced the writers. He did not tell them what words to write or put ideas in their heads but influenced them without using direct supernatural power on them. This view denies that the Bible is unique for it can't then be the only book that God influenced. Also it denies that God is the author of the Bible. If DH Lawrence was influenced by a lady he knew when he was writing *Lady Chatterley's Lover* that does not make her the author. Roman Catholic teaching says that God authored the Bible. So we must hold that God put the ideas in the minds of the writers if we are to be Christians.

Some Christians like Keith Ward argue that the vindictive and evil laws of the Bible are overridden by later laws which are kinder. They say this shows that God was influencing his people to progress in understanding. God commanding Israel to murder homosexuals by stoning is inexcusable. If God had to help the stubborn world to progress then giving it violent scriptures was totally unnecessary. You would need to be insane to believe the lies of people like Ward.

Some say that Israel thought incorrectly that God wanted them to liquidate other nations and then later understood that God wanted them to live in peace with those nations. But that is the take of those Christians. Its just their interpretation. By saying what they say, they are making their own guesses the word of God.

[Top of the Document](#)

BORN-AGAIN

To a Catholic it means the start of God deciding to have a loving relationship with you at baptism. To the Protestant it is the same thing but they often think it happens when you accept Jesus consciously as your substitute who earned salvation for you by paying for your sins for you. The term is terribly insulting to good people who are not believers for it implies that they are spiritually lacking and defective. It is really no better than racism especially when it teaches that people who have never heard the gospel will not be saved and will have to pay for their own sins in Hell. Even to suggest that God might find some other way to save them implies that they might not be saved and they might be ripe for Hell. That is nasty too.

The new birth allegedly removes original sin which causes our bias towards sin so it results in a holy life. Whether we are talking about born –again Protestants or Catholics most of them do not act in any remarkably virtuous way so the new birth is a conscious dose of quackery and deception. No concern is showing for proving that the baptism ritual actually helps. It is not about helping babies but about imposing the foolishness of religion on them.

[Top of the Document](#)

BUDDHA

Founder of Buddhism. A fanatic who advocated a difficult and boring life in order to make sure you are not reincarnated. He never stopped to consider that if there is no life after death this is a waste of time and one might as well live it up within reason. He accused all desire of being something that we must get rid of. But manipulated the right way, desire can make your life fun and more interesting.

[Top of the Document](#)

CANON

The word canon means rule. The canon of the Bible is the list of the books that belong in the Bible. The Catholic Bible is longer than the Protestant one for it contains extra books such as Tobit and Sirach. The Council of Trent infallibly decreed that these books belonged in the Bible. And this despite the fact that Tobit has an Angel of God lying unnecessarily and Sirach commands the abuse of women under the pretext of making them behave.

According to Sirach 42, a man has the right to lock up his wife to keep her from committing adultery.

Daughters are not to be allowed to be friends with married women or to be trusted with men. The author thinks that women think of nothing only sex.

Sirach commands that servants be beaten up for disobedience. Then, by implication, wife beating is allowed.

Such books by no means can really be the word of God.

[Top of the Document](#)

CATHOLIC

The word Catholic means universal. It refers to the fact that the one true Church must invite all nations to become part of it. Christ implied the Church must be Catholic when he told it to make disciples of all nations. To be universal the Church must be primarily one in faith for what is divided by confusion and heresy can't be for everybody. The Church would need a clear and fixed message to be really universal. To be universal the Church has to have one government - that is to say, it has to be one Church. So to be Catholic, the Church has to be one, united. It has to be holy, that is dedicated to God and what God has revealed. It needs some kind of authority then to preserve this revelation intact. If the apostles received the completeness of God's word, and the Church says they did, then the Church has to be apostolic. So there are four marks of the one true Church as expressed in the Nicene Creed, "I believe in one, holy, Catholic and apostolic Church." This creed is a manifestation of the infallibility or protection against error that the Church supposedly enjoys.

The Roman Catholic Church claims to meet this one, holy, Catholic and apostolic model. This Church is not one for it is divided on matters of faith. It is really like a collection of faiths under the Roman Catholic umbrella.

The mark of oneness has more to do with unity in mind and heart than with organisational unity. Plus Protestants are thought to belong to the Catholic Church by virtue of their baptism. That's not unity. The unity of the Church is artificial so the Church is not Catholic. Plus there is the idea of automatic excommunication in which you commit a sin that secretly puts you out of the Church, such as, abortion, schism, heresy and apostasy and others. That means you will have many Catholics who are visibly Catholics but who are not Catholics at all. The Church also says that those who die in invincible ignorance desiring to be with God even if they are not Christians have become members of the Church. That denies the doctrine of the one visible Church. The true Church is not confined to the visible Church so the visible Church then is not necessarily the true Church. The Church is not one. It is missing the main mark.

The true Church should be united. It does not really matter if a false religion is divided. If you can have one con around why not another? Catholics ignore the fact that it is not the Church being one that is important but that it should be one. For example, the modern day Catholic Church claims to be the one true unerring faith but this isn't true for it has altered many doctrines. Traditionalist Catholics can tell you about many of these changes which is why they have declared the current Catholic system led by Rome to be the Vatican Two Conciliar Sect not the Catholic Church. The modern Catholic Church is not fully the Catholic faith so its oneness means nothing. A sect standing by the old doctrines would be the true Church and the Roman Catholic Church continuing.

The Protestant view that despite Christian's disagreements and divisions they are one spiritual family as long as they carry God's love in their hearts and that this family is the one true Church is more plausible than the Catholic view.

The Catholic Church isn't holy for its teaching is often ridiculous and dangerous and it has corrupted the legacy of Jesus and the apostles by adding doctrines they never knew to the faith so it is not apostolic. For example, Jesus told the Jews that they must not divorce. The Jews engaged in arranged marriages involving men and girls who were virtually children. Jesus' teaching accepts these forced unions with children. That shows that the Catholic Church is heretical to allow annulments when the bride is a child or forced.

The Catholic Church isn't Catholic for babies who won't be brought up as Catholics are not welcome for baptism and women can't become priests. Only the right Church would have the right to be called Catholic and the

Roman Catholic doctrine is full of lies and errors.

There has to be something unique about the term Catholic. If any sect at all even atheistic ones can call themselves Catholic, then there is nothing special about being a universal faith so it is not a mark of any kind at all. A religion that errs is excluding people who know it is wrong so it is not Catholic and it is not open to all people. Being universal or open to all is not as important as being right. The reasoning of Rome that as the Church is Catholic that is one of the signs that it is true makes no sense. It is really saying that whatever is true is Catholic and since the Church is Catholic the Church is true. That is incorrect logic.

Catholicism is just another man-made faith.

[Top of the Document](#)

CHARITY

Charity holds that love is doing good to others because it pleases God and not yourself or them. It is allegedly a supernatural gift from God. Actually it is a vice for it puts a concept, God, before people and the one person you are more sure exists than any other, yourself. Religion says we must abandon our own opinions and feelings and agree with whatever God says. But it is human opinion that God has spoken and nobody agrees on what he said, and the experts differ. What is loved is not God but an idol made out of human opinion and pride and arrogance. It's all selfish.

There is no point in believing in God unless you are going to put him first or make him the only concern so the God concept is intrinsically sinister. Misanthropism must have something to do with it which explains why believers of God have been so eager to shed the blood of heretics or have been at least delighted when their rivals in religion were slaughtered.

[Top of the Document](#)

CHURCH

The word means called out assembly.

[Top of the Document](#)

COMMUNION

Bread and wine which are blessed and believed to link you to the body and blood of Christ which they represent. The Catholic Church holds that the bread and wine cease to be bread and wine but become the body and blood of Jesus. It is a sectarian rite in Catholicism for people who are better than most Catholics are barred from it indicating that your beliefs and religious affiliation are regarded as more important than your kindness and decency.

[Top of the Document](#)

CONFESSION

Catholics have to confess their sins to a priest and tell him how often they committed them so that the priest can forgive their sins in the name of God.

The Catholic is compelled to tell all mortal sins or serious sins to the priest truthfully or be guilty of the grave hell deserving sin of telling a lie to the Holy Spirit.

The Church says it needs to be told the sins before it can decide to pardon them which is an untruth because what matters is the person being sorry for all the sins. The priest being told the sins has nothing to do with his deciding to pardon them. That is only done on the basis that the penitent claims to be sorry. Confessing is no good without repentance.

The Church says that when you confess to a priest you are really confessing to God not the priest and the priest only serves as a witness. If it is really God who forgives then how can the Church argue that it needs to be told the sins? It is up to God to see if the confessing person is sincere and admitting all his sins to him.

The person confessing sins does not mean he repents them. No examination takes place as to why the person repents and what steps they have taken to avoid the sin. The Church then is lying pure and simple that it needs to hear the sins. How could it need to when there is little concern for testing the person's profession of repentance?

Confession is an invasion of the conscience and a bad thing to put children through. The Catholic doctrine that the priest is needed to remove sins is cruel for it must terrify those who find themselves dying alone after a car crash.

The sacrament of confession forces priests to be accessories to crime for the priest is forbidden to go to the police even if he hears in confession that a mass-murder is about to be committed by a person who confessed to him. Confession implies that we have a duty to obey the Church even if it seems evil.

Confession is a tribunal – the priest has to find you guilty of your sins and find your repentance sincere and then he absolves you. The seal of the confession prevents the priest from telling what went on. There are no witnesses and nothing to stop a priest from lying that you permitted him to discuss what you told him and that you were the one that told him with all and sundry. A priest indeed should lie that he got such permission. He should not be putting the alleged sanctity of the confessional before human life.

If you had a sexual feeling you would have to explain to the priest how you could have avoided it and what caused it and what you did with it and how many times. Confession is a grave invasion of the conscience and of privacy and it is an enforced invasion because if you don't confess and tell all your serious sins you will go to Hell to burn forever.

[Top of the Document](#)

CONTRACEPTION

The Church forbids contraception and legally campaigns to stop it. It says contraception is an intolerable grave sin. This interference with civil legislation has left people having unsafe sex and getting seriously ill and dying. When the Church does not campaign, it is because other principles have got in the way. It does not mean that in principle the Church will try to persuade the state to outlaw contraception.

The Church says you must let God plan your family. This makes sense if there is a God and a Catholic God at that. But the doctrine is dangerous if there isn't. If there is a God, you are not to blame if pregnancy results and great misery happens because of it for it was God's decision to send the baby. It stops you taking responsibility for the harm you have done.

Almost beyond belief, the Church permits natural birth control! This is confining sex to the period of the month in which the woman is most unlikely to conceive. If family planning is up to God then it doesn't matter if you use the safe period in which conception is less likely or not.

Natural family planning leads to the same contraceptive mentality that the Church condemns contraception for: the feeling that a baby is a burden and not a gift from God and its conception is to be avoided.

The Church's dangerous teaching is riddled with hypocrisy and therefore cruelty.

[Top of the Document](#)

CREATION

Creation is the act by which God made all things out of nothing. Nothing means that which cannot become something. It cannot become something as it is not something. It is nothing.

The Church is clear that all that existed was God and he did not make creation from himself or his power but by his power.

The Church says that nothing can come from nothing unless there is a God to make something come out of nothing. Its a trick as it contradicts the definition of nothing. Nothing is that which cannot become something. Its impossible for there is nothing there. Even a God cannot make any difference.

Believers say that if the universe popped into existence without a cause that is absurd and we would be wiser people if we would say the cause was God. But something coming from nothing is another way of saying it did pop out of nowhere and nothing!

God or not, if the universe came from nothing then he had nothing to do with it.

The notion of things popping out of nothing by themselves is impossible. God causing things to exist is far more impossible. Why? Because if God can do the impossible that makes God irrational and he should be able to create a being who though it has no free will is still able to use free will to become good. It would make God fundamentally evil and bad. The doctrine has the hidden meaning that God is evil and should be worshipped for that evil.

Buddha said we would never understand how the universe and ourselves came to be and so not to waste time on the issue. He was right in relation to religious speculation. The matter should be left to science. Science should be taken more seriously than religion for science is about experimentation and checking things out.

Some have said that there are so many insuperable difficulties with explaining the origin of the universe that the only solution is to invoke the supernatural as maybe providing an answer. Better to offer extremely unlikely answers than a supernatural one. Strange things do happen. The extremely improbable can happen.

[Top of the Document](#)

CRUCIFIXION

Jesus was allegedly nailed to the cross to die for our sins and rise again to show that we could have eternal life. If Jesus showed up again after his death that would mean the man who died was a pretender or that it was all a magic trick. No evidence is given in the gospels that it was really Jesus who was crucified just hearsay. If we are going to accept hearsay we cannot consider Christianity worth believing. Jesus had fanatical followers who risked their lives going after him so any one of them who looked like him could have taken his place and the gospels do state that people had problems recognising "Jesus" and nobody who knew him well saw him close up on the cross. The crucified man could have had a badly swollen and bloody face meaning it was easy to pass off somebody as Jesus. The gospels say that Pilate was desperate to prevent Jesus from going to the cross so a trick might have been employed. The gospels can be read either as speaking of the risen Jesus as a flesh and blood man or an apparition. For example, the vanishing of Jesus at Emmaus doesn't actually say that he just dissolved into thin air. He could have gone when they were not looking. That would be natural and would still be vanishing. The apostles didn't speak of these appearances for forty days after which they never saw Jesus again so Jesus could have gotten away with a hoax. Some of them are down to mistaken identity.

[Top of the Document](#)

DECALOGUE

The ten commandments of the Jewish Law. Two of the commandments are, "Remember that you keep the Sabbath day holy" and "You shall not commit adultery". Christians and Muslims accept these commandments as true. They were reportedly dictated to Moses by God on Mount Sinai. A real God of love would enlighten your thinking instead of giving you commands as if you were dirt. Unnecessary commanding is evil and an act of intolerant violence. Revelation from God in the sense of a Bible that you have to believe in is immoral and so are miracles. The commandments show that God claims the right to be domineering and so religion that represents him should be like that too. The commandments are spiritual pornography. God has no need to command us to do right for it commands itself. Therefore he has no right to.

Command means to force a person to do whether they want to or not and if they refuse they are punished. So either way commanding is anti-freedom. It forces you to obey and imposes penalties on you if you still firmly resist. To command is to claim the right to force. Jesus said his command to us was to love one another. God commanding you to care for others is ridiculous. If you have free will, only you can decide to care and there is no point in anybody commanding it. The master by command compels the slave to scrub the floor but he can't make the slave do it of her own free will. People only want God because they want to bind society to certain rules and commands from God but at the root of all this is suspicion, fear, anger and hatred. Only people who like violence like violent bullying beliefs. That these beliefs are sugar-coated as in Christianity only makes them sly as well. Belief in God is evil. We resent anybody commanding us what to feel. It makes us bristle and so those who believe in God who want others to believe will do so because they want others to feel this horrible resentment too. God commanding us to love is a very serious error and shows that he does not want us to understand what love really is. You cannot command love - and what good is love unless it is spontaneous and is not carried out

because of a command or fear of retribution?

Jesus redefined love in a toxic way - if you want to do evil, set people up so that evil will take root in them in a subtle way. Satan never was as vile as he was. And we have seen the hypocrisy and lies and bloodletting that resulted.

[Top of the Document](#)

DEVIL

The Devil is the head of all the evil spirits. Since God does not make evil beings, the Devil was once good but became bad of his own fault. Or so the Church would have us believe.

We always do what we feel we like to do even when we feel we hate our action. Choosing means prefer. It means you like doing the hated action more than you hate the action. So if God had given Satan better likes he wouldn't have sinned. It's all God's fault that Satan sinned. The Church will answer that Satan didn't have to go along with the sinful attractions. But still God tempted him to sin by giving him those feelings and then punished him for doing what he inspired him to do. Yet for God to be really good he has to be incapable of asking anybody to sin (James 1:13) so temptation is the chief proof that God can't exist. It is so obviously right that all believers are blinding themselves to the truth. God gives Satan the psychic power to tempt us and this is unnecessary for we don't have such telepathic powers. A God who won't tempt but gets a lesser being to do it for him is worse than one that does it himself. Better one evil being than two. He is like a man that won't shoot his wife but hands the gun to his friend to do it.

The Church says that God permitted Satan to be tempted because those who resist temptation are more good than those who don't because they choose to be good after being attracted by evil. What else can they say? This not solving the problem of how an all-good God could allow temptation to happen. If temptation makes those who resist it more good then why can't God tempt? If he can't then temptation is always bad no matter how much good it results in. Their teaching suggests that the person who gets rid of all temptations is not as good as the good person who still has them. Yet they look forward to a Heaven where temptation is no more! They hypocritically worship a God who cannot be attracted by evil because he cannot be tempted and they contend that God is perfect good! It is all incoherent nonsense.

[Top of the Document](#)

DIVINE PROVIDENCE

The doctrine that God looks after all that he has made and that he uses evil for a good purpose.

God can only need evil for a purpose if there is no other way to make us good. This idea cannot be true.

God supposedly made the first human beings, Adam and Eve, as perfect. They sinned and the Church says their sin affects us too and we have inherited spiritual damage from them. All he had to do then was to prevent them having children and make another couple to populate the world in their stead so that they would not spread their weaknesses towards sin. Human evil then is useless compared to the good that has been brought out of it. The evil in us could have been easily prevented.

The very fact that evil is that which should not exist, alone proves that God need have no purpose for it.

Even if you have only one sin, that sin defiles your goodness because you won't give it up. When you do good as you hold on to sin you are saying you will do good on your terms and when it suits you. You hold on to the evil in your heart as you do the good. Thus you turn the good into a counterfeit of good. Considering how most people are "sinners" and have barely any love for God clearly sin is more powerful than holiness.

God had to make us with more good or more evil in us. You are either unholy or holy.

Christians claim that God can't put goodness in us and we have to do it ourselves. The alternative then is to put less goodness in us or none. If God makes us good we can have the choice of keeping it or losing it. Christianity says that God would be evil if he put perfect good in us. Then they say he is good because he made us less than good. That is clearly saying that God made us evil and is right to even though it is wrong. If he can put evil in us

at all he can put good in us and indeed would be better off putting only good in our hearts. The Christians worship a God of evil.

[Top of the Document](#)

DIVORCE

In marriage the husband and wife are closer than mother and son. It follows then that since you can't divorce your mother or make her cease to be your mother you have even less hope of really making your wife cease to be your wife. Marriage then implies that divorce is immoral and invalid and wrong. Marriage is anti-women for women suffer more from marriage than men do.

Christian marriage claims that the husband is the master and head of his wife (1 Corinthians 11:3) and this is the punishment God meted out to Eve and all her female descendants who would marry (Genesis 3:16). This implies that if divorce is allowed only the husband should seek divorce. It implies that the husband must treat the wife as a slave or servant and as his property. If he treats her as an equal then it could hardly be said that he is living up to his role as her punishment from God.

The New Testament says that divorce is absolutely wrong. Even when Paul says that a Christian convert can leave the spouse married in a pagan ceremony, he doesn't let the convert marry again. He says in Romans 7 that the law of God is binding on you as long as you are alive like a woman cannot have another man in marriage until after her husband dies. To allow divorce would contradict his point.

Jesus in Matthew seems to say that divorce is only permitted when adultery has occurred. But all he says is that pornea is a separate case – he doesn't say it is an exception but something he won't discuss now. Pornea can mean adultery or fornication. He may be referring to invalid marriages as fornication and saying they are a separate case but that divorce is always always wrong. If Matthew really allowed divorce it would have to be eliminated as true scripture for the earliest sources say divorce is absolutely wrong.

If divorce is intolerable despite all the suffering caused by being married to an unsuitable partner, isn't it obvious that separation must be intolerable too? Separation is treating the marriage as if it never happened. If you must keep acting married to your partner by refusing to take a new husband or wife is it not as bad to live away from that partner? Do you really think that remarrying after an amicable divorce is a bigger breach of marriage than one having an estranged spouse and living away from her or him?

The Catholic Church boasts that it forbids divorce. Not true. The Church declares that the marriage between two validly baptised people cannot be dissolved by any power. But if one of them turns out to be unbaptised then the divorce is permitted. The Church boasts that it protects marriage when it is really its doctrine it cares about - not marriage!

Marriage is not a union of lovers for the feeling of love can disappear and the partners start to love each other in another way.

Jesus' teaching has a lot of vicious implications. No wonder his apostles didn't like his teaching and said it was better not to marry at all.

[Top of the Document](#)

ECUMENISM

Ecumenism means unity and is different religions coming together to learn from one another, to pray together, to bring out statements of common belief, to be at peace with one another, to help one another and to work together on solving social problems.

Ecumenism will have one of two motives. One motive is just to soften other religions up to convert them into one religion. This isn't real ecumenism for it sees unity as being one faith and getting rid of the others. Destroying other faiths is the main goal. This ecumenism isn't about unity now, it is about a future unity of getting everybody in the one faith so it isn't ecumenism. The other motive is to bring religions together without intending to convert them. This one implies that one religion is as good as another as long as there is sincerity – a view called indifferentism. Or that there is one really good religion and the rest aren't so bad but not as good but acceptable.

The latter form is the form officially adopted when the Roman Catholic Church departed from the Catholic faith at Vatican II in the 1960's. The Church holds that nobody is saved BECAUSE of the false religion they are in but in spite of it and because God is bigger than their errors he can reach them with sufficient truth.

The Church claims to be Catholic. It claims to exist for all people. It says that it is easy to work out that it is the true Church for many people are simple people. If the Church then is really Catholic, then it follows that educated Protestants and their ministers and clergy are wilfully refusing to see that the Church is the true Church. To say any different is to deny that the Church is genuinely Catholic. If Protestants are doing good works and engaging in missions in poor countries and are still hypocrites then surely we must agree that religious faith is probably nearly always self-deception. The Catholics are certainly deluding themselves by claiming they can be Catholic and involved in ecumenism.

The Catholic Church only went into ecumenism because the world was sick of religion causing war and fomenting hatred so the Church wanted a sweetness and light reputation to keep its following in the modern age. It's pure manipulation. Its too cosmetic to do good for much longer.

[Top of the Document](#)

EGOISM

Desire is the wish to gain. People say it is the wish to gain or the wish for another to gain. But the latter tries to cover up the fact that your gain is to see the other gain. It is about you though it looks like it is not. The motive is self-interest.

Even when we hate doing something, we like it enough to do it.

Egoism is the realisation that whatever you do is for your gain - to fulfil your desire.

Those who say we should help others without any intention of gaining from it are hypocrites. They are dangerous for they give us an impossible morality that will only lead to frustration and anger and disillusionment.

Everybody admits the existence of self-interest. But the existence of other-interest can never be proven. For example, you are considered selfish if you hoard your money up and don't share it. Doing this does you no favours and you will know it. But it is still selfish. And if you give everything away for the poor its considered unselfish even though this may do you no favours either! It is more reasonable to assume that human nature only cares about itself.

[Top of the Document](#)

EMPTY TOMB

The tomb of Jesus was found empty on the third day after his crucifixion according to the four gospels.

Christians try to refute the possibility that somebody stole the body of Jesus for they want people to think he rose bodily from the dead. Their proofs that nobody stole the body are just speculation.

The Matthew gospel alone says that there were guards at the tomb. It says they were scared by an angel that appeared and it made them faint. They could have been scared by a trickster who pretended to be the angel. Perhaps the body was stolen in the confusion or after they ran off. The Matthew Gospel says the Jews bribed them to say that the body was stolen by Jesus' disciples as they slept on duty. Maybe they really did really did sleep on duty and it was not a faint. Some say the penalties for sleeping on duty were severe so the guards were probably telling the truth!

Perhaps they were drugged by those who were endeavouring to fake a miracle.

The Gospel of Matthew admits that the soldiers were amenable to bribes. Jesus could have got plenty of donations through the years that he said nothing about. Those funds could have been used to bribe the soldiers to let his henchmen who need not necessarily have been among the apostles steal the body.

The guards are so unreliable and unprofessional that it is stupid to think that they could be trusted to care for Jesus' tomb.

All the sources say that the women were there alone and when the tomb was open. Nothing says the body was gone then. Maybe they stole the body and lied about visions of Jesus and angels?

We have no reason to think they couldn't have managed to move the stone which might have been a small slab.

The gospels say they wondered who was going to open the tomb for them indicating that the guards story is lies. Had there been guards there they would have expected them to open the tomb for them. If the women couldn't open the tomb themselves then why didn't they take men with them? Did they just go ahead to the tomb in the hope that they might be able to move the stone themselves?

The burial might have been a trick. There is no reason stopping you from believing that the buriers of Jesus only pretended to bury Jesus and fooled the witnesses who were in a distracted distressed state. Maybe the body was never buried in the first place. The gospels merely say that Jesus' burial was witnessed but they do not go into detail. They do not say the witnesses kept their eyes on the tomb like detectives would.

The Christians expect us to believe that all the possible explanations for the empty tomb and appearances of Jesus to the apostles take too much faith and it is easier to believe simply that Jesus rose by a miracle. That is appalling logic. Natural explanations, however bizarre, must always be preferred to supernatural ones and the supernatural explanation with the least miracles in it must be preferred if a natural one will not do. A supernatural explanation is never ever necessary. After all, aliens could be doing the miracles with their super-science. Then in that case they merely look like miracles but are not miracles at all. If a man came to the world as it is today from the Middle Ages he would think that televisions are supernatural. That would in fact be irrational of him. He should instead think that it is something to do with nature that he doesn't understand. The idea that demons made people forget the real location of the body is a better one than that it rose from the dead. It involves assuming less miracle. Assuming it is rational to say miracle is possible, we must assume as few miracles as possible.

[Top of the Document](#)

ERROR

Error is being wrong. Being wrong is bad. Error is always bad for in so far as you are wrong you will be willing to undergo inconvenience for that error so error attacks your human dignity. Unless you nip it in the bud, its problems will be passed on to other people and harm them. That is why we should make no apology for gently and politely encouraging people to putting people and not creeds and Gods and clergy first. The Roman Catholic Church teaches that error has no rights because it is wrong (page 277, Pope Fiction, Patrick Madrid, Basilica Press, San Diego, 1999). It doesn't have the right to be respected. When we seem to respect error it is because it is we respect the people who err and not the error. If this teaching is correct then everybody has the duty to try to convert others to her or his belief even if they are political beliefs. Nobody has the right to order you to be silent about your beliefs.

Many Catholics say that the trouble with respecting people of different beliefs is that we can't please everybody so the Catholic Church being the single largest organisation in the world must alone have the right to propagate its beliefs.

[Top of the Document](#)

EXORCISM

Casting out demons that have taken over people so that the people will be free.

Jesus performed many exorcisms in the Bible which is odd for you hardly ever hear of possessions these days.

When demons take over they treat the victim very cruelly to the horror of the spectators. It would be better to take over and use the person to do evil things but in secret while hiding the malevolence. Demons being scary and tormenting their host would only be scaring people into the arms of God. They would be putting people off evil. No story of demonic possession then makes sense.

If demons don't want to be expelled from their victim they have a strange way of showing it. The exorcist comes to cast them out. They go or seem to. When the exorcism works for a while and the demon returns people reason that the person let the demon back in. They blame the person not the fact that the exorcism is a load of hocus pocus. Exorcisms look more like displays to get followers for the exorcist who is really on their side so they pretend he could and indeed has cast them out. The Jews suggested that to Jesus. He then tried to scare them into thinking that they were insulting the Spirit of God when in fact he could give no proof but speculation that they were wrong. He argued that Satan cannot put Satan out as if Satan needed to possess people. Jesus even said that whoever says Satan is doing the exorcisms that the Holy Spirit is doing would never be forgiven for their sin. Obviously what they said had got to him. He wanted to scare them into silence. He was the one insulting the Spirit.

[Top of the Document](#)

FAITH

Christian teaching: "Faith is trust in God and in his promises and in what he has revealed. It is the belief that God is honest and reliable and leads to you believing all he allegedly revealed. It is a supernatural gift from God for humanity is believed to prefer to be independent from God. Humanity will only trust God and become dependant on God if God helps them to do it, if God puts thoughts and realisations in their minds and changes their emotions to make faith attractive. So it is not natural." Faith is a miracle.

Christianity wants and expects, like its God, all believers to believe in the same stuff despite the problems of making this happen. So faith has to be caused by the direct influence of God to make it possible. The teaching that we just have to ask for faith and its God's gift and he will give it is just a subtle means of applying pressure and saying, "If you don't agree with us then you are a bad egg."

Christian Faith involves believing all the dogma that the source God speaks through states as true be it Church, prophet or Bible or any number of these. That means that if you really have supernatural faith in some Catholic doctrines and regard the Church as the source you will believe everything that source says. That is why Catholics who might scoff at the virgin birth of Jesus are not Catholics even if they believe everything else. They do not have the gift of faith but imagine they have it. A person with real faith who refuses to believe doctrines from the source of revelation and belief must be refusing to believe God on purpose and is trying to stamp out the light of God so not only does she know she is fighting God she is also giving up her trust in God. To deny or question one principle taught by the source is say that the whole source is unreliable. That is why the Church regards heresy or disagreeing with her teaching as the worst and most dangerous sin.

Christian Faith cannot mean that God makes you see the evidence that verifies the authenticity of the source of his doctrines for no two people agree on the evidences and reasons. Furthermore, they differ on the interpretation of the evidence and/or how helpful it is. For example, some accept some arguments for God's existence and others accept none of them. So God helps you towards the conclusion without any regard for the evidence. This really means that what you feel God is saying to you is what matters not the evidence for the evidence is not allowed to stand on its own for the whole process of getting to faith requires prayer and openness to God's guidance. So faith then is anti-evidence though it pays lip-service to it. It is a superstition. It takes quite a lot of arrogance to hold that what you want to be true is a communication from God and therefore true and that those who disagree with you are wrong. With that belief the more holier you seem to be the more black inside you would be because fanaticism (the desire to hurt others over faith) and egotism would be behind your holiness and it is not about God at all but only looks like it is.

The rock Christianity is built is on the doctrine of faith and it underlines how that faith is all lies and wishful thinking so that is what the miracles it boasts about are defending! It is feelings about doctrines that mean everything to Christians not the doctrines and they disguise this self-indulgence as selfless love for all.

It is common for Christians to mistake belief for faith. In fact, correct Christian doctrine sees faith as a form of knowledge. Sensible people know that the more outrageous a claim is the stronger the evidence is you need for it. You need absolute proof to accuse people of original sin, to accuse them of being responsible for breaking the law of God, to accuse them of needing a saviour, to accuse them of being able to commit serious sin, to say Jesus rose from the dead, to say priests forgive sins. Every religious doctrine needs absolute proof for the claims made are so huge and strange. And this proof must be understood by the person entering a religion before the person

can be validly accepted. Christians can only say, "The more miraculous the doctrine the more miraculously perfect evidence you need that it is true. We agree. We have this evidence. We know in our hearts that we are right." That attitude is arrogant and vicious and irresponsible. Fundamentalist religion will only go out to murder and maim if it thinks it knows that it should.

[Top of the Document](#)

FANATICISM

Fanaticism is usually a religious trait. Fanaticism in religion takes two forms. The first oppresses the mind and tries to make you feel guilty for disagreeing with the religious status quo. Christianity does this when it forbids doubt (Question 177, A Catechism of Christian Doctrine, CTS, London) which is the same as not allowing you to see clearly if the cult is true or not. The second is when the religion has you doing, thinking and enduring something harmful or hurtful that you wouldn't be doing if you were a decent irreligious person. For example, if it has you scared to eat meat on a Friday though you have no other food in the house.

Political fanaticism is terrible but can be excused a little for it will have some evidence for the stances it takes but there is no excuse at all for religious fanaticism which has no evidence. And it never has any. A political regime knows fine well that it has no right to kill citizens at whim even if it kills. But with religion it could be argued that God authorises and needs those killings for he kills anyway and is the master of life and death and if so he has the right to tell you to kill. Religion is a licence for fanaticism. Politics is not. Religious fanaticism cannot be refuted for you can never prove that God didn't speak to a raving religious fanatic. Political fanaticism can and always burns itself out. The evidence destroys it eventually. Religion is worse for it is immune to evidence.

Tolerance is a big virtue these days. It is insulting for it implies putting up with something undesirable. Religious tolerance means one religion merely stomaching the others that disagree with it. There should be no religion as there is enough around to test our tolerance without it adding to the problems. People get some comfort from religion but have they considered how in the bigger picture that this comfort is not worth it? Tolerance when practiced by a believer in religion is itself a form of fanaticism.

[Top of the Document](#)

FATIMA

The Virgin Mary allegedly appeared six times in 1917 in Fatima and made the sun spin. She gave lots of revelations.

Most of the revelations were not made known until over two decades later by Lucia who was then the only surviving visionary. The Church however had decided that the apparitions were genuine before that time. Had she been an honest woman all would have been relayed to the Church investigation at the start instead of getting them to decide that the visions were genuine and from God without knowing all the facts. The miracles, if real, then serve only to warn us that miracles are the machinations of some evil or deceiving force.

The accounts of the spinning sun are surprisingly few and often contradictory and many present that day saw nothing. A collective hallucination or people needing to see the miracle (for their Church was unjustly treated by the ruling atheist government and they needed assurance) made them imagine it explains it sufficiently for the sun did not move that day. Apparitions condemned by the Church as fraud have been claimed by thousands of witnesses to have nevertheless caused the sun to spin - and those who had to get medical care after hurting their eyes when they thought the sun was moving are often forgotten. Vatican experts including the former Cardinal Ratzinger, Pope Benedict XVI, have expressed scepticism about many of the claims made by Lucia for and about Fatima.

[Top of the Document](#)

FORGIVENESS

Forgiveness is at the heart of the Christian faith. Forgiving is supposed to be good while condoning, rewarding the ill-done by acting as if it does not matter, is bad. Forgiveness says the sin matters and requires hating the sin and loving the sinner on the basis that you cannot forgive a sin unless you resent it and hate it first.

Christian forgiveness is two-faced because you can no more love the sinner and hate the sin any more than you can trust the sinner and not trust the sin they commit. Trust is an ingredient of love and a major one at that. Hate

thrives on mistrust and mistrust involves fear. Fear always blinds you at least a bit. Therefore to fear is to tempt yourself to hate or will evil on another and to attempt to become unfair.

Christianity seeks to turn away from valuing people to valuing people for the sake of God - so in reality people are thought of as commodities to be used to please God. Mother Teresa once admitted she didn't give a toss about the people she helped for it was all about God to her. A faith like that can only appeal to people who are at least secret misanthropes and how could such people genuinely love sinners?

The idea of a forgiving God is not consoling at all. If God forgives he will not forgive you unless you forgive everybody else too first which is only decency and commonsense and it is scriptural too (Mark 11:25,26; Matthew 6:12). But can you forgive Hitler? You can only pretend you can. You would need to experience the full horror of the evil that Hitler did for you need to understand the evil before you can pardon it. Otherwise you are not forgiving properly. Subconsciously, if you experienced his evil and your family did, you wouldn't forgive. Nobody can genuinely forgive everybody. They only imagine that they do.

If to refuse to forgive means that God refuses you pardon, then to sin after or to not forgive means you are ungrateful for this pardon you have received from him and are trying to reverse it all which is a very serious sin indeed. Then nobody can be saved. To deny this would be to become a self-deluding hypocrite.

Forgiveness means that if the person could be punished, you would not approve this punishment. Forgiveness is not about feelings.

Christians talk about how good forgiveness is for you and that it rids you of hate and stress and fear. Recovering from these pests is not forgiveness. Its emotional recovery. If you would not retaliate against an evil person but cannot erase the hatred you feel for them then you have forgiven them. The feelings are not your fault.

There is something arrogant in Christians seeking to have and having no ill-feelings towards those who have tortured their loved ones to death. You can only do that if you do not truly understand how awful it was for them. You would need to be able to become them in order to understand and in so far as you cannot understand you don't know what you are forgiving. And in so far as you don't know you are not forgiving. The Christians are in fact condoning the evil. They pay lip-service to the horror and turn around and reward it.

To accuse people who are trapped in their anger and resentment of being unforgiving is the worst form of bullying imaginable. Yet Jesus said that those who don't forgive will not be forgiven.

Those who are being forgiven "in spite of" their wrongs (by others) and sins (by God) are really being insulted. Its like, "You are bad and its bad for you to be bad but I will treat you as if you are not harming yourself and others". If you have to reach the disposition that you would not commit your sins if you had the chance again, it follows that you are getting conditional forgiveness. There is something begrudging and unsatisfying about that kind of forgiveness. And it cheapens forgiveness.

[Top of the Document](#)

FREE WILL

Free will for believers in religion means that you alone cause your actions and not God or anybody else thus you are accountable if you do good or evil.

The error in this is that if God is the reason anything at all exists then he has more to do with whatever you choose than you do. Whether this contradicts free will or not is controversial. Believers who say that we abuse free will because of God and not in spite of him say the two are compatible. But one thing for sure, it does not get God off the hook. That sadly is what they will not admit.

The will is the feeling that whatever I am programmed to think is for the best wins all the time. It therefore makes me "choose". So my strongest feeling is to do what is best for me. I do not determine what the strongest feeling makes me do for I am not free to want what I like to want with a snap of my fingers. Feeling free is what matters to us not free will. Free will only matters to religious people because they want to excuse God. But nobody has the right to say people do evil not God unless they have strong proof that there is a God. You have to avoid

accusing people unless you can adequately support your allegations.

People worry that if free will is denied that we deny human responsibility for good and evil. But that is an argument not for free will but for believing in it. If it does not exist, enough of us are getting on okay so what is the big deal?

Nobody has the right to accuse you of having the power to freely create evil just because they are afraid what will happen if people do not believe in free will. We are social creatures and our social nature matters more than our alleged free will. This social nature will nurture and restrain us.

If we are not free we should be treated well so there is no need to believe we need free will to be entitled to be treated well.

Even if we are free, we are considered responsible for the harm we do even if we didn't mean it. Belief in responsibility then does not depend on belief in free will. We are surer that people suffer than that they are free therefore it is wrong to make them suffer the punishment they have allegedly earned. If they have to be hurt, this should not be the reason. You cannot blame unless you believe in free will. Free will is a vindictive doctrine. Free will is a passive aggressive doctrine. The believer sanctifies it by making it sacred. The atheist might teach free will but at least she does not go that far!

We can carry on much the same way as we live without believing in free will. The doctrine is just a nasty rumour spread by religion since the dawn of time and it is inexcusable for it is not needed at all.

God could program us to do good all the time for our feelings that cause us to do good or harm are programmed anyway. It is hypocritical to say he cannot when he is programming us anyway. So it must be better to be badly programmed than to be programmed right!

Free will is an assumption. It is impossible to prove it. We think we are free when we are drunk though the drink is removing our freedom. So what makes us think we are free when we are sober?

It is a trendy dogma to assert that blaming a person for some bad thing is different from declaring them responsible for it. It goes, "You can't blame a person without declaring them responsible. But you can declare a person responsible without blaming. We say we should never blame but we should remind people of their personal responsibility for the bad things they allow to happen to them." Blame says bad. Bad means should not exist and we should feel a desire to make it suffer. Thus to say anything is bad is vindictive. It wishes evil on evil. To wish evil on a thing is wishing evil and becoming evil just like it would be evil to wish evil on a person. You can't say that the person who would murder Ann's hat if he could is better inside than the person who would murder her. The purpose of telling people they are responsible for something is to tell them they can recognise they are doing the bad, they can do something about the bad and they can stop being bad enough to let more bad happen. The only true difference between blame and responsibility is the different words.

People like to be told they are free responsible agents. When I do something, I have an intuition that I could have done something else instead. My programming could have made me do something different. That is the cause of the intuition. But it didn't - that is the bottom line. If my programming could have made me do something different that is not freedom. The intuition is misinterpreted by those who think it means they could have did something totally independent of the programming.

People fear that if we deny free will we will take a fatalistic approach to life. It is said that atheism that denies free will makes such fatalism logical. But human nature is not programmed to behave as if fatalism is believed to be true.

Free will is not to be believed in lightly and without good evidence but sadly it is swallowed and washed down with religion. It is an irrational doctrine, it is a fantasy. It is intrinsically hate and the seed of hate. A person who denies free will and who hates "bad" people is only deceiving himself. He believes deep down.

[Top of the Document](#)

FREE WILL DEFENCE

An attempt to salvage God from the charge of cruelty when he allows innocent suffering - it works by blaming us for it. The logic goes that God made us to love him and gave us free will to do right or do wrong because love cannot be forced. But even that would only be right if love could surpass evil. Religion takes it on faith that it does or will. Faith is not a good enough reason for saying that as far as God is concerned evil and suffering should be tolerated. Suffering is too serious for that.

Religion says that love is voluntary. Only a being with free will to do extreme evil can give it. So they say God gave us all this freedom but we abused it of our own volition and so he is not to blame for evil. This reasoning is called the free will defence or the freedom defence. It is meant to clear God of the blame for evil. But it is obvious that God could limit our free will. It is limited anyway by our feelings and what we can remember and what we can think of. In short, it is limited by our mental powers. Hitler disproves God.

Religion says that to be free we have to be free all the way. We have to be free to do tremendous harm like Hitler was.

Christianity says that too. But it does not really believe it. Christianity says that we are all sinners meaning that we do not have the free will to live a sinless life. So we only have choice in relation to what sins we want to commit. We have no choice about being sinners or not. This implies that God doesn't give us enough free will. A God who refuses to give you the power to live a sinless life but you gives you rein to commit whatever evil you wish after making sure you will sin is a God of evil. The freedom to live a sinless life is not as important to him as making people inclined to commit any sin even extreme ones.

The defence asserts that we have free will in order that we might use it to accept God in love.

The defence then argues thus,

We have free will.

#God gave it to us in order that we might have a relationship with him.

#We can abuse this free will and God does not interfere.

=Therefore evil is our fault not God's.

This argument is a circular one. "God gave us free will therefore there is a God." It is an insult to humanity considering the terrible things that visit everybody on earth.

When we chose evil, God allegedly made evil things like killer viruses so that sacrifice could be made in love and we are told that this is our fault, not his. But when I am most sure of my existence (that I exist now is the one thing I cannot doubt), I have to put myself first and so I should not suffer but be happy all the time and a God should make that possible. I am not advocating having no concern for others. We occasionally need to suffer to be happy because of the way things are. I am saying this should not be the way things are in the first place if there is a God. God is evil when I suffer and when he demands sacrifice. To invent a God and then accuse people of causing all the evil in the world means that belief is being put before people, what you can touch and see is put second to a concept and perception that might be wrong. That is barbaric and the free will defence is an insult to us humanists and to those whom we cherish.

We are told that being good is freedom and being bad is bondage. If God wanted us to have a lot of free will he would have given us the power to live without sin. Instead of that he lets us have a bias towards sin that we will give in to and then lets us become Hitlers if we can. So he gives us too much free will of the wrong kind. The free will argument that evil is compatible with God's love is wrong. To worship God is to close our eyes and hearts to his evil.

Good actions are caused by good desires. We are supposed to be most free when we are free from sin for sin is irrational and what is irrational means you have lost your reason and your freedom is diminished. So God takes

away our freedom by giving us bad desires! Is it not better to be so free that you never feel interested in sin than to have an interest in it? And especially when this interest puts others at risk of being hurt? The Church instead of saying yes argues that we need to be allowed by God to do harm. What is happening here is that the Church sees how nasty we can be and are. It puts the cart before the horse. Instead of asking if God can let us be that nasty it looks at the nastiness and guesses that God must be right to let it happen. Why not go further? Why not reason that the paedophile is right to abuse the child just because we see him abusing her?

Religion implies that the most important good is having freedom to take away the freedom of others by hurting them!! So immorality is good! And it suggests that Satan was more good when God put the suggestion of sin in him! When actions are caused by desires it follows that the more good desires you have the better. But God's treatment of Satan implies otherwise, meaning if Satan agreed with God's ways then he deserved to be thrown out of Heaven.

The free will defence is rejected by astute scholars such as Brian Davies OP. He says that it denies that God is the maker of all. It says we make our sins in spite of God. But if God is almighty we make our sins because of him. He argues that God is right to do this so it does not mean God sins with us. We have here an idea of God which means he lays out everything that happens to us. It is a form of fatalism and predetermination that is as vile as that taught by Islam. Islam often reasons that if you want to kill for God, go and do it for he is predetermining your actions so it is up to him to worry about it not you. And it is the only real view of God... anything else only looks like God but is not God for it is not absolute and the reason everything is.

[Top of the Document](#)

FRUITS

All religions accept the fruits doctrine. Basically what it says is that if the religion has good fruits then it is the true religion. Jesus said in Matthew 7 that you can tell bad prophets by their bad fruits. Christianity believes that Jesus was the Son of God for Christianity has good fruits. Roman Catholicism decides that a miracle or apparition - say Lourdes - must have been done by God when it has good fruits. If God is good then that follows from that. But when all religions think they have enough good fruits to be the true faith it is obvious that the fruit argument is worthless. To use the argument is the height of arrogance, "My religion is better than yours" and "Those who believe in my religion can be and are better than those who believe in yours". That is what religion and the miracles are really supporting. The only thing that produces good fruit is healthy self-love and religion is unnecessary for that for self-love implies that you are to be independent of God and you are to be your own person. The fact that fruits are the attraction about miracles though they should not be, is sufficient proof that the miracles produce only the bad fruit of leading people astray.

The Catholic Church teaches that good fruits come from prayer, faith in God's Church and the sacraments. We hear today of the conversions at Catholic apparition sites. The most cited reason for taking these apparitions seriously as supernatural events is the fruits. The Church says it observes that the fruits do not come from the apparitions - which may even be hoaxes - but from the Catholic spirituality applied to the pilgrims. To say fruits come from an apparition directly is to contradict the doctrine of the Church that we do not have to believe in them. It shows that it is hard to know what is causing the fruits. And people tend to look at the immediate ones and not the long-term ones. A false or man-made religion will show its true face in time - consider how Catholicism practiced its own version of relativism which has led to the dreadful spin off relativism that tyrannises the world.

[Top of the Document](#)

GARABANDAL

Apparition site where the Virgin Mary supposedly appeared a great deal during the 1960's. The apparitions were not from God for he could easily have picked visionaries who would never deny that they saw the Virgin like the Garabandal visionaries did. Visionary Marie Loli died denying seeing the Virgin. The apparitions have been condemned by all the bishops of the area who denied, in their official capacity, that the visions were supernatural or from God. They have been condemned not once but several times. Garabandal however was accompanied with many testimonies that miracles really happened and still the Church rejects the idea that any miracle took place. There are times when no matter how good the testimony is there is better evidence that the testimony is wrong. The mess at Garabandal warns about how little faith we should put in miracle testimonies.

[Top of the Document](#)

GOD

To be God, God needs to have all power or there is something he cannot control. To be deserving of worship God needs to have this infinite power and to use it with perfectly good intentions. He has to be absolutely good and holy. He has to be the reason all things exist. A supreme being is not the same as God. God means the origin of all and the being who is so great that he is the reason he exists. Thus it is wrong to ask who made God.

God cannot exist because evil exists. The God concept goes with the activity of worship for only what ought to be worshipped can be called God and only what is worthy can be worshipped. As God is perfect and the maker of all and we owe him everything he alone matters. We should prefer even self-destruction to displeasing him.

If God never wanted evil to exist and it is our fault then it follows that he puts up with it for a purpose. This is to deny that he is almighty or even competent because he could arrange things so that we are less likely to choose evil. Yet we have this bias towards evil. Some are born with less bias than others. It is proven that God must want evil to exist.

If suffering has a purpose then it follows that it must be intended so that we will be able to make sacrifices for love. This implies that the more God lets us suffer the better for the more we sacrifice the more we love. This shows the doctrine of God to be morbid and degrading and enamoured of fanaticism for the allegation that God wants suffering is the only plausible assumption to take if you want to believe in God.

Should we feed the beggar because he needs food and we care? That is the same as doing it is because it is good. Or should we do it because God commands it in which case if he forbade it we would let the beggar starve? If God comes first then we should do it because God commands it for in so far as we do it for the beggar we are not honouring God who is more important. The solution that God commands us to care for the beggar doesn't work for the question is asking what matters: obedience to commands or concern for others. If God commanding is what is important and not good then religion is about power and control even when it seems to do good. God may be called love but all he is good for is destroying it for since we have to put obedience before caring for an unfortunate human being. The person who believes that caring is more important than obeying is an atheist in practice. The only message the concept of God gives out is that God and therefore religion must be served and put first and that human beings and yourself are dirt and good for nothing at all and all must be manipulated for him and those who resist him must be punished.

Priests who condone the ways of God when he lets the children suffer are doing so in honour of a belief that thrives on a hidden kind of evil and that is totally repulsive.

[Top of the Document](#)

GRACE

It means a gift from God. God forgiving sins is a grace for you do not deserve it. A deserved gift is not a gift. Strangely God helping you to live a good life is also a grace. Grace is an evil concept that denies the truth that however bad you are, the one thing you always deserve is to be helped to live a good life. You earn grace by your sins so grace is nonsense. Grace is the essence of what the Christian gospel is about which marks Christianity as evil especially when it teaches that God is right to deprive the souls in Hell of grace so that they abide there forever. Grace cannot make you holier for a person who does a lot of bad things but who tries really hard to fight his weakness will be holier in his heart than a person to whom virtue comes easy. So it follows then that the holier you are the worse you are!

Grace is a miracle. The Church says that somebody very evil who becomes good nearly overnight has got miraculous help from God to change his character so quickly. But we forget that unless it all comes from you it is not all your work. The person may seem better but the problem is that he has not done all the work. It is really no better than programming somebody to be good or partly programming them. He is not a better person in the sense that he would be a better person if he fought his inner nature for years alone to become good.

We know from the entry on free will that God can change our feelings and make us very holy but that God needs to do a miracle when he could have set everything out right in the first place shows that grace is nonsense.

The Bible teaches that forgiveness for sin is a gift from God. Christianity says you get forgiven as long as you

resolve to make amends to the people you hurt. So you get pardoned before you do anything. This is an insult to anybody that you hurt. You should not get forgiveness until you do the bare minimum to prove your worthiness of it for actions speak and words do not. It is doing that shows the authenticity of your intentions. Otherwise you can't know. You proved yourself untrustworthy and now you are asking for trust instead of earning it.

[Top of the Document](#)

HATE

The doctrine of a loving God is wholly based on the lie that you can love a sinner and hate their sin. Thus belief in God is either hypocritical or malicious. It depends on the person.

Hate is a dislike of someone that wishes evil on them for its own sake. The Church says we must hate sins. We are to hate the sins people do and to love the people who commit the sins.

If we really hate sins, then we might as well hate people. Hate is hate.

To separate the sin from the sinner is to deny that the sinner is the cause of the sin and to pretend that sin is a thing when it is not - it is a what kind of person a person is. Sins are not just what sinners do. Sins are what reveal the kind of person the sinner is. No separation is possible. You can't hate the sin like it was the sinner and not the person committing the sin. Its not a person. It's ridiculous hating a thing. It's only a thing. To hate the sin is hating the sinner as well. Christ said if you have two masters you will like one and hate the other (Matthew 6:24). This shows that it is his doctrine that hating a person is too easy for us all. When somebody hates your sin you can be sure that it is you they really hate. We all know that to hate sin is personal for it feels personal. You feel something against the person as a person. Christianity calls on you to lie to be a Christian. It calls on you to tell people with a straight face that you tolerate them as people but you don't tolerate their sins! Hate is a form of intolerance. Intolerance is at the root of hate.

The Christians say that hating sin turns so easily into hating the sinner. Obviously the more you hate sin and the more "sins" you hate the more likely this will be. The gospel is clear that we must hate sin and find it repulsive. The stress of all that hatred and trying to keep it from turning into hatred for the sinner (I'm not pretending that they are not the same thing!) would soon result in a complete mental and nervous breakdown. Christian forgiveness is motivated by pleasing God and not genuine concern for yourself or others. The Church is quite clear that if we have a choice between loving people and God and can't do both we must love God. Vile! Vile! Vile!

Love the sinner and hate the sin is as silly as love the nurse and hate the woman who is the nurse. The teaching that we must love the sinner and hate the sin because we are sinners ourselves suggests that hating the sinner is good but only if you are not a sinner! It involves wishing you were in a position to be able to hate the sinner!

Some say "Cancer isn't bad. It is just something that is living and growing in the wrong place. It's the place that is wrong not the cancer for life and growth are good." If that is true then you cannot hate cancer. You hate its consequences but not the cancer. You don't have anything personal against the cancer or its wrongness. If you really loved the sinner you wouldn't be able to have a personal hatred of the sin.

Loving the sinner and hating the sin is the same thing as condoning in that you pretend the sinner hasn't had anything to do with the sin. The main reason condoning is bad is because of the results and there is no point in condemning it and praising forgiveness when both have the same results: namely the criminal getting off scot-free. It is best to put evil-doing down to the insanity we all have rather than down to us knowingly and freely doing evil. This avoids the hateful implications of faith in forgiveness. In other words, see evil as an aberration and not a sin. This way you can praise the woman who neglected her father for her kindness towards you without implying you approve of her behaviour towards her father. The better you get on in life after doing something terrible the more good you feel about having done the evil, so to be kind to her would be condoning and rewarding her sin.

The Church also says that hate is only a sin if you can do something about it but don't! It is cynical and

manipulative how the Church uses the love sinner and hate sin line to avoid being castigated as a bigoted hate group.

The Church makes people who imagine that it forbids hate, feel good and safe. They are mistaken for the Church says that hate is an act of will not emotion. You can have the feelings of hate and not will them and you can refuse to give in to them. The hate is not sin. So hate is acting to destroy the wellbeing of another. Also, if you feel that sinners are leading your loved ones into Hell forever you will naturally feel hatred for them. This is not a sin as long as you can't help it. It is simply not true that the Church is a sweetness and light organisation that is too nice to advocate hatred. It does.

Acts of sin don't seem that bad in the sense for example that we feel that even Hitler should not be punished with everlasting punishment. But the religious treat people as having sin natures. They have influenced and persuaded the law of the land to jail people for life for something that took them one second to do: the act of murder. They agree that a person who steals a bar of chocolate should have their good name taken away by the law and the papers and punished seemingly out of proportion to the crime. They agree to this because they see the murderers and thieves as having an evil nature or character which is why they must suffer. It is more about dealing with the dark characters than the actions. Nobody can pretend that any of that is about loving the sinners and hating their sins!

Christianity's love and hate are a bit cold. It is not the evil that people do to us that troubles us. It is the hate or bad feeling toward us expressed by their actions. We are made to want people to like and love us with their feelings. We are emotional creatures. If Catholics understood their faith properly they would not be in it.

[Top of the Document](#)

HEAVEN

The state of being with God and enjoying him forever. It is a state of perfect happiness because God is the source of all happiness. Christianity insists that God only lets the morally perfect into Heaven. But why bother when the virtues are no good there for there is no suffering there? (Revelation 21:4). What God would prudence and fortitude be in Heaven? The doctrine shows how the doctrine of God incites discrimination against doubters and atheists for they are influencing people to stay away from the one source of true happiness: God.

Christians want the happiness not God. But they can't admit that. If they wanted God, they would be willing to be tormented forever to the extreme to help others as long as it meant he was pleased. Christians use the people they charm and help in order to get the pie in the sky.

[Top of the Document](#)

HELL

The everlasting punishing for those who die outside of a friendly relationship with God. It is a terrible slur to say that people would throw themselves into such a state forever. None of us could be that bad. You would need absolute proof to make such a terrible accusation. In the absence of such proof it is undeniable that hell is vindictive wishful thinking. It is nasty despite its having being taught by Christ and the Bible, Muhammad and the Koran as revelation from God. People come before faith and not faith before people. Hell suggests different. And Hell is the evil that Jesus (allegedly) rose to promote. The Church says that his Gospel cannot be understood or be even important unless there is a need to be saved from such a dreadfully unspeakable fate. And those who say that instead of Hell we will have everlasting death if we do not do what God wants are only a bit better than their rivals. What is the point in banning hate if you are going to encourage people to intend or wish on some level that if an adulterer or homosexual dies unreconciled to God that they will go to Hell?

The teaching that we make our own Hell and spend all eternity refusing to repent denies that Hell is God punishing us. Jesus will say to the unjust, "Begone from Me, you cursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels" (Matthew 25:41). Jesus spoke of it as eternal punishment that he administers. He does not say, "I want you to be with me instead of going into the eternal fire. It is your choice." Jesus warned people about Hell. It would make no sense to warn people if there was nothing going to put them there or keep them there but themselves! The people in Heaven just look at the inhabitants in Hell and go, "They deserve it and we will not waste compassion on them". Its an insult to your departed loved ones to say they go to Heaven!

The Church says that Hell is your own choice. So the people in Hell supposedly would stay there rather than turn to God. They hate him so much that they cut off their noses to spite their faces forever. Catholics say that atheists are repelled by God because they think he maliciously lets us suffer if he exists. They will go to Hell because they have the attitude that keeps the very Devil himself in Hell. They have the main ingredient of hellfire. The doctrine violates the humanitarian principle that we must avoid having beliefs that attack others.

[Top of the Document](#)

HINDUISM

A tradition more than a religion. It allows you to be an Atheist as long as you follow the traditions. That is fine but all Hindus then should become Atheists and enjoy life without the burden of supernatural beliefs. The caste system of Hinduism is a great evil for it treats many people as dirt just because they were born into the "lowest" class. They are accused of having committed great sins in a past life thus deserving this treatment.

[Top of the Document](#)

HOLY SPIRIT

In Christianity theology the Holy Spirit is the Third Person who is God. He is the one most associated with interior spiritual guidance and Jesus says he leads his true disciples into all truth. Jesus said that the Jews who said he did miracles by the Devil's power were blaspheming the Holy Spirit and would never be forgiven. Catholics, Protestants and Mormons are three cults that each claim that the Spirit has told them in their hearts and by improving their virtues that their religion is true but the three contradict each other. The real Holy Spirit is just their prejudice and arrogance. They are the biggest blasphemers of the lot!

The Holy Spirit is chiefly called Holy because he is the sanctifier, he makes Christians holy and live holy lives. But our perception and practice of right and wrong is impaired. Accidents often happen and we screw things up. To pretend that this is holiness and inspired by the Holy Spirit is the height of arrogance. It is expedience not holiness. Most people who think they are inspired by some sanctifier are wrong - which proves the point.

[Top of the Document](#)

HOMOSEXUALITY

This is condemned in the Bible despite attempts to cover this up with interpretations that are not straightforward. For example, some say that the apostle Paul in Romans 1 condemns people who are homosexual against their nature. But it can be read as saying people bring their homosexuality on themselves. That is the simplest interpretation. And if it was not a sin to engage in sexual activity with a member of the same sex, surely it would not be a big deal if a straight man had gay sex. Paul wrote to Corinth which like today was sexually lax. He ordered that a man must be handed over to Satan and cursed and expelled from the Church because he was living in a sexual relationship with his step-mother. That was not incest or disgusting. It was heterosexual. Yet it provoked such an extreme anger from Paul that he had to persecute this man in a public letter. Anyone who imagines Paul would have been kinder towards homosexuals is deceiving himself. No his condemnation would be even more virulent.

The Bible God says that a man that lies with a man as with a woman they must be put to death in Leviticus 20:13. It is taken to be a condemnation of sodomy. It is more than that. A man can lie with a woman sexually without having intercourse with her. Intercourse doesn't have to necessarily happen with a man and wife all the time. They might engage in other forms of sexual activity. So any sexual activity between two men - eg kissing and masturbation for example - is to be punished as a horrendous abomination. The Bible God also says that their barbaric execution is their own fault "their blood will be upon them". So it is what they justly deserve. The Christian must believe that homosexuality even when monogamous and no harm but only happiness ensues is extremely evil. That is bigotry and going too far and no amount of pretending to love homosexuals can mask that. God says then that all his commands about killing homosexuals and stuff must be obeyed so that the people will not be vomited out of Israel and they must be holy as he is holy. God was willing to put the nation out of the land he gave them if they tolerated homosexuals showing how abhorrent the sin is. So the killing of homosexuals is holy, it is God's nature, it is not something God is forced to allow against his nature (Leviticus 20:22-27). To promote the Bible as the word of God is incitement to hatred and not just against homosexuals.

Jesus said that sex was only right in a marriage between one man and his one wife that was meant to last for life. It is not true that he had nothing to say about homosexuality. He didn't even allow you to marry a divorced

woman so how could he let a man marry a man? To honour Jesus as God or as a quintessential role model is simply implicit, ignorant and indirect homophobia and is encouraging others to be as bad as yourself.

Protestantism teaches that the Bible is the only authority in faith and morals and that the Christian has to interpret it for himself with the help of the Holy Spirit. Clearly this implies that if one reads about the holy murder commanded in the Bible by God and feels they must stone gay people to death or settle for beating them up then they must be given the right to do it.

The Catholic Church says that sex outside marriage, whether homosexual or not, is always a sin - its absolutely (ie always) wrong. It says we must always let the person know we do not like it or approve. For example, you don't let them have sex in your house. You speak up for heterosexual marriage and keeping sex confined to it. You don't congratulate gay people for being in a relationship. The Church says that if you really love a person you will not respect their sinful choices. Thus true Christians will fight to stop sex outside straight marriage ever being legally tolerated.

[Top of the Document](#)

HUMANISM

In my opinion the true understanding of humanism is the recognition that atheism and living without God is love.

Anybody in the world who accepts the following three principles is automatically a Humanist.

I see no reason why God or any religion should tell me what is right and wrong. I will decide that for myself. There is no need for them because I cannot follow them unless I decide to anyway so I may as well decide without letting them making any decisions for me. I will not say, "God says this is wrong and he knows best so I choose to agree with him." That is you judging that God knows best so you are doing the judging and pretending you are not and pretending to be submissive to God. Say, "I agree with God, if he exists, that it is wrong but I do not agree because he says so. Its not about authority. I am deciding for myself." Recognise that real goodness is based on the latter - the latter is all you can say if you want to be honest. The first engages in dishonesty in the name of honesty! The first is very prevalent among religious people and corroborates Humanism's fear that religion's prophets and popes and priests know they cannot claim to be God to control people so they do the next best thing and claim to have a message from God.

I see no reason to believe in free will for we could be programmed to feel free. There is no need for punishment – just stop the crime and deter people from crime without judging them as evil beings.

Everything I do I want to do at least under the circumstances so when I only please myself I can only love myself. I love myself in helping others.

[Top of the Document](#)

HUMILITY

The virtue of not getting above yourself. It is the converse of pride which the Church considers the root of all evil. Religion is actually opposed to this virtue though it pretends it is not. Is it humble to say you have got a revelation from God? Not even if you really have had some kind of revelation or vision for that gives you power over others. The very reason that humility is advocated by religion is that it makes you serve others rather than be above them. It will be replied that to give a message from God is serving others. It is if the message gives advice and does not start saying stuff like that Jesus rose from the dead or gives orders. Doing right matters and not dogma and not commands.

[Top of the Document](#)

HYPNOSIS

A trance state that enables you to be controlled by another person. One thing is for sure, human beings are in this state all the time. We know this for there are things people who know us can get us to do without us even realising that we are being manipulated. We can make ourselves ill if we mistakenly believe that we are ill. The human mind is so fragile and steered by emotions and forces we are unaware of that it is certain that things like religion are dangerous and irresponsible and exploitive. That is why Humanism forbids anything that is against free-thinking and self-determination.

It has been scientifically proven that hysteria can be easily spread in a crowd for we are conditioned by society to believe that we should do what everybody else does which is why good and bad example are so influential. Also, if people see a crime happen and are questioned separately after their accounts will be different in many ways for their memory and perception is tampered with by suggestion, a power in the subconscious that takes over.

[Top of the Document](#)

IDOLATRY

Giving a created thing the honour that is due to God. For example, worshipping the moon like many pagans do. To be real worship, the worship has to be well-meant and sincere. Otherwise it is not idolatry but play-acting. You cannot really worship a thing unless it claims it is worthy of your trust and loves you.

The condemnations of idolatry as a sin in the Bible clearly imply that God will condemn you for worshipping anything good that is not him even if you did not mean to. Furthermore, God will probably condemn you for disobeying him by mistake as well. The condemnation of idolatry implies you will go to Hell forever for not believing the right things. Christians say that you will be punished not for your unbelief as long as your unbelief is caused by invincible ignorance that you cannot help but for your sins. This is nonsense for unbelief could only justify God leaving you to suffer for your sins if it was a sin itself. Despite all the watering down these days, Christianity is a very bigoted religion.

You can worship even the one true God in an idolatrous way. For example, if you care about what you are going to get out of God and not about God that is idolatry. Thus only the person who looks in her or his own heart knows if she really connects with God or God's mirror image. There is no reason to believe that many of those who claim to love God really do so even if they seem to be very good people.

[Top of the Document](#)

INCARNATION

When God the Son allegedly became man, later named as Jesus, in the womb of the Virgin Mary. Jesus once lied that he and the Father witnessing to his being the Son of God fulfilled the divine law in the books of Moses that two witnesses were necessary before a claim could be believed. The claim that somebody testifying to himself was any good plainly contradicts the rule. And Jesus is clearly trying to distort the rule. God would not need to lie at all never mind call on the Father to make a liar of himself by defending his lie so the incarnation doctrine is untrue.

Jesus and God were guilty of the hypocrisy of recognising the Law of Moses as the infallible word of God when there was no eyewitness testimony that it was written exactly as God had laid it out. There is no eyewitness testimony that says the four gospels were not selective in what they said about Jesus. Being selective is the best way to give a misleading impression. It is good if you wish to create a better image of some idol than he or she really was. Had God really written them as the Church says, we would have the testimony. The Church will answer that many will still not believe. Maybe, but that is no excuse for God making a poor effort to back up the scriptures.

Jesus failed to mirror the best in human nature and cannot be considered divine in any sense. God did not become that man.

[Top of the Document](#)

INDETERMINISM

The view that our choices are uncaused and therefore we have free will. But if we don't cause our choices then they are not ours so it fails. Free will cannot be reconciled with determinism the idea that our choices are caused for cause means forcing something to happen. Free will cannot exist for determinism necessarily holds that our choices are caused by our emotions and our perception and our circumstances so the same emotions and choices and circumstances always results in the same choice. So whether caused or uncaused we can't have free will. This problem refutes the view that God has given us free will and that we are to blame for the evil and suffering in the world for we have abused our freedom.

[Top of the Document](#)

INERRANCY

The claim that there is no error in the Bible and that its contradictions can be solved. Muslims say the same thing about the Koran and Mormons about their scriptures. It is easier to believe there are contradictions than to swallow the many improbable and bizarre solutions they offer for the contradictions and the errors. All the so-called solutions are human assumptions. God could arrange things so that it could be CLEARLY proved there was a remarkable agreement that could only be explained by divine inspiration. God failed to: meaning the books are not inspired at all. To believe in inerrancy is to believe more in scholars and theologians who pretend to explain away the errors than in the purported word of God.

The doctrine of Jesus - taught in the Bible - that people who will not repent and believe in the word of God when they have the word of Moses and the Prophets will not be convinced if anybody goes back to them from the dead in a miracle implies that these books are more convincing than any miracle. This is total madness. The books are not that convincing. (Obviously Jesus takes it for granted that anybody with commonsense will agree with putting homosexuals and adulterers to death as the Bible commands.) The books are not a miracle themselves so a miracle would be more convincing. If Jesus is right then the miracles the books testify to do not verify the books. It is absurd to consider the books to be the word of God then.

The Bible in 2 Peter 1:16-21 says that the Old Testament is more sure even than seeing Jesus transfigure and glow before your very eyes – that means total infallibility for the Old Testament was taught by Jesus and the early Church. Paul wrote that all of scripture is breathed out from the mouth of God (2 Timothy 3:16-17) and able to be complete for all who want to do the will of God. The true Christian then will be a Fundamentalist. The view that the ideas not the words of the Bible are inspired is rubbish. The ideas are inseparable from the words. The view that the main truths is inspired is dishonest for that leaves you free to pick and choose what you like. While it is true that for Christians only Jesus Christ is the word of God and infallible, he is supposed to be the supernatural author of the Bible so it is his voice. Jesus alone being the word doesn't mean the Bible can be treated as containing error.

[Top of the Document](#)

INFALLIBILITY

The power of the Roman Catholic Church and the pope to work out doctrines and declare them revealed by God while being guarded by God against error. Most Roman doctrines have come out of this belief in the power to define what is true doctrine. If the Church is wrong then the doctrines are not binding for belief and the whole Catholic faith falls apart. The Roman Catholic Church claims that it is infallible when its bishops meet in an ecumenical council and when the pope makes an ex cathedra statement. They must intend their teaching to be infallible and binding on the Church. Jesus is said to have given the Church this power when he said the gates of Hell would never prevail over his Church and when he promised the Holy Spirit to the apostles to guide them into all truth. But at most Jesus promised his Church would be indefectible, never depart far enough from the faith to block the salvation of its members. And no Church has all the truth.

The Catholic Church says that infallibility is not inspiration but protection from error. This is a lie for you must need some inspiration to avoid error. The Church says that inspiration doesn't happen since the time God wrote the Bible and the traditions of the Church for there is no public revelation since the apostles. This proves that infallibility cannot happen. The Church is totally incoherent in its claims about the infallibility charism. This being so even if it has the power to be infallible it cannot use it.

The Church does its homework before declaring a doctrine to be true. The Church says that the conclusion is infallible but the reasons for the conclusion are not. So the Holy Spirit protects from making the wrong conclusion when the research is undertaken but he doesn't guarantee that the research will be well done. In that case, the research can't be very important and so we are talking about inspiration here. If the research is important, then the reasons for the conclusion are also infallible.

What infallibility supposedly does is show that a doctrine was taught by the apostles at least implicitly or by implication for nothing can add to their teaching. That is why giving an infallible statement is called defining or making known. First of all it is made known to the pope for example but it is foolish to think it's not infallible until he reveals it. Can you believe that the decision of Pope Pius IX that the Virgin Mary was conceived without sin wasn't infallible until he announced it? No way. If God revealed it was already infallible and the pope merely

recognised its infallibility. It is not about his infallibility but its own.

Don't say that the pope was infallible during his research for he intended to define the doctrine and if he didn't intend that he wouldn't have any infallibility. He intends an infallible revelation as a possibility. If Pius IX had been led to the conclusion that the Immaculate Conception was false then he would not have made the announcement. We would have a dogma saying that the Immaculate Conception wasn't true. Anything a pope says could possibly be turned into a dogma so everything a pope teaches is open to being made infallible. The intention idea solves nothing.

Infallibility in itself would only make sense if the pope was infallible all the time. Even the most extreme Catholics don't think that he is.

Vatican I was the ecumenical council that made it a dogma or binding belief that the pope was infallible. Vatican I put limits on papal infallibility. It said the pope was only infallible when he spoke clearly that he was making any dogma part of the faith. Despite all that, it is obvious that it makes the pope more infallible than it looks. The Church only pretends that it accepts papal infallibility under strict conditions because it knows fine well that popes are capable of serious error and to go too far with papal infallibility will only make a laughing stock of the Church. But nevertheless its cover-up doesn't work and the pope is still left more infallible than even he would want to be!

Pius IX proclaimed the Immaculate Conception as infallible dogma BEFORE any definition came from the Church that he was infallible. This proves that the pope must be regarded as infallible all the time for he is to be obeyed even without a definition and he can define without being defined infallible. The pope then is the only thing that is needed if you want infallible teaching and ecumenical councils aren't. This gives absolute power, at least potentially, to the pope! It contradicts the biblical view that the apostles shared authority with Peter. There was no greatest among them in terms of rank.

Papal infallibility is not a harmless doctrine for the Catholic is asked to die for it if asked to renounce it or be put to death.

[Top of the Document](#)

INQUISITION

A regime used by the Roman Catholic Church for many centuries to stop anybody expressing opinions contrary to the doctrine of the Church.

Millions were put to death through it and extreme torture was deployed. Today, the Church claims to believe that it was an abuse of religion. But as long as the Church holds that it is better for one human life to be lost than for the Church not to exist we refuse to buy that. Human nature is peculiar and we are all strange to a great extent which shows why weird organisations like the Church are just asking for to be "abused". Only if you can prove your teachings can you dare to say that abuses are not your responsibility. Even being wrong or implausible is enough to prove that the abuses are your responsibility. Additionally, the Church teaches doctrines that suggest that hurting people for religious reasons is perfectly acceptable. Accepting that Jesus was right to sanction the Old Testament as God's book in which he revealed that he wanted homosexuals and others stoned to death is not harmless. A decent person rejects such scriptures outright and does not excuse them. Excusing them only opens the door for people to interpret them in a violent way. It is more natural for a man-made religion that claims to be the voice of God to get people to kill than for a human organisation that makes no religious claim to do it. This is because man can argue with man but man cannot argue with God or what is put forward as the word of God.

[Top of the Document](#)

INSPIRATION

The doctrine that though men wrote the Bible the way they wanted it is as much God's word as theirs and so it is both fully human in authorship and fully divine. This is obviously contradictory nonsense. The Church says it is not and that it is a mystery. Then why could I not be God the Father? Maybe that is a mystery too! Only a book that was mechanically dictated by God could be his word. Not even fundamentalists believe that the Bible was dictated with the human writers being little more than typewriters. The Bible does show marks of humanity such

as bad sentence structure in places and bad descriptions and vague teachings. When the Bible is not the word that means the Koran isn't his word either for it sees the Bible as its predecessor. So though the Koran claims to have been dictated by an angel speaking for God it is not God's word.

[Top of the Document](#)

ISLAM

The word Islam means submission to God. The religion was founded by the Prophet Muhammad. He gave the world the Koran which was written down after his death. This book, though it claims to be the perfect word of God, gives no evidence of supernatural origin. It never predicts the future though such predictions are the only sure mark that a book is from God who alone knows the future. You could write a clearer and more uplifting book than the Koran in the name of God so it would be fairer for this new book to be taken for the real word of God.

The Koran is alleged to be a perfect work of written art. It's "divine" author Allah says that. But if you read it you see many mistakes, such as lack of clarity, and you will sometimes meet a piece of it in one place and a similar version of it in another - bad editing. It accuses Christians of making a Holy Trinity of God, Jesus and Mary which is false. The trinity is the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Mary wasn't even as important in the Church at that time as she is now. So its hard to make an excuse for this gross error.

[Top of the Document](#)

JEHOVAH'S WITNESSES

An American Christian Fundamentalist sect that follows the New World Translation of the Bible. This Bible is a travesty of the standard text of the Bible and has been adulterated to back up the sect's peculiar beliefs. They deny that Jesus was God and reject his bodily resurrection. The cult has fallen prey to fanaticism in its absolute opposition to blood transfusion. The fact that this teaching does not murder as many today thanks to alternatives to blood transfusion makes no difference for they would still kill by their teaching if these alternatives were unavailable. And like all bad religion, the more converts it gets the more people suffer and die.

[Top of the Document](#)

JESUS

A false prophet who allegedly lived in the first century. His prophecies are susceptible to too many interpretations. Are his best prophecies lost? God would not let the evidence that he spoke through a true prophet, especially Jesus who professed to be the supreme prophet, disappear. There is no evidence that Jesus really could predict the future.

A prophet as ambiguous and suspect as Jesus could not be a real prophet of God and God said that when he speaks through a prophet there are no games like that or errors (Deuteronomy 18). Jesus gave no remarkable or unique moral example or advice. We are told little about him meaning it could only be the good things we are told and his advice was dished out by many religious teachers before him. And so he could not have been the Son of God for why not believe that somebody decent who you know better is the Son of God?

Jesus' prediction of his own resurrection could have been written down after the event or been a later invention. Jesus said he would rise on the third day but a true prophet will leave proof of that. He didn't. The point of making prophecies is that they will be seen and proven to have come true. Prophecies have to be declared before the events they forecast. He appeared on the third day which proves nothing for we have no proof that he appeared in the body that died. In fact his friends struggled to recognise him. Also the body could have vanished from the tomb before the third day. It was only found empty then. This error proves that Jesus was not a prophet, and if he was not a prophet he was not God or the Son of God.

The crowning point of Jesus' mission was his Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7). This was uttered to ordinary people so we should take it at its word rather than pretending it was more poetic than literal like even fundamentalist Christians do. When it suits, Christians soon forget the rule that a text should be interpreted the way the listeners would have done and the listeners were not theologians but simple people. That means then that Jesus condemned all sexual feelings, saying that a man who looked at a woman with desire was an adulterer. It means that you should let anybody who steals from you steal even more he must be taken literally. He also said that he hadn't come to soften the harsh Law of Moses but to perfect it - that is add in more tough teachings. Jesus advised extreme hatred of sin by saying you should pluck out your eye if it makes you sin meaning you should do

all you can to avoid sin for you should detest it so much. People find hating sin too painful and stressful these days and don't want to do it and the clergy is as bad. Jesus made it clear that his words were literal in this Sermon when he said that whoever listens to it and obeys it will be like the man who built his house on the rock (Matthew 7:25). And the gospeller commented that this Sermon was taught not like a sermon by the scribes but with authority (Matthew 7:29). It was serious and there was no time for confusing people with non-literalism. There is no doubt that going by the Sermon on the Mount that Christians have turned an evil or insane person into their God.

If you love your neighbour as yourself that means a lot of stress for sin is all around you. You won't live too long if you seriously hate the harm that sinners supposedly do to themselves by sinning. Hating the sin is as dangerous in practice as hating the sinner for even if you make a difference in your mind between sinner and sin you won't be able to in practice. Jesus' teaching was not about helping people but about burdening them.

[Top of the Document](#)

JOHN, GOSPEL OF

The only gospel of the four we have got that says that Jesus claimed to be the only way to God. Strangely the others did not think this claim important when they forgot about it or deliberately omitted it. Its unreliability is proven by the absurd reasoning its mad Jesus uses. For instance, he says to the Jews that the Law of Moses correctly needs two witnesses to establish claims as true. Jesus then says he is his own witness and God is the other! (John 8:17, 18). Any crank could make claims like that. The law meant two witnesses apart from yourself.

[Top of the Document](#)

JUDGING

To regard a person as a wrongdoer deserving of disapproval and condemnation and retribution.

Some Christians lie that Jesus condemned judging. He did not. He only said that before you judge make sure you are not worse than the person you judge. He said you may see the speck in the eye of another and ignore the plank in your own. He said get rid of the plank and then judge.

Christians say he forbade hypocritical judgement in saying all that. He actually forbade unfair judgement. It is not fair to judge somebody who is not as bad as you.

Other Christians say we must judge the sin and not the sinner. This makes absolutely no sense at all. It only makes a hypocrite of the person who claims to believe it.

Those who when their actions are condemned say, "You have no right to tell me what I am doing is wrong - judge not that you be not judged." They are hypocrites who judge those who judge them. They are being judgemental though they condemn being judgemental!

To judge that there is a God who will judge those who judge you is indirectly judging them.

You insinuate that God will judge those who judge you! So you admit that judging is not necessarily sinful! You want people to believe that judging need not be sinful and is necessary. So you are humbly saying it is only sinful when you are being judged!

The Catholics say you must tell those who have sex outside marriage for example that they are doing a great wrong and that sex outside marriage is a sin that merits everlasting torment in Hell from the moment of death. They deny that saying this means they are judging the persons as going to Hell. There could be weakness or ignorance that prevents them from deliberately committing a great evil. Their responsibility might be mitigated. Also they might soon repent and escape Hell so you cannot say they are already condemned to Hell. You cannot judge them that way. The Church says it can judge that somebody is doing wrong but they cannot judge the person's exact intentions. For example, murder is a mortal sin but if the murderer was given drugs against his will it would mean he was not being fully himself and so did not intend to commit a mortal sin.

Matthew 18 records that Jesus said that those who continue in sin after being told they are sinners must be shunned.

Should the true Christian be constantly disapproving? Even if you say you cannot judge a person as bad or how bad they are because you cannot know all about them, then you are disapproving in the sense that, "They might be terrible inside. They might not." That is light judgement not non-judgement. Non-judgementalism is often a cover for hypocrisy.

Even believers do not put God first very much, it follows that the Christian must always have a problem with everybody.

[Top of the Document](#)

JUSTICE

Fairness. In Christian theology, justice condemns the wrongdoer but love forgives. In Humanism, justice is what is meant by love. The system is always fair. Love in any other sense is an evil.

Jesus accused adulterous people and those who hated people of serious sin. He was very harsh. The Church condemns sin as seriously. Sin is not serious if you believe the sinner should get away with it. When a person is not made to suffer what she or he inflicted on others, the person does not see how grave the sin is. Also, evil needs to be repaid by evil otherwise you are treating the person as if the evil is not important. That is an insult to the person who does huge sacrifices to be good. The purpose of punishment is to deal with the imbalance in justice so that the relationship between the evil person and the people he hurts can be restored. You do evil and there is a debt to be paid before restoration can begin.

We plainly see how evil the love that Jesus preached is for it refuses to give people the evils in the form of punishment they have consented to by their sins. Thus it is merely artificial love. Why? Because Christianity claims that valuing a person necessarily demands respect for human free agency - giving people what they ask for even if they won't like it. Freedom is put before feelings. Christianity believes that to treat a person as a person you have to give them what they deserve. So its mercy contradicts this. Some say that mercy is important for it softens justice with kindness. This view says that kindness like justice is an important virtue too. It is nonsensical for if punishment is dignified then it is kindness to give it unpleasant and all as it is.

Some say you have to forgive for you cannot punish everybody. And to have mercy just because you cannot punish everybody all the time is not mercy. Real mercy is freely given while this is given because it has to be and it is grudging. Yet this is the reason Christians "forgive".

[Top of the Document](#)

KARMA

The doctrine that the evil that you send out of you comes back on you. This is totally insulting. It implies that a murdered baby deserved its fate. Some say that karma just means that whatever you do will be done to you - and it isn't about deserving. They say it is just a reaction. But nevertheless the murdered baby is being accused of being a baby murderer in a past life. You need the baby to be the defendant in a court trial to be able to say such a horrible thing and then only if its guilt is established beyond all doubt. Karma is only acceptable to people who are not as nice as they pretend to be. Buddha and co could not possibly be saints when they propounded such a concept. They did the evil they said that prevents salvation.

[Top of the Document](#)

KNOCK

An Irish apparition of Mary and Joseph and St John and the Lamb of God in a bright light that took place along a Church gable in 1879 at Knock, Mayo during a dark wet night.

It was seen by several witnesses who provided depositions which were changed and exaggerated afterwards by a dishonest Church and a dishonest publisher. Top witness Mary Beirne in the original handwritten deposition said, "I saw the statue of the BVM". This is omitted in the published version. It is telling that the witnesses never acted to stop the Church and the people coming to Knock as if Mary appeared there and not just her statue. That

was very dishonest.

Judith Campbell in her real deposition - not the altered published one - declared that, "There was a beautiful light shining around the statues". Her declaration that there had been statues of Joseph and John in the chapel in the resembling the statues she saw was excised from the published account.

It is a Catholic legend that gable and the ground at it were miraculously dry despite the torrential rain battering in that direction. Now Campbell stated that the ground and the gable were quite dry. The quite is interesting. It was not as dry then as some of the other witnesses claimed.

Bridget Trench's line in her altered testimony, "The wind was blowing from the south" meaning against the gable contradicts the assertion of Mary Beirne to The Weekly News of 1880 that there was no wind. There seems nothing unusual about the alleged dryness but it is the chief reason why many think the vision was a miracle and not a trick.

Trench famously tried to feel Mary's feet and her hands clasped nothing but thin air. However, this tale is a fabrication. It is not in her original testimony. Here is the original:

LIVES IN THIS PLACE. ON THE EVE OF 21 AUGUST A PERSON SICK SENT FOR HER THAT SHE MIGHT SEE HER. SHE CAME THAT EVENING TO THE CHURCH [SOMETHING ERASED]. SHE WAS IN THE HOUSE OF THE SICK WOMAN. SHE CAME BY THE ROAD AND SAW GREAT LIGHT. SHE ENTERED AT HER RIGHT HAND. SHE LEFT HER HAND ON THEM. SHE SAW ST JOSEPH AND THE BVM AND ST JOHN AND THE ALTAR AND THE LAMB. THEY WERE NOT STANDING ON THE GROUND BUT PROBABLY TWO FEET ABOVE THE GROUND.

It even says she did touch them!

The apparition was not of Mary and Joseph and John but of their statues.

Mary McLoughlin the priest, Archdeacon Cavanagh's, housekeeper asked him to go and see the vision. He said he didn't believe her and didn't go. The next day he started credulously promoting the vision as genuine and believed all the rubbish he was told from religious nuts who claimed to be cured. The conversion was so fast that it looks like he didn't go because he was playing the innocent and was involved in the hoax. Also, he had a view of the gable from his house and had the light been as bright as some witnesses said he would have noticed.

Some of the stories of the witnesses improved with the telling which shows that God was not involved for he could organise things better than that (The Apparition at Knock, A Survey of Facts and Evidence, Fr Michael Walsh, St Jarlath's College, Tuam, Co Galway, 1959). Also, the Archdeacon who was the parish priest and his priest friends were anxious to promote the apparition as a real miracle wrote the witness reports and could have influenced their memories and manipulated the alleged witnesses to tell much the same story. The Archdeacon reported many eccentric visions of his own in the house. The witnesses talked about the vision for a long time after it happened among themselves which means that in the excitement and wonder they would have corrupted each other's memories so that the story unconsciously got better and more convincing and consistent and more preternatural in the telling.

The witnesses could have been duped by a projector as was rumoured at the time and they would have pushed the evidence they noticed for this outside of their minds in order that they could believe they really had a miracle vision. It has been found that a light source such as a projector - a magic lantern - could have been used. It may have been on the window sill and the image was then directed at a mirror which shone it down the gable. This would have avoided the problem of spectators getting in the way of the light source.

Sceptics observe that the witnesses strangely stood at an awkward viewing angle from a schoolhouse at a distance as if they were trying to avoid disturbing the vision. It is said that there is no evidence the witnesses got in the way of the light source. But there is no evidence against it either.

It is claimed that at least some of the witnesses would have examined the scene for a hoax and would have been smart enough to spot a hoax. But when one considers how people can flock to venerate a tree stump that seems to have the virgin's face on it, it is possible that they felt no inclination to check it out. Also the witnesses were never asked if they saw anything suggestive of a hoax. If they were it was never written down. Judith Campbell's

testimony is typical of most of the visionaries. She only states what was to be seen and says nothing about a hoax never mind a miracle! If the images were not that amazing that would explain why the visionaries were too embarrassed to get all the neighbours out to see it. The apparition was seen only by a few and most of them were related.

Perhaps the images were cut-out paintings stuck to the wall. The images were not seen coming and they were not seen going.

Patrick Beirne testified in 1932 as follows, "I saw three figures on the gable surrounded by a wonderful light. They appeared to be something like shadows or reflections cast on a wall on a moon-light night" (page 53, *The Apparition at Knock*). That is evidence that a magic lantern was used. This testimony is to be taken seriously because if the figures were that unclear they would have looked better at a distance. Was that why the witnesses stood at a strange spot for viewing the vision?

The other witnesses exaggerated how good the visions were. The fact that the Beirne woman said that the Virgin's crown was kind of yellow indicates that it was not supernatural for a vision from God or Satan would manage to get the colour of the crown right, get it gold. *Knock The Virgin's Apparition in Nineteenth Century Ireland*, Eugene Hynes, Cork University Press, Cork, 2008 shows that the apparition was reported in a culture prone to bizarre visions and offers psychological explanations.

The Church seizes upon the tiny things that seem to indicate supernaturality. Mistakes happen if somebody said the rain was torrential and the gable was dry when they took a few seconds to check that is only a tiny thing. It is not central to the story and thus cannot be taken as verifying the paranormal nature of the event. It would be different if they checked oftener and more thoroughly. And if your hands are wet how do you know if the gable is dry or not?

Patrick Hill's testimony seems to indicate it. But Father Lennon, a scientist, went as far as to say his testimony was of no value. Biased supporters of the apparition, though they have no evidence, simply take comfort in the notion that that Lennon may have been prejudiced against Hill as Hill was in his early teens. That is speculation and Lennon did question the boy. Statistically, if a group of people see something unusual there will be at least one person who will add a lot of window dressing to his or her testimony. Hill's account is too good to be true. Judith Campbell like him went close to the vision but she simply stated they were statues. Had the vision been as glitzy and magical as Hill said surely she would not have been so calm and matter-of-fact about it?

No cure at Knock matched the calibre of the cures at Lourdes (which is not to say that the cures of Lourdes are as good as we are told!).

There is no evidence against the hoax theory. There is nothing to indicate a real miracle.

[Top of the Document](#)

LOURDES

St Bernadette allegedly saw the Blessed Virgin Mary at Lourdes in 1858. There was nothing the apparition did or said that indicated that it was not a demon in disguise - assuming Bernadette wasn't lying and was the subject of some preternatural experience. The fact that the apparition wanted sickly Bernadette and the people to ingest dirty water though the area was a grotto used as dump full of hospital waste and rotting animal flesh proves that it was an evil force. No apparition that hasn't been checked out by the Church - which takes years - has the right to command things like that. Even Catholic doctrine recognises an apparition commanding what is harmful to be inauthentic, that is, not from God. It is most likely to be a hallucination and that those who presented evidence to the contrary were only seeing what they wanted to see though they vehemently denied it.

Some who were there during Bernadette's visions were shocked at her pale dead appearance. During the first vision Jean Abadie, her friend thought she was dead though she was kneeling.

Bernadette talked about seeing something white in the shape of a girl. Called it aquero meaning that thing.

In 1860, Bernadette was still calling the apparition that thing aquero.

Of extreme significance is what she said to the Jesuit Pere Langlade in 1863. He asked her if she had seen the Blessed Virgin. Her reply was that she did not say she seen the Blessed Virgin but she seen the apparition.

Whatever the apparitions were, they were not from God.

The miracle spring had always been there though not at all times. The apparition told Bernadette about the spring. The obstructions were cleared and it has run constantly since. The spring is cited as a miracle even though it is not.

The alleged miracle cures of Lourdes are not very convincing when examined objectively. Largely they are based on misdiagnoses.

[Top of the Document](#)

LYING

Subjectively, lying is saying what you believe or know is not the truth. Objectively, lying is saying what is not true whether you realise that or not.

If God exists then he is the perfect good. Therefore the truth that he exists is the most sacred truth there is. It is more important to know that than to know or do anything else. Nobody is comfortable with such a doctrine for we deep down all believe that the truth about antibiotics saving lives is more important.

If truth is so important where God is concerned, then to lie would be to attack truth and the principle of telling the truth. To lie would be to insult and harm the most sacred truth. If you ever allow lying, you lose the right to ever forbid it. If you oppose truth you cannot complain if somebody opposes truths you wouldn't oppose. So, all lying, passive (when you let people get the wrong idea) and active is ungodly. This shows the complete undesirability of even saying there might be a God for then you would be expected to act as if there were one, just in case.

Religion says there is no trace of deceit in God for he is perfect good. And because of his power, he never needs to lie. To be like him, we must be truthful in all things. He never can approve of our lies for he never lies himself.

It is odd that God can create a disease that kills a baby and cannot lie. Why is the disease seen as part of God's loving plan and something he sadly has to create because we have made an evil world by abusing his gift of free will? If he has to do this to the baby, why can't he be forced to lie even a little? He values the truth more than the life of a baby.

The notion of a God who doesn't lie is really about religion trying to tell you it speaks for him with his authority and that his teachings cannot be mistaken. It is trying to get authority for itself as the messenger of God.

Believers in God have to claim to have the right to persecute those who differ from them because they don't respect truth. Their targets might not realise they are working against the truth or ignoring it but they are. The amount of blood shed for God is unbelievable and sickening. No wonder.

The Bible teaches that even clever lies to people - who will never find out - to make converts of them to Jesus Christ and save them are sinful. 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 we obey this lying ban we will have no friends and cause the Third World War.

[Top of the Document](#)

MAGDALENE

The Magdalene is St Mary of Magdala who supposedly announced the resurrection of Jesus after he appeared to her to the apostles.

Mary Magdalene and some other women went to Jesus' tomb on Sunday morning to anoint his body. This was an excuse for decomposition was believed to have set in by then so what were they really going to the tomb for? They were up to no good. Plus what took them to the tomb so early in the morning? Why was it important to them that there would be nobody about?

The gospel says they wondered who was going to open the tomb of Jesus for them which had a big stone rolled across it. Why didn't they bring somebody to help them? That they carried heavy expensive goods with them to anoint the body means they were lying when they said they had nobody to open the tomb. They must have had strong males with them to protect them in case the robbers were out and fancied stealing the goods from them. If they didn't want help, then the reason was because they were plotting something devious. They didn't want to bring men with them to help for they were scheming. You don't go to all the trouble they went to unless you can open the tomb yourself.

If the women had expensive goods with them to anoint Jesus how do we know then that they didn't bribe somebody to steal the body for them? They had the motive and money to do it with.

There is nothing in the gospels or New Testament or anything to indicate that the stone could not have been moved by the women.

When the women came to the tomb the guards were unconscious according to the Matthew gospel only. Matthew says the tomb was open by then and there had been an earthquake so did it move the stone allowing the women to steal the body?

In fact there were no guards. The Matthew Gospel says the Jews feared the apostles stealing the body to put out a resurrection report. If that was a real concern, the Jews would have put the body in a secret place. It wasn't. Why make extra trouble by posting guards when it was easier simply to move the body to the dump where it would never be found?

The women might have stolen the body. The act of stealing the body might have triggered hallucinations, or imaginations caused by the sheer passion of religious faith, of the risen Christ in the apostles if they thought the missing body was a miracle. Once they had the hallucination they wanted to believe it was real and convinced themselves they all experienced the same thing and had happened several times. Memory is very easily polluted. With faith, people generally persuade themselves that they believe what they want to believe. People do make sense of the silliest hallucinations in time as their memories and imagination and wishful thinking tell them a different story from what actually happened. That is how collective hallucinations, which are relatively common, become more credible.

The claim that the apostles were totally disillusioned with Jesus at the time of his death cannot be gleaned from the gospels. It's a Christian lie to thwart attempts to suggest the visions of Jesus were hallucinations or just mystical experiences rooted in psychological need. It is argued that the apostles gave up on Jesus therefore they could not hallucinate appearances of him. Mark only says the apostles didn't believe the women about the resurrection vision which could mean they just didn't believe the women but did accept that Jesus could be alive. In John the apostles going back to their former trades, only means they went back to their jobs. Even if they believed Jesus rose, it was all different now and they couldn't walk around with him as before.

The women were very loyal to Jesus and determined that he would not be perceived as a failure so they perhaps concocted a pious fraud. The claim that the women must have been telling the truth when they seen Jesus for nobody regarded female testimony as true proves nothing. Christians did regard female testimony as valid. So the gospels using such testimony proves nothing about the believability of the claims. Besides, if the gospels were using women for evidence when women were considered to be bad testators that does not speak well of their objectivity and fairness.

[Top of the Document](#)

MARRIAGE

Marriage or matrimony is a sacrament of the Roman Catholic Church. The Church believes in marriage that isn't sacramental but valid and marriage that is a sacrament or Holy Matrimony. Only two baptised persons can contract matrimony. Jesus then refuses to help a baptised person married to an unbaptised person with the grace of the sacrament. How kind! How egalitarian!

The marriage rite makes a man and woman belong to each other for life. This contract is validated by them having sex at least once. A system that stresses that instead of how happy they can make each other is definitely unloving and degrading. Marriage is a sacrament in the Roman Catholic tradition which forbids us then to say such things about marriage!

If marriage is about love, then it's odd how it is finalised by an act of sex even if the partners turn to hate each other. And another couple who love each other infinitely who can't have sex never have a valid marriage. Sex may express love but it is not love.

The marriage is validated by sex meaning the man and woman virtually cohabit until they have sex. There is no real marriage until the sex.

Church teaching says the letters of the apostle Paul were written by God at the same time. Paul, who the Church says wrote the letters carrying his name in the New Testament, said that because the unmarried can spend more time serving God that marriage wasn't recommended and was only for those who had strong sexual needs that could lead them to sin unless they got married (1 Corinthians 7). Doesn't sound much of a sacrament to me! Paul may say this is his opinion but he says it is trustworthy in the Lord meaning God inspired this opinion! He wrote that the single woman or man is worried about the affairs of the Lord and how to be holy in body and spirit but the married woman or worries about worldly things and pleasing the spouse. He said he wished that all were like him and were unmarried celibates (1 Corinthians 7:7) and that it was best to refrain from marriage (v38). If marriage were a sacrament, it would bring people closer to God no matter about the world for the husband and wife find God in pleasing and helping each other.

[Top of the Document](#)

MARTYRDOM

Martyrdom is testifying that your faith is true by dying for it.

Christianity thrived – and still does - on the lie that the twelve apostles of Jesus were killed for their testimony that Jesus did miracles and he managed to rise from the dead.

Clement of Rome writing either before 70AD or in 96AD is misinterpreted as saying Peter and Paul were martyrs in Rome but the word he used does not mean blood martyrs but just witnesses. He never says how they died but that they were pestered to death like Joseph of the Bible. But Joseph was not pestered to death for he lived a happy life after the pestering. So the expression is very loose and poetic and not literal. Clement doesn't even say where they died. Like Joseph, Peter and Paul were persecuted or martyred but ended their days in peace.

The early Church father Hippolytus was one of the best earliest sources that denied the martyrdom that Christians alleged visited most of the apostles. His account may contain some legendary material but there is no doubt that the sources that say that most of the apostles died natural deaths must be right for Christians wouldn't have wanted that to be true. And it is easier to remember martyrdoms than the more boring natural deaths.

Martyrdoms make more impact and draw more interest in the martyr's cause. So let us not hope Hippolytus was mistaken. There were no martyrdoms – Hippolytus was telling the truth.

The alleged predictions of martyrdom from Jesus are ambiguous. They can be understood as predicting something other than death by martyrdom. But the texts may still have been enough to cause the legend through people misunderstanding - the gospel of John speaks of a case where Jesus was misunderstood. Evangelicals though claiming to support the Bible only, still believe the martyrdom stories though they come from legendary material that is full of wildly over the top stories which is dishonest. Their faith in the apostles' testimony does not come from the Bible but from outside it though the Bible claims to provide evidence. They say they believe

what the apostles said about the resurrection because they died for their faith.

The apostle James was said to have been slain by Herod in Acts 12 but no indication is given that James chose this death to avoid denying Christ. It may have been an assassination so he can't be a martyr. For a person to be a true martyr he has to embrace death rather than denying his faith. He must have no other sufficient reason to choose death than to testify to it with his blood. He has to have this choice right up to when the sword is about to fall on his neck. He must not be blackmailed by the fear of divine retribution. The killers must not have made threats to him to hurt his family. It would be easy for somebody who was happier dead to be "martyred". He must be sane and not senile. We have no evidence that the apostles fulfilled these conditions – and the accounts of their deaths are legendary and full of stupendous and foolish miracles. No evidence is given by anybody in the early Church that claims any of the apostles was a true martyr in support of their contention. Accordingly, the apostles being martyrs is only hearsay not evidence and to deploy it to get converts for Christ is dishonest.

The apostles might have given their lives for political reasons for that was basically the reason they were slain if they were slain. If they died for religious freedom, to be able to declare the sectarian faith of their Jesus as true, that hardly makes them proper martyrs! It does not amount to being the same as testifying with their blood that Jesus rose.

To argue the apostles were telling the truth because they were martyred is to try and trick people. It is obvious that they might have been fooled themselves and we have no real evidence that they died for belief in a Jesus who physically not spiritually rose from the dead. If they died for belief that Jesus rose spiritually or then they are no good to the Christians. They would not be the first to die for something without sufficient evidence so if they did think Jesus rose physically we can wonder if or how they knew that.

Even if the apostles died for Christianity, we don't have any hard evidence for what kind of Christianity this was. The gospels only say the body was missing and that Jesus was raised but they never actually state that the body was resurrected for they don't know. There was a connection between the risen and the crucified body but it is not stated what it is. The crucified body might just have provided the seed of the new body.

Apostles dying for visions would mean nothing for visions are easy to explain and are commonplace. Jesus himself said that the resurrection would be the only proof (Matthew 12:38-40) for even fakes could do real miracles (Mark 13:22) for presumably only God could have power over life and death.

Jesus stated that the Old Testament scriptures come first for they are more convincing than men coming back from the dead (Luke 16:31) so it is forbidden to believe in his resurrection unless the scriptures testify to it. He said that the resurrection must be believed in mostly because it was predicted in the Old Testament (Luke 24:25-27; Luke 24:44-47). He indicated that we must not believe in his resurrection unless we see that it is prophesied there. If the apostles died for Jesus then they did not die for Jesus or for visions or empty tombs or miracles but for what they said the Old Testament said. They died for an interpretation of the Old Testament that nobody honest or sane accepts as correct.

It is certain that the gospels say that Jesus after he rose lied to the apostles that his rising on the third day was predicted (Luke 24:46) so why listen to anybody who dies for a lying messiah?

Jesus' would have believed that as God is all-powerful, he alone has power to raise the dead as only he has power over life and death. So Christians argue that Jesus was from God for he rose. But they don't want to remember that Satan could make it look like his man rose from the dead. The evidence for a resurrection means nothing if Jesus' teaching was unimpressive or not unique or if it advocated evil. The resurrection is supposed to be important for it inspires us to love and gives our love eternal meaning. If Jesus and his teaching isn't special then all the evidence for the resurrection in the world means nothing. You can have a lot of evidence for something but then you could have a big piece of evidence that this something is not true. If Jesus ever sinned or taught wrong morals then this is big evidence against the resurrection. And he did both!

The evangelical habit of writing books to show that the resurrection is believable history is a tactic to scare and bully sceptics to believe. They want them to think, "There is something to this Jesus lark. I'm done for if he is the Son of God and my saviour so I had better turn to him." Jesus' own boast that the resurrection would prove his

claims - if the gospels are to be believed - smacks of that vicious attitude. It is also intended to make their believers cockier. Weak believers are no help to priests and popes and evangelists who seek to use religion to enjoy power over lives.

The argument that the apostles told the truth about Jesus for people don't die for what they know is lies is untrue. People do die for what they know is wrong – people who seem happy even commit suicide though they could get help like many do by opening up to their doctor. They die for the belief they know is untrue: that there is no hope.

The resurrection of Jesus is a legend and is not convincing enough to base a religion that makes huge and outrageous claims and equally crazy demands on.

[Top of the Document](#)

MARY

The mother of Jesus Christ. There is no proof that she was always a virgin and the Bible positively denies it but the Roman Church holds that she was. Though the Church says Marian apparitions cannot add to the evidence of the apostles, they always portray a Mary who claimed to be virgin and to always have been.

There is no evidence at all that the doctrine that she was conceived without sin was ever taught in the early Church so when Pope Pius IX proclaimed this doctrine to be revealed by God he was adding to the apostles' teaching – a practice that Roman theology says is always wrong. Paul declared that all were sinners in Romans 3. The Church says Mary was an obvious exception along with Jesus and young children so he didn't need to mention these exceptions. So the all is not literally all. But we have no evidence that Paul thought Jesus was born sinless! And Paul writes that we are not sinners because we sin but we sin because we are sinners - we have the sin nature. Mary was not an exception for it would be centuries before a significant number of theologians would agree that she was sinless. Many doctors of the Church did not believe that she was conceived without sin. If we are sinners by nature and try to stop sinning, then we are repressing our natures and so will end up becoming mentally disturbed. Protestants say we need a born-again experience which changes our nature from sinners to children of God. This is the new birth. There is no reason to believe Mary was a born again Christian.

It is Catholic dogma that Mary never sinned. But even if she were conceived immaculate that doesn't necessarily mean she remained faithful. So why should we think that Mary never sinned. She could have sinned on her deathbed – the sinlessness of Mary is just an assumption. Its something there cannot be any evidence for and yet the Church was able to make a dogma of it – proving that its teaching that no dogma can be made without getting evidence for it first to be false.

In Luke, Mary says that her soul glorifies the Lord and rejoices in God her saviour and that he has looked upon her in her nothingness and now all generations will call her blessed for God has done great things for her. The context is about spiritual nothingness so she denies that she is sinless and says all generations will speak of her blessings which have come in spite of her sinfulness

Catholicism reasons that since Mary was so special, God would not let her decay so she was assumed body and soul into Heaven meaning she is resurrected. And this is the religion that tells us about God's ways that look so strange! God might have a reason for doing the unexpected and leaving Mary in the grave.

The evidence that the assumption was a late Christian fantasy proves that the papacy added a doctrine to the Christian faith and declared it revealed by God. This is against the Roman Catholic law that doctrines are to be rejected as being binding on believers that way unless the evidence or reason proves they were taught by the apostles for the Church has no authority to create new doctrine and revelation stopped with them.

The Church teaches that Mary was taken up into Heaven body and soul. There is no proof that this doctrine is more than just a human fantasy. We have no reason to believe that it is actually a divine revelation.

[Top of the Document](#)

MEDJUGORJE

A town in the former Yugoslavia where the Virgin Mary has allegedly being appearing since 1981. It is one of the most powerful religious recruitment scams ever.

The apparition pretends to support the Catholic Church while causing and inviting dissent from the authority of the local bishop. This contradicts the foundational Roman dogma that you have to be with the legitimately appointed bishop to be part of the Church and protect the purity of its doctrine. To oppose the successor of the apostles is to oppose Christ who gave him the authority to represent him in the one true Church. Even if a bishop is stubborn and stupid he must be obeyed. If we didn't have to obey people who we thought were wrong there would be no such thing as authority and no need for it. The Church says that as Jesus gave his authority to the bishops, no apparition can challenge their authority. If one does, it is a false apparition.

The Church teaches that that the headship of the Pope means he has authority to teach faith and morals to the bishops, lay down canon law for the whole Church, and give them a large level of independence from him. The bishop does not have to seek the pope's approval for every priestly diocesan appointment for example. The Medjugorjan claim that the Vatican has to investigate the apparitions as the bishop is incompetent is just an excuse for getting around the fact that he has the right to condemn the visions.

If miraculous, then the Medjugorje visions support opposition to the Catholic Church and the Virgin Mary who we cannot know without the Church. The excellent book by Michael Davies, *Medjugorje After 15 Years*, explains that the Vatican left the decision about the apparitions to the bishop and that his negative verdict was official not just his private opinion as lying supporters say (page 84). The bishop has banned official pilgrimages there and what can be more official than that?

It is also a lie that the Church will reconsider its conclusion that the apparitions are not from God (page 87).

Vicka the visionary was proven on a widely seen film clip to be faking the miraculous ecstasy that comes over her during a vision (page 10) for she leapt back when she thought she was going to get prodded in the eyes despite the visionaries claiming that pricks and attacks like that and sound being blasted into their ears does not bother them during ecstasy. She tried to cover this up with an absurd story that she thought the Virgin was going to drop the baby Jesus and she was leaping to catch him but she jumped AWAY from the vision. This supersedes the testimony of the likes of Professor Henri Joyeaux that there is something supernatural about the ecstasy for the camera does not lie. This clip can be viewed on the website <http://www.marcocorvaglia.com>.

Consider the following message from Mary given July 21, 1982 "The best fast is on bread and water. Through fasting and prayer, one can stop wars, one can suspend the laws of nature. Charity cannot replace fasting. Those who are not able to fast can sometime replace it with prayer, charity, and a confession; but everyone, except the sick, must fast." To say that it is better to go on bread and water than to volunteer to dole out soup to the homeless is disgraceful.

The Lourdes Medical Bureau rejected all the alleged miracles of healing at Medjugorje as false (page 60). The real Mary would not give cause for division and doubt. She would not appear if her appearing would bring them about. To reply that God has strange ways means we are left with little hope of telling true revelations from Heaven apart from fake ones and is unacceptable. Mary would appear in a diocese where the bishop wasn't likely to oppose the visions too much so that he might relent and accept them so that excludes the diocese Medjugorje belongs to.

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, November 1996

1. The Interpretation given by some individuals to a Decision approved by Paul VI on 14 October 1966 and promulgated on 15 November of that year, in virtue of which writings and messages resulting from alleged revelations could be freely circulated in the Church, is absolutely groundless. This decision actually referred to the "abolition of the Index of Forbidden Books" and determined that --- after the relevant censures were lifted --- the moral obligation still remained of not circulating or reading those writings which endanger faith and morals.
2. It should be recalled however that with regard to the circulation of texts of alleged private revelations, canon 623 #1 of the current Code remains in force: "the Pastors of the Church have the ... right to demand

that writings to be published by the Christian faithful which touch upon faith or morals be submitted to their judgment".

3. Alleged supernatural revelations and writings concerning them are submitted in first instance to the judgment of the diocesan Bishop, and, in particular cases, to the judgment of the Episcopal Conference and the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

Any apparition that breaks this rule, and the Medjugorje Virgin commands that her messages be distributed as they are received, is not a Catholic apparition or concerned about Catholic orthodoxy. The bishops are the official Catholic teachers not apparitions. The vast majority of modern visions break the rule and so are themselves disobedient apparitions.

The apparition never mentioned the fact that miracles are not for propaganda but for showing how loving God is. A God who makes the sun spin is showing off and out to make propaganda. The apparition never condemns the attitude of the huge percentage of pilgrims who are there primarily to experience a miracle. The Church says that seeking miracles makes God look bad and shows that your faith is flawed and probably fake.

[Top of the Document](#)

MESSIANIC PROPHECY

Events in the life of Christ were allegedly foretold in the Old Testament scriptures written before he was born and Jesus himself stated several times that his death by crucifixion was predicted in them.

The main events were the virgin birth, the crucifixion and the resurrection.

The verse that Christians say speaks of the virgin birth has been taken out of context for it has Isaiah (7:14) telling Ahaz that the young woman, virgin is a mistranslation, will give birth and bear a son who will mature as his enemies lose their kingdoms and this will be a sign for Ahaz. Even if it did say virgin, a girl that was a virgin at that time could have a baby later when she is not virgin anymore. So it only means that a girl who is a virgin now will have a baby later meaning she will not be one then. The text does not say the birth will be a sign but the birth and its aftermath are all part of the sign. So you can't say that he must have meant a virgin birth for a normal birth is not much of a sign. Besides, even a virgin birth isn't much of a sign. Women were known to have got pregnant without intercourse.

Isaiah 53 supposedly predicts the death of Jesus on the cross for sinners. But all it says is that somebody who is innocent will be violently treated and wounded and will die for sins and will be given a grave among the wicked. It does not even say that the wounding will be the cause of death or that the man will be killed.

Psalms 22 supposedly describes the crucifixion of Jesus before it happened. If it were about Jesus then it would have been more logical for the psalmist not to write as if he were writing about himself. How are we supposed to know what psalms are about him or Jesus for he wrote them all as if they were about him. There is a clue that it is not about Jesus in verse 9. It says the tormentors were saying of the victim that he relied on God therefore let God save him. This is thought to predict the Jews mocking Jesus on the cross. The Jews who nailed Jesus would not have been saying that for that would have been blasphemous. Also to say Jesus relied on God contradicted the Jewish consensus that he was a heretic and a blasphemer not a holy man. It would have been promoting Jesus. The psalm says the enemies are bullocks who encircle him and attack him with their open mouths (verse 14) and that they have wounded his hands and his feet (verse 17). It speaks as if he tried to stop their biting him by hitting them and kicking them which left him with their bite marks on his hands and his feet. So the psalm is using a metaphor for the enemies did not literally bite him. Yet Christians attempt to pretend that the wounded hands and feet refer to Jesus who was nailed to the cross by his hands and feet. The New Testament never actually says that Jesus had any nail wounds. Foot wounds are not mentioned at all. The mention in John about hand wounds could be referring to cuts from the ropes if Jesus was tied to the cross or cuts he had from his work as a builder.

Anybody could be a prophet if that is all it takes to predict. I have seen fortune-tellers doing better than that. Jesus was an eccentric fraud because he appealed to these prophecies.

MIRACLE

Some say a miracle is an event that cannot be accounted for by any known order of nature. This is a broad definition. The other definitions are really sub-definitions and are therefore lesser in importance. So it becomes a case of, "I don't know how this event that seems supernatural took place therefore it is supernatural." That is an argument from ignorance and it is no good. It is better to dismiss all miracles as nonsense instead of using such arguments. It is not biased or unfair when there is no option. The believers in miracles are the ones who are unfair.

Others say a miracle is a remarkable coincidence. But some will say they learn from remarkable coincidences that God is vindictive and deceitful or that magic rules the universe not God. So the definition isn't really any good when it comes to evidence and logic. And the coincidence won't impress you unless you are looking for it to. A coincidence showing you Jesus is God requires that you decide in the first place that he is God. So it makes no difference to your faith. God must be doing it just for the entertainment value.

It is not coincidences that tell us truth - the mundane is more important for that. We learn more from the mundane and live with the mundane more. What use then is somebody being saved from death by a remarkable chain of coincidences that look like God acting when babies suffer and die? You may reply that God has a reason for saving the person and letting others remain in danger. But that is an assumption - you cannot provide evidence or proof. You have to let evidence speak for itself and keep speculation out of it.

No matter how good the evidence or testimony for a magical event - eg the sun being turned into cheese for a while - we will not believe it. Religious people agree with this attitude and do not see it as narrow. But if we take the same attitude say towards the magical return of Jesus Christ from the dead they disapprove. Fair is fair. Belief in miracles is implicitly unfair and therefore an insult against those who do not believe. It is not fair to randomly pick miracles and magic reports to believe and discount or dismiss others. Religious people can be very angry when their miracle beliefs are challenged - they sense the problem if they cannot put their finger on it. Miracle reports stifle true decency. Religion is a system of belief concerned about the magical and the miracle - ie the supernatural. Religion, then despite its charm, is really a time-bomb.

Believers forget that a miracle by definition is only possible but possible by itself does not make any reported miracle believable. You can only go as far as saying, "Maybe it was supernatural and maybe it was not. Who can believe either way?" Somebody may rise from the dead. The evidence cannot indicate that he did rise. It can only indicate that he might have done. So a miracle possibly happened. But then you will only guess where the miracle made its input. Maybe the miracle is not that somebody rose but that people thought he did though he did not. Maybe the miracle is that something implanted false evidence in their heads. Maybe the miracle is that the person was so close to death that he passed for dead and a few days later made a magical recovery. You cannot say you are a servant of a God of truth and honesty and sense if you dogmatically claim that the man rose from the dead. You are pretending to care about what God is trying to say in the miracle when in fact all you care about is arrogantly saying you know what you do not know.

A religion based on miracles should be avoided like the plague - it is based on arrogance and lies.

MORALITY

It is self-evident that certain things are good and other things are not so good.

Morality is not about doing good. In fact, it is about doing certain kinds of good under the pain of retribution.

That is why it is not considered immoral to buy yourself a nice coffee instead of giving the money to the beggar outside the cafe door. It is not good but it is not immoral either.

Morality is about rules and laws. A law is not a law unless a punishment is prescribed for those who break it. The moral person will punish the immoral person by judging and disliking and condemning her or him. If the person

has the authority to, he or she can lay down further punishment. For example, the parish priest may fire the housekeeper for being a lesbian.

The law of the land enforces moral rules that affect the people as a whole and claims the right to make any immoral act illegal that it wishes to.

The Christians promote God because they think we need morality. They ask, "Is morality right because God says so?" Or, "Is morality right regardless of whether God agrees with it or not?" Morality is either invented or it is real. If it is invented then you can murder babies for fun. If it is real, it doesn't need a God to make it real. Even he has to obey it. So the Christians say that morality is neither invented by God or independent of him. They say people think they have to choose one or the other not realising there is a third option. They say morality is grounded in his nature because he is by nature kind and loving and fair. They say that being unloving is a sin for it contradicts God's nature. But the third option is denialism. It is in denial of the truth. The truth is that morality is either made up or it is not for it is real. Simple. The third option is a lie for it denies the undeniable. To ground morality on a lie or denial of the truth means you create a system called morality but which is actually not morality but immorality.

Believers in God want to believe in a God who represents moral values and want to argue that he made us as value-honouring persons. They think that we cannot really believe in moral values unless there is a God and these values are grounded in his nature.

Suppose I need to believe in a good God in order to explain why I have values. I am really grounding this in my belief in God and not in God. Trusting my belief in God is not trusting in God. It only superficially looks like it. So I am still treating my values as brute facts and trying to get away from that.

My values are often called moral values by Christians. But just because I want to see babies safe from attackers does not mean this is a moral value. Good and moral are related but are not the same thing. Good is about what benefits. Moral is saying that good must be done under the threat of punishment. Moral is a kind of social law. If I need belief in God before I can see that a baby must be protected from suffering then I am an evil person who needs the belief to rein in my evil. But restrained or not its still there inside festering away.

Religion says we have a duty of obedience to God to become good people. Duty is based on the idea of owing. If I owe you money and you have no punishment for me, not even punishment for me in the form of disapproval, if I refuse to pay, then it follows I do not owe it to you at all anymore. If you say I do, you have no right to be taken seriously. By not making it a rule that you get paid, you are effectively saying you are not owed the money anymore. A rule with no price demanded of those who break it, is not a rule. Christians claim that they can sin and as long as they confess and get forgiven promptly they will be fine. This is really admitting that they do not have a duty to do good but only a duty to get forgiveness for their sins. That is a travesty of right and wrong. Its a mockery of those who suffer.

[Top of the Document](#)

MORMONISM

The religion founded by Joseph Smith Jun in 1830. He claimed that he translated a new scripture The Book of Mormon from golden plates that he dug up in a hill. Eleven witnesses had a vision of the plates. Their evidence was totally pointless because there is evidence in the book itself that it is not the word of God. For example, it makes prophecies and not one of them has been convincingly fulfilled. Those that did come true came true through luck. Yet Smith's translation of the Bible (Deuteronomy 18) declared that the highest standards while giving revelation from God will be followed by a true prophet. Basically, if a prophet gets all his predictions right but one he is still to be regarded as a fraud despite the miraculous knowledge of the future. This warns us against the idea of accepting miracles as signs from God though the false prophet Jesus (who claimed allegiance to Moses or to have sent him) claimed they were. Logically the same would apply to prophets who make some predictions that could be explained by chance when they are fulfilled. The Bible indicates that evil spirits can do seemingly holy miracles to deceive people but since only God knows the future then prophecy is the only way to be sure, it is the only miracle that proves God is speaking or has spoken.

Smith prophesied that a man called David Patten would accompany him on a mission in spring but Patten died

before this happened. The Mormon would do the mission as a spirit being is just an obvious cop out. This prophecy can be read in the Mormon Scripture Doctrine and Covenants Section 114 which asks Patten to sell what he has and get ready so that he can go on the mission with twelve others. Another excuse is that the section contains not a prophecy but a command from God for David. Would God tell you to do something knowing you will die before you get the chance especially when he doesn't speak much? Excuses like this are unconvincing and when God speaks there can be no doubt that God knows the future. God says in the prophecy that it is wisdom for Patten to get ready for the mission. Why would God who rarely speaks waste time on Patten and what he was doing if he was going to take Patten from the world? Smith accepted the Bible statement that if a prophet predicts wrongly he is a fraud. Smith was a fake prophet.

Smith's new addition to the Bible The Book of Mormon is a fraud. The Bible commands that a prophet who is always right but who is wrong once or who teaches heresy is to be ignored. That is why if Smith was not a true prophet we cannot believe in the Book of Mormon.

Mormon 7:9 says that whoever believes the Bible will believe the Book of Mormon. But the Book of Mormon says the Bible has been changed and corrupted and the Bible gives no reason to believe in the Book of Mormon! 2 Nephi 2:23 states that if Adam and Eve had not sinned they would have had no children and would not have known any joy for they knew no misery and being unable to do good for they did not know what sin was. This is utter rubbish. Sinlessness was no bar to making babies. Thought God was all-powerful? And you can have joy when you forget about misery and do good when you forget about sin so you can have joy without knowing what sin is.

Moroni 10:3-5 promises that those who sincerely pray about whether or not the Book of Mormon is true will find that it is true. Mormons interpret that to say that they will get a burning feeling that it is true from God which tells them that it is true. It mentions knowing and not feelings and the Book says that feelings can mislead so it means that the Book will be credible which is completely untrue. We know that when people stray from the truth that it is because they feel their heresy is true. The Book of Mormon is saying that there will be plenty of archaeological evidence for its claims. This is untrue. Archaeologists ignore the book completely. No wonder when the Book says America was full of cows, pigs and horses in the period it claims to record which we know isn't true. Today Mormons say that there were strange animals and God just used the name of the animal we know in the modern world that was most like them! Rubbish! Smith altered the Book after saying it was the word of God. For example, he forgot that King Benjamin was dead by the time we get to the book, the Book of Mosiah verse 21:28 in the Book of Mormon. He had to subsequently change this to King Mosiah. To this day, the Church has been interfering with the text.

Smith was copied by a man who was undoubtedly a fraud James Jesse Strang who produced far more convincing witnesses to his miraculous, yet undoubtedly non-existent, plates which warns us not to be quick to believe Smith.

[Top of the Document](#)

MORTAL SIN

In Catholic doctrine, mortal sin is a serious sin that rejects God and cuts off friendship with him and which will take you to everlasting damnation in Hell. Venial sin is sin that is not as bad as that and only breaks with God a bit.

The Church says that God gave us all we have so we owe him devotion with our entire being. We are like married to God and to sin seriously is adultery for adultery does serious damage to a relationship. The commandment of God that we are to prefer nothing and nobody and not even ourselves to him but are to love him with all our heart and soul and mind and being is behind this rationale.

God would hate sin infinitely because he is all good – his goodness is infinite. He can only be good to the degree that he hates sin which is unlimitedly. Therefore venial sin cannot exist. Catholic morality then is hypocrisy. Catholics are pretending to be acceptable on the basis that their sins are not as serious as they actually are. Protestants reject the doctrine that venial sin is not a complete break with God. Venial sin is not in the Bible. For Protestants, all sin is mortal.

The Church says that even if you commit one discreet act of adultery or miss mass on a Sunday you commit mortal sin. A system that says that and then that many venials which do more harm do not add up to mortal sin knows nothing of justice or making sense. It is a religion that is about law not goodness.

The Church says that a young boy may die after masturbating which is a serious sin and go to Hell. This is an appalling doctrine. The priests teach this message and represent it. If God is responsible for this message, they are still responsible too and saying that they agree with the boy going to Hell. They have stolen the moral authority they have taken.

Paul wrote that nobody can be saved by works of the law of God and by obeying it and believing it as it commands for all it does is reveal what sin is in Romans 3. Its not for getting you into Heaven. Even the Sadducee Jews who believed that most sins were venial couldn't be saved or right with God. The Catholic teaching of venial sin contradicts the Bible and means the Church is telling people. they won't go to Hell when they will. And the reason is that all sin is mortal.

[Top of the Document](#)

MOSES

The reputed author of the first five books of the Bible which comprise the Law which was allegedly instituted by God.

The Prophet Moses was an evil man who demanded in the name of God that adulterers and homosexuals be stoned to death. To say the Old Testament is the word of God is to side with God despite the murders he said he commanded through Moses. Though Moses demanded the highest standards in working out who was really a prophet of God: agreement with the word already given and predicting the future without error, he never left any fulfilled predictions behind that would prove that he could keep up to the standard. To reject Moses is to deny the divine origin of Judaism and the pretended fulfilment of Judaism, Christianity. It is to deny the divine sonship of Jesus Christ for Jesus said Moses really was a prophet of God and that Moses' writings were his credentials.

Judaism is the default faith. Christianity started among Jews who changed the Jewish religion. If they had no right to then we should become Jews. For this reason alone, the Christians must allow the Jews to commit the executions as God commanded. Having faith that Christianity is true is not a licence for refusing to play it safe.

[Top of the Document](#)

MOTHER TERESA

This nun was famed for her work among the poor in India. Yet she admitted she put dogma before people when she defended Catholic teaching on contraception which sought to prevent the poor planning their families. Her charity was an anti-humanitarian blight. If God had wanted the poor abandoned she would have done it. She would have justified this by saying God must have better plans to help the poor. She also gave huge donations of cash to the pope and hoarded millions in the bank. All that while many of her patients in hospital had to be injected with the same syringe. She took the best medical care possible for herself no matter how expensive it was, while children in her care died and these deaths could have been averted if she had spared the money for them.

[Top of the Document](#)

MURDER

The unlawful killing of a human being. The doctrine that an all-good God has the right to kill makes us see death as less bad than we could which is a help to the person contemplating committing a murder. There is no need to believe in God therefore belief in God is encouraging murder.

[Top of the Document](#)

MYSTERY

A "truth" of faith or morals that we cannot understand however hard we try. Christianity is full of mystery. This marks it as a bigoted super-sect because they reject other systems of belief that are full of mystery and accuse them of contradicting themselves or of being otherwise implausible. Mysteries can be used as an excuse to get people to believe anything that is very silly and no theology that has too much mystery or unnecessary mystery can be considered believable.

NATURALISM

Naturalism is the view that there is no God or magic or supernatural. Religion says that we need to believe that our origin is God who has personality and awareness and who is pure intelligence and pure love in order to ground our trust in our reason and our values. If we are the products of chance or blind natural forces how can we trust our reason? How can we trust our perception that some actions are to be forbidden and some are to be praised? Some say that naturalism undermines trust in reason and science and values and morality. Others say that it does not but merely fails to support them. The latter view says we may have values and the power to think even if there is nothing but nature.

In fact, we treat our perception of values and our trust in thinking as brute facts. That cannot be changed. It's intrinsic to us. Brute facts are things that are just the case and there is no explanation for them or at least none we can think of. Perhaps we will never explain and they need to be treated as brute facts as long as we do not understand. By being dissatisfied with our reasoning faculty and our values as being brute facts, religion is in fact saying, "We oppose the human intrinsic instinct to accept them as facts that are simply facts." That is an onslaught on our nature. They defy their own nature to pay homage to religion. They purge integrity to embrace self-deception. They are on a par with the man who denies the existence or the power of gravity. They cruelly try to make others addicted to the same self-degradation.

The notion that blind forces can't produce moral beings or beings that value goodness is as absurd as saying chance cannot make a basic machine that adds up 2 and 2 to make 4. Of course that is possible. Seeing something as good and something else as less good is like maths in the sense that you see that ten apples is ten apples and three apples is three.

If natural forces cannot produce moral beings, God can't do it either. He is not like us at all but more like a mind without personal characteristics. He is not a moral agent for he cannot be punished if he does wrong. He can't do wrong but that is not the point.

Good exists whether there is a God or not. If there is no creation and nothing at all exists, that is good for it means there is nobody around to suffer. It is bad other ways but that is not the point.

Natural selection causes us to tend to adopt beliefs that are advantageous in the natural selection processes. Some say that it follows that if we believe God is not behind our evolution then we are saying is very unlikely that we are programmed and made properly. In other words, we will have untrue and true beliefs that are advantageous. But surely natural selection would have us pick out the true beliefs that are best for us at least when it comes to the major things such as thinking and working out what values we have? An untrue belief never confers an advantage when the overall picture is looked at.

Another complaint that naturalism is counter-intuitive. It is stated that "intuition is sometimes wrong but still it is unwise to pay no heed to it without having adequate evidence that what it is saying is incorrect". Intuition does not come from nowhere. It comes from how we apply reason and learning to life. If we misuse reason, our intuition will mislead us.

Naturalists and believers in God alike assume the trustworthiness of human reason - when learned properly - in order to work out their view. The notion that you need to believe something that indicates that reason is reliable is silly and is assuming the thing you aim to prove. We simply go along with our reason. How can we look for arguments to prop up reason when we have to use reason to come up with the arguments?

ORDINATION

Ordination or Holy Orders is one of the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church. Only bishops have the magic power to make men bishops or priests. They pass on the power if they are ordained properly themselves.

Just as the Church has found that many marriages are invalid – and these are the few it was able to know about –

obviously there must be invalid ordinations as well.

The Council of Trent made it official Catholic teaching that a sacrament can only be conferred by intending to at least do as the Church does. "If anyone shall say that intention, the intention at least to do what the Church does, is not required in ministers while performing and giving the sacraments then let him be accursed" (Session VII, Canon 11). So an unbelieving bishop can validly make new bishops as long as his intention is this: "I don't believe this stuff but if there is anything in it then I intend to make this man a true bishop and give him grace." Obviously, then ordinations done by a bishop like this should be repeated to be on the safe side. What if because of his unbelief he can't intend to consecrate? What if he thinks, "What a superstition this rite is! I am so sure there is no power in it and I can't give any and I don't even intend to."

The decree would imply that unbelievers cannot give real sacraments. The Church says they cannot give real ordination. Inconsistently, though it may recognise their baptisms.

There is nothing the Church can do to guarantee that you are getting a real sacrament. The Church says that it trusts in God to protect her from such disasters as ministers giving invalid ordinations. When God lets the Church be bothered with invalid marriages and lets it be fooled by false popes why be so sure? The Church has admitted to excommunicating people and groups unfairly causing grave division in the Church by its invalid excommunications. This does even worse damage than the consecration of fake priests and fake bishops.

Suppose somebody is invalidly baptised. If that person becomes a priest or bishop that person will not be a true priest or bishop. Church law is that the sacraments can only be validly received by a baptised person. If a priest is invalidly ordained he cannot become a valid bishop for it is necessary to be a priest first. The doctrines surrounding the sacrament of ordination are so ridiculous that one must question the sanity or normality of any man that becomes a priest.

[Top of the Document](#)

ORIGINAL SIN

The doctrine that when Adam the first man ate the forbidden fruit according to the first book of the Bible that this was a terrible sin that cut him off God and made us born in the same rebellious state. This was supposed to be why we needed the atonement of Christ to make up for this so that we could be put right with God. No good God would let us be born in such a state for he would want us to be with him in every moment of precious time. The Church says that the human weakness in us is evidence for this original sin. But it is just evidence for weakness and that is all. God is universally insulted to justify the claim that nobody is saved without Jesus for all have descended from Adam and inherited his antagonism towards God like a virus.

People took stories like Adam and so on literally in ages past. Theologians today who say it is symbolic cannot give us a Bible verse that says it was. They are making assumptions and treating them as the word of God. To find absurdities and contradictions in the Adam story and claim that they indicate that the story is symbolically true but not literally true is extremely dishonest. If we use that approach all the time we will have to start saying that every rubbish story say in paganism is true. Adam did not exist so original sin is a lie.

The story says that Adam was asked not to touch the tree of knowledge of good and evil. God made this law. Touching the tree was not wrong in itself. God made it wrong. The story implies that sin is not exactly doing harm - it is the disobedience to divine authority that is the problem. Original sin if it exists then causes the wish to unify law and morality in the name of God.

Theologians say that the tree was called the tree of knowledge of good and evil because anybody who touched the tree would know experientially what it is to stop being good and become evil. They deny that Adam was going to get a purely intellectual knowledge of these things without experiencing them.

[Top of the Document](#)

PADRE PIO

A stigmatic miracle-working monk who died in 1968 and who canonised by Pope John Paul II.

Pio claimed that Jesus gave him a copy of the five wounds of the crucifixion. In 1923, Rome declared that

nothing supernatural had been proven about the marks. This is very important for less was known then about magic tricks and chemicals that keep wounds open and the power of the mind than is known now. The wounds then could have seemed supernatural indeed - more than they would nowadays - for the same reason that the cures for smallpox would have seemed miraculous to many. This shows that the Church did find indications of possible fakery.

In the pro-Pio book, Padre Pio Under Investigation, Francesco Castelli states that a Monsignor Rossi (in 1921) examined Pio's stigmata and found no wounds in the palms even though there was a scab of blood in each palm. He found two white button like marks on the feet but no blood or wounds there. Rossi described the marks not as wounds but as the effusion of blood - like blood getting out through skin. This book admits that Pio was ordering carbolic acid but says without proof that he needed it to sterilise needles.

The book says that Rossi found no lesions but yet Pio told him that his hands were very sore. Why would they be sore when there were no wounds but only scabs?

This book says that in order the doctors who examined the alleged wounds were

Doctor Romanelli in 1919. Asserted there was a side wound "lacerated" and "linear". Stated that he thought the wounds in the hands went right through.

Professor Bignami in 1919. Asserted there was no side wound. Denied there were any deep fissures.

Doctor Festa in 1919. He contradicted Romanelli who said the wounds in the hands went right through. Asserted there was no side wound. Denied there were any deep fissures.

Doctor Festa conducted a second examination in 1920.

Doctor Festa conducted a third examination in 1925.

Festa regarded the marks as supernatural. He reached this opinion merely from the fact that they were perfumed. He obviously just took Pio's word for it that no cologne had been applied!

Its uncertain that Pio ever really had remarkable wounds.

Nobody ever said he could press on each side of the hand "wound" and get his fingers to touch one another through the alleged wound. Doctor Romanelli said he had the impression that the hand wounds were through the hands but he admitted it was only an impression. He tried but assumed that his fingers would meet if he tried harder. But he was afraid to for it gave Pio great pain (page 14, The Stigmata and Modern Science). The priest was crying and struggling and wincing with the alleged pain enough as it was so would the examination have been done right? Romanelli is the weak leg that the pro-Pio devotees have to stand on.

How convenient that Pio was not put under anaesthesia for examination of the wounds. That shows that neither Pio or those who organised the tests were very particular though they did a bit to look particular. Pio was not seriously interested in having the wounds cured for as far as he was concerned he knew how to handle them. Pio wanted the appearance of being verified as a true stigmatist. And Pio was able to undergo two operations without anaesthetic which is a phenomenon known as auto-anaesthesia (page 89, The Bleeding Mind)– many people with trained minds are - which makes his behaviour very suspicious. It looks as if he wanted to use the pain as an excuse for getting the tests rushed and to prevent anything suspicious being found. It paid off.

Pio's Provincial said he would testify on oath that he could see through Pio's hand wounds (page 68, The Bleeding Mind). But no doctor ever could so that is worthless. A piece of a mirror in the middle of the encrusted blood could be used to give the impression that the hand could be seen through just like a magician could do it.

Reason bids us believe the doctors who said the wounds were superficial for that would explain why they were not septic – as can carbolic acid which some thought Pio was using on the wounds. Superficial wounds would explain why there was not a mark on Pio when he died. When there is conflict of testimony the testimony that is closest to a rational or simplest interpretation has to be preferred. And in this case we have disposed of

Romanelli's reliability – remember when we refute his testimony that is all we need to do for he was the only one that was nearly any good - so we can be confident that Pio's wounds were superficial and that naturally he exaggerated the pain from them to avoid detection and so he was consciously deceiving.

It is absurd to think that the wounds would change so much as from superficial to complete perforations if they were miraculous. They might change if they were natural.

Pio was certainly dodgy and has recently been exposed for surreptitiously sending for chemicals amid great secrecy as if he needed them to make his wounds. Pio himself claimed that he only insisted on secrecy so that those delivering the chemicals to him would not know they were carrying such dangerous materials! What kind of excuse was that?

If Pio's stigmata was dubious, how can we be confident in the other miracles ascribed to him?

Pio was famous for the miracle of perfume which surrounded him. One thing is for sure when a person has a nice smell that is supposedly a miracle you can be sure that it is not. No sensible God would do such a mundane and easily duplicated miracle.

Pio drew attention for his alleged (and unsubstantiated for he was alone when they happened) nocturnal battles with demons who used to hit him. Demons would not have drawn attention to him unless they had some secret pact with him for if God was with him they could not hope to win. They would have been promoting him.

[Top of the Document](#)

PANTHEISM

The belief that God is not a spirit outside the universe but that the universe is this spirit behaving as if it were matter so all things are God. This is absurd for it would mean the child killed by the car is the same being and thing and person as the car. A God like this is insane when he morphs into a world such as ours. He is therefore not a God for he is not in control of himself so he cannot expect sincere worship. Many Atheists claim to be Pantheists for they believe that God is a material thing, the universe. They see God as non-supernatural and just another word for the universe.

[Top of the Document](#)

PAUL

The man who was behind the spread of Christianity throughout the Empire. He claimed that Jesus made him an apostle by appearing to him. He told the Corinthian Christians who had fallen away from belief in the resurrection of Christ that Jesus rose for all the dead would be lost if he did not. He was trying to emotionally blackmail them to believe. That was a very very cynical and callous lie for he was trying to make those who doubted the resurrection feel so scared and depressed that they would believe. He was plainly lying for if Jesus was a fraud there could be another saviour who is not. He cannot be trusted for Jesus being a fraud could not mean that the dead would have to necessarily be lost. He clearly was hard up for evidence for the resurrection. He knew that the stranger a claim is the more evidence it needs. He was trying to make people dishonest with themselves and believe such a serious claim with such flimsy evidence.

That the apostles tolerated this man and even gave him the hand of fellowship shows that they were just as bad.

[Top of the Document](#)

PERJURY

The sin of swearing on the Bible to tell the truth and then lying. Most people these days lie under oath and they get away with it because it is very hard to prove they were deliberately lying. In the past it was believed that if you lied under oath you would be consigned by God to eternal damnation because you were calling the God of truth to bear witness to a lie. That was the rationale for swearing on the Bible. It was very useful for those who secretly sneered at the Church - and every Church contains a large number of people who do that – to give their lies more weight.

Few people know the Bible well enough to be able to decide if it is God's word or not and to swear on a book that you think contains fabrications or may do so is in itself perjury. You are basing your oath on a tissue of lies.

One thing is for sure, the person who swears outside of a court of law is definitely lying for they are asking for more faith to be put in their statements than normally would be. Their oaths mean nothing because the solemnity and the penalty of the law does not hang over them so why are they wasting their breath swearing if they are telling the truth? Yet we have Jesus and Paul swearing in the Bible outside of the courts. Jesus said that God bears witness to him which is the same in all respects as an oath. If God is truth then to tell any lie is calling on God to witness to a lie at least implicitly. You lie to destroy truth and you are hoping that God will not expose you and thereby imply that he agrees with what you are doing.

[Top of the Document](#)

PETER

This apostle supposedly wrote 2 Peter in the Bible. This crazy letter says extraordinary things about the Bible. It stated that even though Peter actually heard the voice of God when Jesus was transfigured that this voice was not as certain as what God said and predicted in the Old Testament. This indicates that the evidence for Jesus Christ should be gleaned from the Old Testament and that even the apostles should not be believed when they testify that Jesus rose unless it can be determined that the Old Testament God forecasted it. Jesus himself according to Luke 16:31 reasoned that if the Old Testament says something it is right and even a resurrection miracle has less credibility. He stated that if people don't believe in the Old Testament they will not be persuaded even if they see a man rising from the dead to warn them. This is a deadly sanction for rabid fundamentalism. It has spilled so much blood in the world.

When the Old Testament is more sure than even the direct voice of God that means that the Old Testament words must be literally the words of God as fundamentalists believe – the Old Testament is verbally inspired.

The pope claims to succeed Peter. A real successor of Peter would uphold his legacy of fundamentalism.

[Top of the Document](#)

POPE

The head of the Roman Catholic Church. Roman Catholic doctrine says that the apostle Peter was the first pope. Peter was the first bishop of Rome and so the man who becomes bishop of Rome becomes pope and head of the Church as he succeeds Peter. The fact that an ossuary has been found on the Mount of Olives bearing Peter's name Simon Bar Jonah does not faze the Catholic Church. Peter indeed was probably never bishop of Rome and died and was buried in Jerusalem.

The pope claims to be the successor of St Peter the apostle on whom Christ built the one true Church, the Roman Catholic Church and that all Christians have a duty to obey him. He goes as far as to claim to be infallible. There is no evidence that if Jesus made Peter the rock that he meant he was to be the head of the Church. Peter might have been only the chief organiser of the Church meaning that if the pope is his successor the pope like any organiser may be rebelled against and broken away from if he does not do his job.

Jesus would have meant that if Peter was the rock he would only be that as long as he stayed firm so it is a conditional role he got. The pope claims that his office is unconditional for the Church needs him. So the papacy was not instituted by Jesus.

The pope sees no evidence for his infallibility and his kingship over the Church so he has stolen his position. He has stolen the place of Christ and is antichrist.

Pope John Paul II claimed that the papacy never misleads the Church and yet he came out against the Bible teaching on the rightness of capital punishment! To say as he did that capital punishment is evil for the person might be innocent however unlikely this seems, accuses Jesus of backing up an evil God who commanded executions by stoning for apostasy, heresy and sexual sins. This is the man who insists that condoms must not be used even by a married man trying to avoid giving AIDS to his wife!

The Church says Peter was the rock that is to say the foundation of the Church. If Peter was the rock the Church was built on, it follows then that Peter and the pope, if he is really his successor, have to hold the Church

together. This would require one to believe that the Roman Pontiff is infallible or acting without error when he excommunicates. The Church dares not teach this for history shows persons and groups being thrown out of the Church by one pope and this action being apologised for by another pope. If the pope were really the rock he wouldn't be able to excommunicate unfairly.

If Jesus promised us popes to be the rock the Church was built on, then he broke his promise for many of them have been wimps and disasters. They cannot be described as rocks. At times, two or more men claimed to be pope and nobody knew for sure who was the real pope. How then could the papacy be rock?

There is no good evidence that Peter was the rock in the Catholic sense. For example, he doesn't leave any affidavits saying he was head of the Church. Nor does he mention that bishops of Rome will be his successors. Peter might have been one of many bishops in Rome - if he died there at all. For all one knows, maybe the Peter that allegedly died a martyr's death there could have been a mistaken identity. Peter would need to designate a successor to be the new rock after his death. None of this happened. The evidence is not convincing enough then that Peter can be considered to be the rock the Church is built on in the sense of father, infallible teacher and monarch over the Church. A rock that leaves inadequate evidence that it is the rock is not a rock at all. Worse, even if Peter was the rock in the Catholic sense there is still no reason to believe that the popes, even if they are his successors, are his equals or were meant to be.

If Jesus made a false prophecy or Matthew mistakenly imputed one to him, then we cannot take Matthew 16 as support for the papacy. It is unreliable.

[Top of the Document](#)

PRAYER

Prayer according to the Church is raising the heart and mind to God. It means sincerely and consciously communicating with God. It is always asking God for something, it could be to love God more or it could be for something as materialistic as a pay-rise.

Suppose God is essentially about us doing good to each other as most people think. Prayer is an intention of connecting with God. If you are really connecting you will not be going about telling rosary beads and eating communion wafers but will be out connecting with God by feeding the homeless etc.

The Church says that salvation is impossible without prayer. That's discrimination against those who don't pray but do some mighty good work. So prayer is unloving and it cannot do any real good for it deepens darkness in the heart. The virtue it produces is just self-serving vice in disguise.

If you are happy and confident, you don't need prayer. It is strong self-esteem we need not prayer. Prayer is therefore incompatible with self-esteem for it denies this truth. It only bestows self-esteem in some cases in spite of itself.

You would only need to pray if God won't help you unless you open your heart to him. A really good God would help you anyway. He could save you through your sincere effort to live as a good person even without you knowing it is he or that he exists. God will do what is best and he is the almighty boss so prayer is not trying to help anybody. It is an evil God that will abandon people until somebody prays for them. Praying to such a God for them would be insulting them and doing them no favours - it would be like asking Hitler to take a bottle of water to the Jewish family down the road. To pray ardently for people to a God who will do whatever he wants and does not let himself be influenced by you is not trying to help them. Magic would be more moral for it at least is really trying to help by sending power to the person in need. Prayer is not for you can't influence or change God. Its not really trying.

Praying Christians know that Christianity is not a humanitarian religion - it is about God and serving him through helping others - the others are not to be helped for their sake but wholly his. Prayer is for them, just an attempt to feel good about doing nothing. Then rancid selfishness is concealed by piety.

Even the believer has to admit that prayer is really doing nothing for another person. God knows what is best. We might pray for healing. And it may come. Did God answer the prayer then? That depends on his motive. Did he do it to answer the prayer or did he do it just because it was the right thing to do? If he did it because he was asked, then it was not because it was right. Maybe he did it both because he was asked and because it was right? That means he refused to do it entirely because it was right. In so far as God does not do it because it is right he is acting amorally if not immorally. As he claims to be good, he would be showing he is not perfectly good. Then prayer is saying, "I don't care if you are evil or not do what I ask!" How is that supposed to help us become more virtuous? No wonder there is nothing remarkable about the virtue of most believers. Any virtue they have is there in spite of their faith and their prayers.

It is said that if we pray we become more like God in virtue and this alone is an answer to prayer. He helps us. But surely learning right and wrong then matters more than praying? And even those most devout admit they are far from turning into the image of God through prayer!

A tiny minority of believers say that if we want something from God, we must make sure that it is spiritually good for us to get it. We have to make the circumstances right for God to give us the blessing we want. If you want a bicycle and pray for it then you have to acquire virtue so that you will appreciate getting it and having it and try to grow closer to God through using it. For example, you might use it to go to Mass more if you are a Catholic.

This seems to avoid the idea that prayer is an arrogant and prideful attempt to manipulate God and to impose your will on him. But does it? It does not work. Most Christians do not emphasise it or even know of it. This means that their prayers are undoubtedly superstitious. The true devotee will try to be holy for the sake of holiness and not for the sake of a bike. Such holiness would be mercenary and thus it would be fake. And if it will help you spiritually to get the bike you will get it even if you are not paving the way by becoming holier.

As for being good and holy and spiritual so that God will be able to answer your prayers what about the many evil people who think their evil prayers to him are answered? Jack the Ripper would have prayed to get through the streets after his crimes without being apprehended by the police. He would have imagined his prayer was answered. Believers would see that as proof that his escape was just down to luck not God for God wouldn't hear his unholy prayers. Yet they refuse to admit the truth, "There is no way of telling if an answer to prayer is coincidence or a real answer." They carry on the same way as fortune tellers with their superstition.

To love God with all your heart means to hate sin with all your heart as well. Prayer is opening up to that and trying to do that. That is what really matters if there is a God. Prayer indicates that God is good and so deserves all our love and it urges people to sacrifice themselves on the altar of religion by being eaten up by hatred. Then when they go out of control they can make out its a crime of passion and not fully sinful as they were not completely free.

The prayers of most believers are not motivated by the intention to develop a rabid hatred of sin so they are not prayers to God but to the image they have made of God. The ego lurks behind their piety.

Prayer implies that it is God's will that matters and nothing else - it conditions people to help themselves and others only for God. It implies that God is what matters and people don't. It implies that if God needed you to torture everybody else to death you would. Christians say that is a stupid thing to claim for God would never ask that. But that is not the point and they know it. The point is that it is hypothetical. You have to be willing to do it at least in theory.

Why is it that one prayer is never enough? A good God wouldn't care about the quantity but the quality. Prayer then is a kind of a spell, trying to control God and it insults his goodness. It puts people into a relaxed hypnotic state of mind that is useful for religion to hypnotise people to believe its lies and obey it. Surely if you pray, "Your will be done!" once you don't need to pray any more? That is the only real prayer. Those who pray for help at job interviews etc are hypocrites. They are trying to disguise magic as prayer. If you pray for a bicycle, it is the bicycle you care about and not God's will. If you trust God and care only for his will you will not be even mentioning the bicycle.

Catholics pray to saints. They say God uses the saints to help those who pray to them get close to him. If they really want to get close to God then they don't need the saints. They can go straight. The saints who pray for you

are hypocritical for the essence of prayer is hypocrisy. If you ask their prayers that is what you are asking them to be - hypocrites. If we thought they were merely praying, "You know best O God and your will be done!", we wouldn't bother invoking them. We wouldn't need to and it would be ridiculous to ask. Those who pray to saints are trying to get them to manipulate and fool God for them. Only demons will be interested in responding to such prayers! The prayers are really attempts to bend God's ear and a sign of mistrust.

Miracles supposedly aim to inspire prayer which if true, shows they are signs not of wisdom and grace but of folly and evil. Religion teaches that miracles only happen because people pray as there is no point in God doing miracles unless there is a reasonable chance people will pray. Doing miracles without enough concern for inspiring people from within and building up their relationship with God is merely showing off.

Does prayer matter in itself? If it does, then it is the fact that it honours God that matters. God supposedly has to put up with evil. Hypothetically, he has to put up with people never being happy if evil goes that far. Obviously even then if there is a God we would have to honour him though in our lives there is nothing nice or good. It is not his fault if we suffer. True prayer then involves a willingness to sacrifice a happy eternity for the sake of morality. In that case, most people who pray do not really. They only feel they do. Prayer then is a placebo - you relieve the pain of witnessing the suffering of others and being unable to help and unwilling to help. You feel that it is not as bad as it seems for its part of God's lovely plan. The truly good person does not risk diagnosing evil as less than what it is. That only stops a proper treatment.

Does prayer matter only because it gets us blessings from God? If it matters even partly because of what we can gain then in so far as we do that we are for self and not God. Prayer must matter in itself if there is a God. It follows then that its lesson is that we must be meant to suffer by crying out to God for help and getting nothing from him. God then has the right to do this and even the obligation to.

Prayer when dissected is alarming and offensive and pays homage to fanaticism.

[Top of the Document](#)

PRINCIPLES

Some say that principles do not come first and practice is what matters. But to celebrate the rejection of principles or violence against principles mean you cannot object if people decide to put their bad principles into practice. Or if they create new bad principles. You don't say that the principle of paedophilia being bad is unimportant as long as people don't carry out acts of child sexual abuse. Your condemnation of their actions only makes you a hypocrite who tolerates their evil. Principles are not just rules but about people. For example, if you value truth you automatically value people's need for the truth and their right to it. Principles consider the bigger picture and look beyond pleasing some people to what is best for as many people as possible in the long-term. If you suffer for the truth it will pass and it is worse to give in to those who hate the truth.

[Top of the Document](#)

PROPHET

A person who functions as a kind of channel for God for God to speak through, which often involves telling what God has shown them about the future.

The Law of God in Deuteronomy 18 decrees that if a prophet who accurately predicts the future at all times and makes one prediction that fails, he is to be stoned to death. It says he is a false prophet for God does not err. So it says God does not speak through prophets who err in reporting what he said or who lie about receiving revelations.

The standard is high and so it should be. We should expect awesome amazing evidence that somebody is really inspired by God and is his prophet. Deuteronomy says that a prophet can be miraculously right nearly all the time and still not be a prophet of God. This warns us that even if somebody does miracles and shows they really do know the future and can forecast the lottery numbers they are getting the power from some source other than God. The person is not a prophet of God. Deuteronomy 18 denies the religious lie that miracles are signs from God saying where the true faith is and which church teaches it. This makes a question mark appear over Jesus'

big sign, the resurrection.

The standard eliminates Moses and Jesus and John the Baptist and several others as true prophets as they showed no power to tell the future. They made no predictions except for Jesus who is terribly unimpressive. Jesus' fulfilled prophecies were recorded after the event. The ones still to be fulfilled are vague and show he didn't know the future at all and was only guessing.

Too many prophecies have not been fulfilled - it only looks like they have been. All prophets make some guesses that prove accurate. It should be that prophecies that come true cannot be rationally explained. It is worse to make no prophecies that fall into this category than to make many prophecies that come true and get one wrong.

Prophets are evil men because they predict wars which influences politics and evil men. For example, the Bible prophecies about Palestine about its future and about it belonging to the Jews by divine right have incited religious wars in modern times and influenced the loathsome machinations of Christian US President, George Bush. Real prophets should only predict wholesome and nice things. Jesus predicted simply apocalyptic and nasty rubbish so that shows what kind of person he really was if he ever lived.

[Top of the Document](#)

PROTESTANTISM

The Protestants belong to Christian Churches that separated from Roman Catholicism at the time of the Reformation though their faith was certainly around long before then in the form of the Waldensians, Hussites and Wycliffites. They teach that the Bible alone is the word of God. They teach that salvation is not by faith and good works and sacraments like you have it in the Catholic Church but by grace (God's doing) alone. When you trust in God that he has washed away your sins in the blood of Christ that is a sign that grace has saved you. God then will inspire you and help you to do good works. This is a sign too that God has saved you and chosen you for salvation in Heaven. Many Protestants say that nothing, no sin or anything, can take your heavenly destiny away from you once you are saved. They teach that you are made righteous by faith in the sense that when you believe by the power of God your salvation is activated. Faith is not a good work that earns salvation. They teach salvation by faith alone without good works.

The Protestant God is obviously condoning the sins of believers. Jesus may pay but as far as we experience it, which is what counts, our sins are being condoned. The Catholic God does the same when you can go straight to Heaven after committing billions of venial sins if somebody has got indulgences for you to cancel the punishment due to them. A God that rewards sin is not a God but a hypocrite. The fruits of Christianity prove that Jesus was not the Son of God for he was the one that said the work of God always brings good fruit.

To teach that faith alone saves is to deny that human beings matter. It teaches that dogma matters more than people for you cannot be saved by saving a life but you can be saved by trusting in dogmas. It is a lie that it is not dogmas but God a person that is trusted for if there is no God then it follows that it is dogmas. We don't know for sure if there is a God and less sure if God really saves this way so it is dogma.

Paul wrote in his divinely inspired scripture that obeying the law of God cannot save or justify, put you right with God, because the law gives knowledge of what sin is (Romans 3:20). In other words, the law saves nobody for they cannot keep it. Then he writes that God has had to save us without the law by faith. He means faith alone for he already said why obedience to God can't save.

The Bible is a Protestant book. The Bible is an evil book for it is attractive to those who want to be saved but not from their sins. Protestantism is perfect for people like that with its doctrine that Jesus died on the cross so that you could sin with impunity.

[Top of the Document](#)

PUNISHMENT

Giving a criminal the bad things they earn for doing wrong. This is really the only thing that free will is believed in for. People say you cannot deserve punishment if you did not do the wrong you did of your own free will. You can give rewards as incentives towards goodness – because free or unfree, we will not do good unless we get interested in doing it and so you can still tell a person what they should do without accepting free will. The

punishment doctrine is just an excuse for hidden revenge. We can put criminals in jail so that the law is seen to be seriously opposing evil activity and we don't need to bring in the notion that they really deserve it. All we need to know is that they are not deranged persons in the psychiatric sense. Evil people are all deranged but not medically deranged.

The best way to encourage evil is to condone it. Condoning says that an act is bad. Then when you do it there is no punishment. So it is not real disapproval. It is really a form of encouraging evil. Forbidden fruits are the most attractive. So the fake disapproval is necessary to make it more attractive. The Church never punished child molesting priests. It is no different from paedophile rings which admit the abuse is wrong but who facilitate it. In a sense the person who thinks what is evil is good and refuses to do anything about it is less bad than the person who does that believing that evil is bad. Religions like Christianity that tell people they can sin and face no penalties are frankly evil.

To punish the car thief by throwing dung on his jeans is not to punish him at all because real punishment always fits the crime. If you hate, you deserve hate in return. God said in the Bible that the law is to be an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. To deny this is to deny that hate should be punished properly by hate. And if it should not be punished then why forbid it at all? To forbid what should not be punished is evil and shows there is hate involved.

A God of justice must necessarily be a God of hate. A person who commits an act of hate is usually punished not with hate but with community service or something. But there is still an undercurrent of hate there. If he doesn't deserve hate, then it is not wrong for him to hate. Then to punish him at all is an act of hate for he has done nothing wrong.

Some liberal Christians lie that when the Bible speaks of the wrath of God and God punishing that this is a metaphor. Suppose you drink a bottle of vodka a day you will destroy your liver. This is the punishment. It is the way your body reacts to your treatment of it. It is not a punishment in the sense that God wills it to happen to you or is angry with you. They then use the word punishment to describe the bad effects of your actions on you. That is stretching the meaning of the word. They don't believe in what they are saying. They say that it doesn't matter what you believe as long as you are sincere and mean well. But dangerous or wrong belief brings bad on the believers and those they live among. And they don't describe that as punishment! They are just pandering to and sucking up to those who are so arrogant that they think they should get away with their sins and misdeeds and even crimes. No wonder Christianity is popular in prison.

[Top of the Document](#)

RATIONALISING

Rationalising means

- you call something rational when you have not thought it out for yourself. Religion likes to say, "People say our religion is stupid and wrong. But if it is, why do so many intelligent people even scientists support it?" Every religion says the same thing and if a religion is ridiculous you need intelligent people to make it look sensible. Calling yourself rational means you take it for granted that you have to do the thinking yourself. Nobody has the right to expect another to see them as rational - the person must give you the reasons and let you test for yourself. You simply cannot know a person makes sense without seeing they make sense.

- you make far-fetched excuses for holding a view that is wrong or improbable. For example, Padre Pio was able to undergo surgery without anaesthetic yet he claimed it was painful if somebody tried to touch his allegedly miraculous stigmata marks. Another example. The medium Florence Cook used props and was caught fraudulently pretending that she could call up the dead. She claimed she did not know what she was doing for she was in a trance when these tricks occurred. Mediums used props and tricks to supposedly help them focus their powers to call up the dead. The powers can sometimes fail. The mediums said they needed to resort to fraud when their powers let them down or were too weak because the pressure to produce signs and messages could actually cause them to fail. The excuse is that the tricks take the pressure off the mediums so that they can be relaxed and more attuned to their powers. Mediums know that they will keep enough of their followers and clients after being exposed for cheating. Another tactic was to claim that the cheating was really a set up by evil

spirits.

- you use speculation to ignore the problems. For example, the Bible's Book of Daniel contains predictions that could have been made after the events. There is no evidence at all that the book was really written centuries before the events. The Christians say that Jesus who claimed to be God's prophet said it was authentic and that settles it! But if Jesus was wrong he would have been a false prophet! Why should we agree with the Christians? The Book of Mormon says the wheel was used over a wide part of ancient America. No evidence has surfaced to back this up. The Mormon excuse is that God laid waste the nation destroying the evidence and its people became barbarians and lost the knowledge they once had.

- rationalisers say their religion is true and they try to explain away the evidence against the religion being true all the while having little evidence that the religion is true. Mormons say Joseph Smith their prophet knew the future from God. They explain away his false prophecies. That approach would only be fair if they could give us authentic examples of prophecies that did impressively come true. This then would allow us to reason, "Prophecy 1 came true and this must have been miraculous. Prophecy 2 seems to have failed. Let us see if it really was a prophecy or if it really failed. Maybe there is something wrong with our interpretation? Is the text correct?" If a person does not start with the pro-evidence, that person is a rationaliser and a fraud and a self-deceiving fool. Instead the person will try to explain away problems and leave it at that.

- rationalisers will shovel rubbish into a system that makes it look believable. For example, the resurrection of Jesus to eternal life is supposed to fit the idea that God saves body and soul and wants us to have a community in Heaven. But that does not make the story of Jesus' resurrection true or credible. If somebody claims revelations say that Abel the son of Adam rose from the dead and sanctioned and preached the philosophy that goes with resurrection and claimed to be the only person who would resurrect before the end of the world that would not make these revelations true. A rubbish doctrine that is slotted into good philosophy is still rubbish. The good philosophy should not need it and will not.

Rationalisation gives silly things a veneer of plausibility. It leads to rubbish "ringing true".

Rationalising and deceiving yourself are one and the same thing. The rationaliser tries too hard meaning he or she knows fine well that his or her claim about the supernatural or paranormal is suspect or downright wrong.

Rationalising is dangerous for anybody. Most of us do it on naturalistic grounds. That puts some limit on the scale of it. Belief in the supernatural takes the limit away. If Jesus' bones turned up the Church might say that Satan cloned Jesus's corpse for the real Jesus has risen.

Rationalising like all forms of lying can even make you think and feel you are not lying when you in fact are!! Its a form of abuse for it is open to getting others to abuse themselves by fooling themselves.

[Top of the Document](#)

REASON

It is best seen as a tool for protecting yourself from fools and liars - it protects you from what happens if you make yourself a fool or self-deceiver. That takes away its off-putting cold clinical stereotype - especially when it is called logic not reason - and makes it a warm safety net. Reason is a tool for empowering yourself and society by distinguishing what is true from what is untrue. It is judgmental in the sense that it is a tool for weeding out liars.

Reason is thinking without contradicting yourself for A cannot be B at the same time and in the same way that A is A. Reason is about knowing when something is a fact and holding beliefs that do not contradict it. A person who follows reason in preference to religious dogma and emotional feelings is called a rationalist. We can't get away from reason. Even those who say that faith and not reason should be listened to are reasoning that faith is better. Their reasoning is bad for why their preferred faith and not another? But it is still reasoning. Accordingly, it is only natural that we should check anything we are told with commonsense and logic.

It is right to have a faith that exalts human beings as the supreme dignity and which questions all things to get the right answers and is open-minded and eager to hear all sides if you must have a faith. Keep away from religion. Religion is bias and prejudice.

Reason will not answer all questions but encourages us to be fair and sensible and consistent and we can fill the gaps with harmless hypotheses that we are happy to change if need be and when they are disproved. It is a way of dealing with what we are told and experience. Rationalism should not advocate reason alone. That won't work for we do need faith but we need godless faith that is tested by reason which sees no contradictions or impossibilities in it. Feelings are fine as long as they don't control our thinking. We should experience joy in our reasoning.

It is unreasonable to believe in reason alone because we need faith to help ourselves and to fill the gaps. But it can be said we believe in reason alone because we only have the faith that reason permits us to have and because reason tells us to use faith and have it. Positive thinking is a virtue for even when it is proved wrong it is still the best approach for it has less suffering in it and it amounts to better rationality overall. Positive thinking is faith.

It is said that if we are rational, we will ignore our feelings. Being rational is good. But being rational and enjoying it and feeling good about it is far better. Our feelings will spur us on to passionate adulation for reason and truth. Being rational and emotional are not only compatible but desirable. Our feelings and desires must direct and fuel our rationality.

[Top of the Document](#)

REINCARNATION

The view that this life will not be the only one for me and when I die I will come back in another body. This doctrine is very dangerous. Committing suicide then does not exist - all you are doing is getting a fresh start. And its bad when coupled with the doctrine of karma. Then it could infer that a baby that is murdered must have murdered somebody in a past life. One would need perfect evidence to justify making an accusation like that. Many women who commit late abortion or infanticide reason that if they have the baby killed it will be conceived again in the future when the time is right. They see the killing as postponing the baby!

[Top of the Document](#)

RELATIVISM

Relativism is the view that whatever you think is the truth is the truth and everybody has their own truth. Moral relativism is the notion that you have a right to your moral opinion and that nobody should tell you your morality is immoral or wrong. It rejects the idea that anything is absolutely wrong. But it contradicts this by saying its always wrong to say relativism is wrong! It rejects the idea that morality is fact-based - or objective which means the same thing. But as we cannot stop thinking of moral right and moral wrong as facts and they can't stop presenting themselves as facts the relativist is only trading objective morality for an invented objective morality.

Relativism accuses objective morality of being intolerance but is itself intolerance. It condemns the view that morality is objective and real. It is not a proper response to the problem of tolerance. The pope speaks of the dictatorship of relativism which regards the person who rejects relativism as intolerant and evil. If a moral fact is a fact then tolerance demands you accept it. The fact is not intolerant - it is just a default. It is not intolerant for a tree to be a tree not a pansy. Its just a default - the way it is.

The modern adage, "You have a right to your opinion/belief" is used by those who think they should think or believe whatever they WANT rather than think or believe whatever seems TRUE. Its a revolting misuse based on the wish to become immune to rational argument or persuasion. The only reason you have a right to your belief or opinion is that you use belief and opinion to find the truth or to improve your knowledge and accuracy. To say you have the right to believe or think what you want is ridiculous. It is not about what you want and you have no right to deceive people that it is. Grow up!

The person who tries to believe what he wants without regard to what is true is being intolerant of the fact that belief is based on evidence. He is not being fair or honest in this. He is not being supportive or tolerant towards those who want to base belief on good reasons. He will fear and tend to be bigoted towards those who endanger the facade he has created.

People say they have a right to their beliefs and opinions. That is actually a half truth. The correct thing is to say you have a right to your beliefs and opinions as long as you see them as helps on the journey to truth. If you say you have a right to your beliefs and opinions without any concern for truth then you are not being fair. Fairness is based on what is true. The person who sees the truth and calls it a lie is being unfair.

A person can claim to be a moral absolutist or to believe in an objective morality. But a relativist can do that too for they are essentially amoral. It is probably safe to hold that as Christians are not that obedient to their version of God that they are relativists and not admitting it. The Epistle of James says it is only the remarkably religious and obedient who can be considered to be real people of faith.

Decide: morality is either really true (objective morality) or you can make it really true (relativism). Relativism trades objective morality for another objective morality that you make up. Pure relativists do not exist - they just are relativists when it suits them.

[Top of the Document](#)

RELIGION

Religion comes from a word meaning to bind. The best definition of religion is that it is dogma that people are bound to adhere to no matter what. The pope for example does not permit himself to doubt that Jesus is God. Thus religion is not the same thing as good. It is not about how many good people are in it. Religion is about offering commitment to principles. Catholics give a good definition - its about forming a relationship with God by prayer and by believing what God has said. For that reason, a Catholic who won't commit or try to is not a Catholic. So Catholics rightly argue that the only question is when faced with religion is, "Is it true?"

Atheism is not a religion as long as it is all about rejecting hypotheses there is no evidence for and using reason and experimentation to work out the truth. Atheism counts God among such hypotheses. If religion really cared about truth, Catholics for example would be encouraged to check out the Church and given the resources to decide for themselves and leave the Church if their conclusions were unorthodox. You may say it is the person's own responsibility, but the Church claims to be the shepherd of souls meaning it takes responsibility.

[Top of the Document](#)

RESURRECTION

No miracle claim is worth looking at unless there are first-hand critical sources as well as sources that say a real miracle took place. There is nothing critical at all in the reports concerning the resurrection of Jesus.

Christianity and Islam believe that the body will rise again. Christians hold that Jesus rose from the dead and left an empty tomb and subsequently appeared to his disciples.

The earliest Christian writer, Paul the apostle, spoke for the Church when he said that if Jesus has not risen then our faith is in vain and useless and our dead will not rise and believers are to be pitied above all people. "But if it is preached that Christ has been raised from the dead, how can some of you say there is no resurrection of the dead? If there is no resurrection of the dead, then not even Christ has been raised. And if Christ has not been raised, our preaching is useless and so is your faith. More than that, we are then found to be false witnesses about God, for we have testified about God that he raised Christ from the dead. But if he did not raise him if in fact the dead are not raised. For if the dead are not raised, then Christ has not been raised either. And if Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile; you are still in your sins. Then those also who have fallen asleep in Christ are lost. If only for this life we have hope in Christ, we are to be pitied more than all men" (1 Corinthians 15:12-19).

This argues that just because the resurrection is preached it should be believed. That is unfair. The apostles were manipulating and subtly bullying their believers. Paul then later says that it should be believed because it is testified to. That is only slightly better and slightly more charitable than what he said before. But still testimony is only human and so we can reject it if we don't see why we should accept it. Paul certainly was not very confident about the testimony. If your testimony is questioned you repeat it and answer problems people have with it. You don't say, "Accept my testimony because you are calling me a liar or wrong if you don't." To do that would set alarm bells ringing. All the religious frauds in the world try that tactic. Paul states that the faith even if it makes people happy is useless and futile if it is not true. He seems to mean here that God will damn believers if their faith is wrong. Happiness would only be useless if it was the means of landing you in Hell forever after death. Paul's argument shows that he is only concerned about being called a fraud like the other apostles. He was not as saintly as he pretended to be.

If you want to refute Christianity, all you need to do is focus on the resurrection of Jesus and see whether it is credible and possible or not. Every other miracle reported by Christianity is not as important. Paul set the standard and as an apostle we are meant to take his word as the word of Jesus himself. To repudiate the standard is to become your own religion and cease to be Christian. People think a huge miracle happened at Fatima in 1917 when people had visions of the sun spinning and changing colour in the sky. The Christian teaching on the resurrection of Jesus implies that this miracle was not necessary. It implies that it could not be as convincing as the resurrection. It implies that it is dishonourable to spend time examining that miracle instead of the resurrection. In reality, the Fatima miracle would be one of those miracles that refute the resurrection for it is better attested. Thus it purports to be the miracle that deserves the most faith.

The gospel writers offer not evidence for the resurrection of Christ but an interpretation they put on what they think happened. Why should we accept theirs for millions of interpretations are possible? They are the ones that say there is only one explanation so it is up to them to refute all the alternatives even if it takes to the end of the millennium so they have no right to our faith. Worse, there is no proof that the accounts are eyewitness accounts. Christians say they are. They seem to think that eyewitness accounts that have been worked over will do. They will not. We don't want something that was edited. We want the original unaltered written accounts and we want assurance that the witnesses checked over them before they were made public. They can't give us any of that.

Faith in somebody's interpretation of a revelation or miracle from God is not the same as faith in the revelation or God. It is not faith in them at all but in the person doing the interpreting.

Nobody claims the body was seen coming out of the tomb. The tomb somehow was open but not a single line of the New Testament eliminates the possibility that somebody sneaked in and took the body. The tomb had been unattended while open. And Matthew does not say the tomb was checked when the guards took their post. It was alone until then.

Bodies have vanished inexplicably from their tombs. Even if nobody knows how or why they were taken, nobody reasons that this indicates resurrection. Christians agree and they say the empty tomb on its own is not enough and that is where the apparitions of Jesus come in. Apparitions alone would not be enough either - consider the visions that Mormons and Catholics see all contradicting one another. So Christians say that the empty tomb alone proves nothing and the apparitions alone prove nothing but the two together indicate that Jesus rose. But nothing can prove a connection between the two. Jesus could have been stolen from the tomb perhaps by people who thought he had enough healing ability to recover. And he could have risen in their care and vanished. But that is no use to those who seek evidence. We have no record of Jesus's body being observed as it vanished from the tomb or as it rose. And we need that.

A ghost could have masqueraded as Jesus to create the resurrection appearances. It's easier to believe that than that a man came back bodily from the dead so it is more reasonable. Ghost stories are the most common miracle accounts. That counts for a lot. The Church admits that if it was just a ghost story that started the whole thing off there is no point in believing in Jesus any more for his resurrection was meant to be a miracle that could not be duplicated by Satan or anybody else. Jesus being a ghost would mean the resurrection was a hoax.

Jesus being among the apostles for a few short appearances and being touched once by Thomas is not great evidence of a bodily resurrection. A person would need to live an ordinary life for a while. Jesus during the appearances kept them very brief as if he had something to hide. The shorter a vision is the bigger the chance that the person is imagining things. He was also very curt and complaining - it was not like a man who really rose and was happy to meet his friends.

The risen Jesus said that his crucifixion and resurrection were foretold in the Jewish scriptures. That was a lie and the apostles knew it because there are literally thousands of different interpretations for the passages he was on about that Christians say predict the crucifixion and nothing at all predicts the resurrection. Psalm 16 allegedly does (Acts 2) but all it mentions is the recovery of King David from serious illness. It doesn't even mention dying.

The Christians all say that it is easier to believe that Jesus rose than the natural explanations. Hello! So a miracle

then is a viable alternative to an outlandish natural explanation? A bizarre but possible natural explanation is always to be chosen over a miracle one. We know weird outlandish natural things can happen for heaven's sake and what is natural comes first. Also, you can only assume that a miracle has happened and you cannot know exactly what the miracle was. For example, if somebody seems to have risen from the dead bodily, could it be that the miracle is how people thought he did though he did not? You do not assume bodily resurrection when a lesser miracle would suffice.

Faith in the resurrection depends on denying that a far-fetched natural explanation is better than a miracle one. Faith in the resurrection depends on assuming a bigger miracle than you need to. Once you do that you show you care not about the truth but about what you want to believe. Any witness you give is destroyed.

Faith in the resurrection of Jesus is a denial of the principle that we do not say something is a miracle unless we have to. We need to keep true to this principle for our own protection. We cannot live if we give people free rein to claim that say the missing money from the piggy bank could not have been taken by saintly Alex or sickly Paul and since there was nobody else in the house a demon must have taken it. Jesus wants us to be irrational if he wants us to believe in this resurrection. Irrational is the same as evil for evil is irrational. The irrational thought is what starts evil off. To condone the irrational is to repudiate the right to try and invite people to live better lives.

The Christians won't admit that there could be mistakes in the gospels that makes the resurrection tale more credible than it looks. Yet they use the gospels to prove the resurrection. So what they are really saying is that no other explanation works for the gospels are right. Evidently they are begging the question or arguing in circles: "The gospels are all true therefore there is no other explanation but resurrection and the resurrection proves the gospels are true."

The Torah emphasised that nobody should be punished by death under God's law unless there were two or three witnesses (Deuteronomy 17:6). Then later it said that nobody must be accused of a crime unless there are two or three witnesses (Deuteronomy 19:15). God gave this law. Jesus said two witnesses were needed that he was the Son of God and quoted this law in the Gospel of John (John 8:17-18). . He said God was one witness and he was the other. Any madman or religious fraud could say the same. Jesus was not genuine when he said this. But that aside, he was implying that witnesses to the resurrection were not needed. Indeed looking for them or depending on them would be sidestepping his testimony and that of his Father God.

So the law is reaffirmed by Jesus and the apostles taught it as God's will (2 Corinthians 13:1 and 1 Timothy 5:19). This means that if three people tell you they had a revelation from Heaven that Jesus was a fake or did not rise from the dead then you must believe them. After all it makes sense to believe people you know than people who lived thousands of years ago like the gospel writers. This proves that those who focus so much on the resurrection of Jesus are being arrogant and arbitrary bigots. They centre on this and ignore better miracle claims just because those claims do not fit what they want to believe. There is no such thing as believing what you want to believe. If you think you have done this then you merely feel that it is true. That is not belief. Roman Catholicism then thanks to Jesus' low standard, has been refuted by the three witnesses of the Book of Mormon, a volume that denies that the Catholic Church is guided by God and is his true Church.

The major lie about the resurrection is that it is the miracle that proves to us that Jesus saved us from sin and death — a doctrine that was put into Jesus' mouth by the gossellers and the other creators of the New Testament. For it to do that, you would have to prove that aliens or demons didn't do some kind of trick like making everybody go to the wrong tomb and have hallucinations of Jesus induced and controlled by their super-science. In other words, nothing ever can prove that the resurrection was supernatural or the work of God. The resurrection of Jesus and the outlandish emphasis put on it destroys the credibility of Christianity.

The next big lie is that Jesus was not merely brought back to life but made immortal and has a glorified spiritual body. Not a single alleged witness supports that. Paul speaks of this totally radical body but never says there was evidence. It cannot be stressed how much the Christians need him to be right for the religion says that merely returning from the dead is not enough and does not in itself help or represent the doctrine that the dead rise to enjoy eternal life and perfect. There are other returns from the dead and Jesus' loses importance unless it is all about what eternal salvation is all about.

The resurrection of Jesus is a cruel lie and people waste their lives and prayers over it. Sincerity is no excuse for following Jesus unless you have no way of checking it all out objectively.

[Top of the Document](#)

REVELATION

When God or a spirit gives a supernatural message. Revelation is propositional (in statement form) and clear. It tells you a truth that God wants you to know. Unclear or controversial revelation is not revelation but shows God is a bad teacher or the revelation is not really from him.

Those who want to make out that all people and religions have the same essential spiritual truth but do not realise it are saying revelation is non-propositional are patronising. They want to make all religions the same and ignore their differences which is nonsense and which is really a recipe for implosion. So they are experts on every religion and can tell it what it really teaches? Moreover they invariably discriminate against some smaller religions! It is really relativism pretending to be tolerance. If God is bigger than our errors and works in hidden ways - an idea at the heart of non-propositional revelation ideologies - then it follows it is fine to get a sense of meaning and faith from your dog or in being atheist.

Such "revelation" forces people to use their own understanding and interpretation. There is no direct revelation or knowledge which accuses Jesus and Muhammad and Joseph Smith of lying for saying there is. Non-propositional revelation only produces a culture where people make religion and morals whatever they feel it should be and nobody will agree. Experience, even religious experience, does not support the notion of inward non-propositional knowledge which is why we have different religions and sub cults in the first place!

For Christians, revelation is the miracle of God giving us knowledge we wouldn't get otherwise. It is necessarily anti-reason and anti-evidence - and therefore anti-science. We will see this in a moment.

The Church disagrees - it says revelation is not irrational, not even slightly. It says reason is good for seeing if a claim is coherent or true or false. It sees it as a tool. But it says reason alone cannot tell us everything.

Reason says we need to take things on trust in order to function in life. It is reasonable to do that for reason is not enough. But it is not reasonable to claim that religious trust, trust in God and religion, is needed. The minimum faith we need is faith in each other. That is the default. Humanism, us deciding what is best for ourselves while assuming there is no more to life than the natural universe, is the default. Any faith that goes beyond the essentials then is against reason.

Revelation is invariably a scam with which to gain power over people's thinking. It denigrates our human ability to look after ourselves for the magical messages would not be coming if they were not thought to be needed. God should help us to reason better so that way he doesn't need to appear in visions or write holy books through his channels. Revelation should take place the mundane ways.

We may not do well at looking after ourselves but that does not mean we need revelation for we are just abusing our resources and could waken up. God could give revelation simply by giving us inspiring thoughts that we don't know are from him instead of setting up a monolith of dogma, a miraculous source of revelation such as a Church or Bible, which serves only to stir up trouble and division and confusion.

Man cannot claim to be God for it will soon become apparent that he is not. So the next best thing and the safest thing is to pretend you have a revelation from God and have been appointed to a divine mission. If you slip up you can say you are not immune to misinterpreting God once or twice.

A divine revelation to X that man passes on to you is not a divine revelation to you. It is hearsay. For any man to claim to be the mouthpiece of God, to claim to be the Son of God which is to claim to be the supreme mouthpiece, demands extreme arrogance for he wants you to be dependant on what he wants you to believe about God.

Maybe God is talking through him but how do you know? Remember that many people with stronger faith and more intelligence than you could have another prophet saying completely opposite things. It is really the man who is trusted and not God and it is the man's vision of God not God that is worshipped. If revelation is immoral, then so are miracles for they are supposedly intended to reinforce the authenticity of revelation. The men in one

sect claim to have verified miracles that show their gospel is from God while there are other sects claiming the same verifications for their gospel that contradicts it. It is not God and religion we oppose when you think about it but the men trying to fool us.

When man's word is mistaken for God's, you end up following what you think is good and what you think is truth instead of the real good and the real truth. The more you heed man then the bigger the risk of danger and the more you waste your life and energy.

To embrace faith in revelation or miracles is really to abdicate responsibility. It is letting another tell you what to think and believe. In principle you became like the Nazis, "Oh I was only following orders." The outlook is evil in its intent. Like the Nazis you virtually tell yourself, "I choose to think this because X thinks it. So I will live it out and if it harms or misleads others I care not." Not all believers will necessarily do much evil but the mindset is the same as the ones that do. They have a vicious mindset underneath the sweetness.

[Top of the Document](#)

SACRAMENT

A blasphemous rite that is alleged to be a channel through which God gives grace. It pictures the grace it is supposed to give. For example, the priest saying he absolves your sin pictures God forgiving you and causes God to absolve you as well. Sacraments are occult activities condemned by the Law of Moses. The Catholic Church rejects this teaching for it says that sacraments are not magic for God has decreed that his power will only be channelled through rites performed a certain way. But then what is stopping you from saying that God will give you riches and a love mate if you carry out certain rites? Magicians often do make such claims. Their claims show that the sacraments are indeed occult rituals.

A sacrament is an occult spell. Believers say it is not because instead of working like magic, the sacrament only works on a person who wants to receive the grace and who has faith. But that is like saying that a love spell is not a spell at all if the one you want to love you has to consent to letting the spell work!

Magic goes by the law of correspondence, which simply means that like produces like. The sacraments are said to give the grace they symbolise: in other words we have like produces like.

Many Christians believe that you should not do the Ouija Board or meditate for you don't know what kind of spirits or supernatural influence you are opening yourself up to. And they have the nerve to inflict sacraments on their babies and eat communion wafers!

God would be more interested in people being holy than in them gaining holiness through rites which is too restricting and makes availability a problem. The Catholic Church has seven sacraments.

You could have tremendously holy dispositions one day and be ready for the sacraments. Then you miss the bus to the Church and the next day when you finally get there your dispositions are far from the calibre they were yesterday. That a God would decline to give you grace until you undergo a rite though you might have been more open to his grace before is disgraceful and superstitious. The sacraments were useful for getting people to trust in the Church for salvation so that the Church would trust them more. They exist for the purpose of ecclesiastical manipulation and empowerment. If you are reluctant to do heroic good for others, you may pray for them and do rites for them and tell yourself you are doing the only thing for them that ultimately matters. It is a way of feeling you are good for doing nothing.

Jesus said if you cannot trust a man in big or small things you cannot trust him full stop. The Bible sees human authority as regrettable but necessary for humanity is so dangerous and godless and deceitful. In this context no sane God would give humanity the power to channel his grace, especially in relation to forgiving sins through baptism and absolution. Such doctrines can only spring from human pride. Sacramentalism is deformed spirituality.

Sacramentalism is insulting to God. Even if God does not exist, the fact remains that it is bad for it would hurt him. If you think a burglar is in the house and you decide to beat him to death you are still a bad person. There being no burglar does not change that.

[Top of the Document](#)

SAINT

The Roman Church says that we always have some residue of sin in us no matter how holy we are.

“Lord, the end of another messed-up day. I let you down at every turn. I’ve lived for myself all through” (page 4, Friday Penance, John C Edwards SJ, Catholic Truth Society, London, 1985).

Even the greatest saint has sins (1 John 1:8-10). But to do good while sinning is making it clear to God that you will do good when you feel like it and not because it is right or because it is God’s will. That is totally evil as God is so wonderful so the good is not good but defiance disguised as good. To understand this is to understand the reason the Bible says that one sin defiles all the good you do (James 2:10; 3:10-12) and makes you a good actor. The result is spiritual blindness where doing your own will and not God's is made to look good and even pious. So the saints are really sinners who are whitewashed over by the Church. To honour them as saints is to honour their sins.

The Catholic Church prays to saints. If you really trust God and find comfort in him you will not be asking saints to pray to him for you. You will pray to God. The Church says that praying to the saints is really praying to God through them, it is giving them the prayers to give to him. If praying to the saints is really praying to God as the Church says then why don't Catholics simply pray to God? The reason must be that praying to saints is really satisfying our natural liking for having many human gods. Humankind did it for countless centuries so we haven't changed.

If praying to dead saints is fine, then why don't Catholics pray to the living? The reason is that the saints are thinly disguised gods and it is easier to believe the dead know all things for the living clearly do not. It is no reply to say that the saints have God's power to help and not their own power. In paganism, many gods had no power of their own but they were still gods.

The Bible teaches that Jesus intercedes for us before God (Hebrews 7:25). That blasphemously infers that God would ignore us and refuse to help us unless Jesus asked him. A perfect God will give help when its needed and will not need intercessors. Our asking is not important. God has to do x or its opposite anyway regardless of whether we ask or not. It is not that he is rude but it is just the way things have to be. He cannot keep waiting for our consent.

If God would bless you if Jesus never asked then clearly Jesus is not an intercessor for intercessor means a person who tries to influence a higher authority for you on your behalf and this authority has to make the decision if your request will be granted or not. To teach that Jesus or Mary or any saint can influence God is to deny that God is perfect. It is declaring them more powerful than he is. It is declaring them to be the real Gods.

The asking is about trying to feel you have some control when you do not. That is why prayer feels good but it is selfishness hidden as devotion to God.

If God won't help you until you ask or get a saint to ask, then you or the saint is better than God and God can be manipulated. The saint for example must be wiser than God.

Praying to saints is really turning to demons for it shows contempt for God and resorting to beings that are against him. They must be against him if they listen to your prayers and want them.

You can honour and respect the saints without praying to them.

[Top of the Document](#)

SCIENCE

Science teaches that there no truth claim or doctrine or belief that should be made immune to testing and questioning. Science is about always checking things out and rechecking. Religion refuses to change its mind at

least in matters supposedly revealed by God. The attitude is the reason for the gulf between religion and science. The other problem is that it is too easy for man to present his ideas as God's.

Catholicism is infamous for being opposed to science. Today it claims to respect science and both science and religion (the Catholic one) are valid sources of truth. Is it true that Catholic faith or any religious faith fits and endorses and learns from science and merely sees faith as another way of gaining information and truth?

If science says it is okay if there really is a God and he speaks, it still cannot take man's word for it that his word came from God. It is biased and unfair to take man's word for it that his words are God's. It is biased and unfair in principle. Also, when religious prophets contradict each other it proves it is risky to elevate any man's teachings to divine authority, to invest them with divine inspiration. Thus science will have to ignore religious claims. If science says it has no problem with God, we must remember that it is not that simple. It does not imply science must be open to religion or any religion. It could only be open to a religion that is from God. It will be open in principle but in practical terms this is not possible. Science cannot risk mixing man-made doctrine with scientific truth. It seeks to teach so it cannot encourage the layman to mix.

Man-made religion is definitely a threat to science and even religion should admit it. It can admit it. Man-made religion creates errors and as man's word is mistaken for God's people are reluctant to challenge it. They feel they cannot and should not query God's word. So such religion creates more error and where there is a lot of error it is hard for the voice of science to be heard.

If God and science are complimentary as religion says, this only applies if God is real. Mormons say God is a polygamous married man with great but limited power. Catholics say he is absolutely not like man at all and has boundless power. Science will be unable to do experiments to support either of these ideas.

We see that it is religion that says they are complimentary - science cannot say that. It may say they are not complimentary or that no body knows. Religion is consciously lying.

We see that if two theories fit together it does not mean they really are complimentary. Complimentary means that both theories have to be true. A wrong theory fitting a true one only threatens the true one.

We see that religion is trying to make its theories equal with the facts and theories of science. That is utterly deceptive, dangerous and disgusting. No religious doctrine could ever compare to a fact. No doctrine taken on faith could ever be equal to a theory that is developed after testing and experiments.

Science ignores the supernatural because the supernatural cannot be tested. A scientist can only say that an alleged miracle is unexplainable. Occam's Razor says that if something takes place that needs explanation, we must look for the most likely and simplest explanation. It does not say the explanation is necessarily right but it's the one we will choose if we are sensible.

Miracle and science are diametrically opposed. Those who are truly grateful for and to science, will not sully themselves by propagating miracle stories.

The whole purpose of miracle and magic beliefs is to encourage people to put them out of reach of any tests. The person who believes in a miracle is putting her belief beyond testing. For example, we could find out that the apostles were on opium when they thought they saw Jesus back from the dead. Would that prove that the miracle of the resurrected Jesus apparitions never happened? It in fact would not. If God wants you to see a miraculous vision then you can see it despite your propensity to hallucinate through drugs. It would take a greater miracle for a smackhead to have a genuine supernatural vision than a clean and normal and sane person. A belief that is made untestable is not worth anything. The doctrine of the resurrection being a miracle actually fails to make it any more important than the notion that a flower told you that a spaceship is coming next week to take you to a planetary paradise forever.

Suppose a miracle happened. All science can say, "We can find no scientific explanation." That means there might still be one. To say it is a miracle is an assumption - it's going too far.

The believer in the Bible who thinks that all knowledge - whether revealed by him or not - comes from God will find he has to reconcile science and everything else with the Bible. In other words, everything must be made to fit the Bible. Anything that contradicts it may evoke an attitude of, "We still hold the Bible is right and let us wait for more light. Maybe this thing that contradicts it will be proven false." This attitude can only lead to fundamentalism and distortion. The best obscurantist always pretends to be distorting nothing.

It only takes one or two false notions or beliefs or assumptions to make you go far wide of the truth. Hitler developed a bad view of all the Jews based on a few unpleasant stories about some Jews. And the New Testament played its role. Science is based on the fact that whatever assumptions and beliefs you have control how you view and interpret evidence and it seeks to reduce this tendency as far as possible. It wants to see things as they really are. This totally opposes the view that any alleged revealed religion should be considered when interpreting and trying to understand the evidence. It's what the microscope reveals that counts. There is enough to skew our perception without religion's input and especially with all the severe disagreements between religions.

[Top of the Document](#)

SECULARISM

Our modern freedoms, peace and wellbeing come from the separation of Church and state.

Secularism means that the state should be run without influence from specifically religious principles. Secularists make their policies as if there is no life but this life and as if all that matters is making people well in this life.

If a religion claims to have the important truths, then secularism is against those truths if it claims to be neutral regarding religion. To be neutral concerning the important and beneficial truths is to oppose their importance. Secularism in theory is neutral about religion but in practice this cannot be done that well.

For example, the state should not consider banning, say, contraception except on rational and non-religious grounds and shouldn't be doing it just because a pope or Bible says so. The taxpayer should not have to fund religious schools. It is not fair to have Mormons and unbelievers in religion financing, for example, Catholic schools with their taxes. If religion wants to influence, control and condition children it should pay out of its own pocket. Running the state is the state's business. Recently Islamic girls were banned from wearing head coverings in public schools in France for this was a religious practice that was being pushed into state territory. The ban was right. The girls' excuse was that their faith requires them to wear the coverings and so the ban was against their right to religious expression. With so many new religions coming up, it is impossible to please them all. Religion is not a right. Rights are based on needs. Nobody died from having no religion. Secularism is based on needs and religions that oppose it are against human rights. Religion is a privilege not a right.

Religious faith is not really about pleasing a God who comes first - even before the state - though religion would have you believe otherwise. What it is really about is people pretending that what they want to be true is probably true. Those people are out not for religion but for gratifying their desires and prejudices. It is not an issue of religion but of manipulative people. That is why crucifixes should not be displayed in state schools either.

Secularism is a human right. Religion is its opponent and may act like a lamb but it is still an opponent and a weakening influence over secularism.

[Top of the Document](#)

SELF-DECEPTION

A mother is hit by her son who she adores. She convinces herself that she dreamt it. She knows deep down that she didn't. But she turns off that voice that tells her that. Now she seems to believe that he didn't do it. She is engaging in self-deception.

Because she knows the truth and won't face it she is deceiving herself. She is deceiving anybody who she tells that her son would never hit her. When she seems to succeed in fooling them that confirms her denial - she finds it harder to see her own foolishness. Even when she simply says he is good, one of her implicit meanings is that he wouldn't hit his mother. So the deception goes deeper than her simply denying her son has or would hit her.

We are so good at self-deception that psychologists and psychiatrists deny that we can ever be completely unbiased and fair and objective. Christian psychiatrist Andrew Sims admits this. Page 146 of his tome, *Is Faith Delusion?*, says that all attempts to be objective or totally unbiased fall short in the sense that there will always be a bias or subjective aspect. In short, the unprejudiced observation does not exist.

Even the most devoted servant of God is practicing a degree of deceit in his or her religious affairs and practices.

The atheist must be engaging in self-deceit too in order to be an atheist.

The best we can hope for is that everybody's statements and beliefs are or are intended to be sufficiently accurate. Their accuracy and the intent to be accurate will have been degraded by the self-deceit.

Self-deception influences all we believe and testify to. Suppose somebody reports a miracle. Is it more probable that the claim arises because somebody is deceiving themselves than that a real magical event happened? We have stronger proof that people deceive themselves than we do of miracles. For example, everybody practices self-deception but hardly anybody sees miracles. And when they do they don't experience as many miracles as they do episodes of self-deception. Also, people suffer and die for their self-deception but you don't see anybody dying for belief in miracles.

Another problem is that a miracle can be caused by a magical violation of nature or it can be caused by a natural law that we don't know of yet. The latter is the most likely possibility of the two. Thus even miracles then cannot prove that the supernatural exists. Maybe the secret natural law rather than causing blood to come from a statue is actually causing people to think it came from the state though their mechanism of self-deception?

Christianity says the testimony of twelve apostles is enough to make belief in the resurrection of Jesus reasonable. The word apostle in the special sense is used to mean those who have seen the resurrection of Jesus and have been accepted as its official witnesses and missionaries. The Book of Acts say that the apostles chose Matthias as a new apostle in the place of the traitor Judas as he knew Jesus like they did. We say that the testimony of twelve psychiatric patients that self-deception is very powerful makes it more reasonable to deny that the testimony of the twelve apostles is enough.

Christians have twelve witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus Christ, the apostles. Did these witnesses deceive themselves? Christians say their testimony is accurate. They cannot know that so they are deceiving themselves - they would need to be the apostles to see if self-deception was at work.

We know of wives who died because they would not stop believing that their evil monster husbands who murdered them were good people. The evidence that people die for self-deception is better than the evidence that people die for the truth or what they genuinely know is true.

The evidence for the reliability of human testimony to miracles is always counteracted by evidence that people deceive themselves.

If religion makes self-deception worse or gives us another reason to engage in it as if we don't have enough as it is then religion is a bad thing.

[Top of the Document](#)

SELF-ESTEEM

Feeling good about yourself and liking yourself. If you don't like yourself you can't like other people either. You will be afraid they will not like you either or notice what it is that you don't like about yourself. Self-esteem is a sin in the Bible, God's word, for it commands that you should look up to everybody else as better than yourself (Philippians 2:3). So you shouldn't think you are as good as anybody else or let anybody else think they are good. In the Sermon on the Mount, Christ taught that if you love those who love you then you deserve no praise for that for even evil people love those who care about and for them (Matthew 5:46-48). If this love deserves no reward as Christ says then how much less of a reward one must deserve for loving oneself? Jesus says evil people get no reward for loving their families and friends. He really hates evil people when he says that you should get

no reward even if you are good person and care for your family and friends simply because they care for theirs too. It is like saying that people should be condemned for reading the Koran just because it is the "bad Muslim's" book!

Jesus' message is that if we look after our health it is to be solely so that we can help others and not burden them. Self-love then is no good. This tells us that if we do good for ourselves we must do it only for others and it must have nothing to do with looking for anything from them. You must serve them even if they hate you and plot against you.

The Bible also says that it is a sin to think you know anything without loving God (1 Corinthians 8:1-3). Only true Christians love God according to the Bible for they are born again so nothing anybody says who is not a Christian is to be valued. You need God to know things, for you are good for nothing.

Self-esteem makes a person rejoice in making others happy for he or she wants to share and find his or her happiness through others. To do this properly it is necessary to avoid anti-social acts like stealing and slandering and lying.

Christianity says we must do good for others just because it benefits God. It says that as we are not 100% sure God exists, we must have the attitude, "Hypothetically if God does not exist we must do it just because it benefits others". If the faith really believes all that then it is a sin to say you were glad you did the good because you enjoyed it.

Luke 17:7-10 (ESV) - 7 Jesus said, "Will any one of you who has a servant ploughing or keeping sheep say to him when he has come in from the field, 'Come at once and recline at table'? 8 Will he not rather say to him, 'Prepare supper for me, and dress properly, and serve me while I eat and drink, and afterward you will eat and drink'? 9 Does he thank the servant because he did what was commanded? 10 So you also, when you have done all that you were commanded, say, 'We are unworthy servants; we have only done what was our duty.'"

That says it all! It proves that if Jesus said love your neighbour as yourself he meant do good actions and it is not about feeling good or loving. In fact he commanded that you must feel you are no good.

[Top of the Document](#)

SHEMA

The Shema, the two foundational commandments, was first taught by Moses as a revelation from God and reaffirmed as such by the notorious Jesus Christ. The Shema commands that we love God as Lord totally and our neighbour as ourselves. Jesus preached Theofascism (unjustly devaluing people for the sake of God) when he told us to love God with all our powers meaning any good we do should be done for God's sake alone. He said that this was the most important.

The command he said was the second most important is the commandment to love your neighbour as yourself. Its inferior importance indicates that human welfare comes second to God (and religious dogma). God being almighty does not need to be looked after and people do which makes this particularly despicable. Jesus' teaching about love of neighbour reflects this Theofascism too for it draws its authority from God. Love of neighbour is not commanded because it is sensible but because God wants us to do it. Moreover, by doing it we put him first. How could Jesus and God tell us to love God totally or to love only God and then contradict this by saying we must love neighbour as ourselves too? Jesus himself had defined love as doing. For him serving our neighbour while thinking only of God and not him is love. He said we must love God with all our hearts meaning we must direct our feelings toward God and not others. There is then no contradiction.

We know by reason we cannot love anybody we meet as ourselves so the rule results in the destruction of self-esteem which brings out unsocial acts. To help a person just to please God is to insult and declare that person worthless. It is very mercenary. You love yourself in others because you can only love in others what you love in yourself. That is the meaning of the psychology dictum that you can't love others unless you love yourself and in so far as you love yourself. The rule love your neighbour as yourself is harmful and destructive and produces anger for you can't do it for nature decrees you shall love your neighbour through yourself not as yourself.

Jesus in Matthew 10:37 says that whoever prefers a parent or a child to him is unworthy of him. He condemned it as a sin. If you would defy God to save your child's life then its a sin. If you are mad at God because your daddy died horribly that is a sin. You are preferring daddy to God. If the Catholic tolerates their child's refusal to go to Mass that is a sin. Preferring means that if there is a contradiction between your devotion to a relative and God then you choose God.

[Top of the Document](#)

SHROUD OF TURIN

The Turin Shroud is hailed by Christian fanatics as the burial cloth of Jesus Christ showing what he was like when he was lying dead in his tomb. Whether you believe or not that it is inexplicable comes down to what "experts" you wish to listen to. But, when you consider the rule that you must accept a supernatural explanation only when all the natural ones are impossible, it is evident you have to side with the sceptics until absolute proof comes. If you make your own concoction of herbs and chemicals and stuff out of the fridge and get it tested you will be told that there is a mystery about what some of the ingredients are. Put the bottle away for a hundred years and it will be even more mysterious. Something is innocent of being a miracle until proven guilty! Inexplicable does not amount to miraculous! In reality, it is impossible to be ever reasonably certain that an event is a miracle. Unknown natural laws may do strange things.

Believers claim that the image cannot be rationally explained at this time - they fail to remind us that even if that is true, the image is inauthentic because of the major errors made on it. It is certainly not a miracle then.

Believers do not tell us the whole story.

Believers like to say the shroud is excellent anatomically. Maybe but that does not mean it is anatomically excellent as an imprint. No far from it!

The image contains errors - the face in particular should show wraparound distortion but it doesn't. A cloth pressed into a paint stained or bloodstained face will have a distorted image. There is no wraparound distortion on the cloth at all which is interesting.

The man bled around the head from a crown of thorns. But the "blood" looks as if it was put on artificially. The blood is very clearly defined like drops. Real blood would not be sitting on top of the hair but would have matted especially when Jesus would have sweated a lot. There is too much blood everywhere for a supposedly dead man.

The Shroud man has a lot of blood all over him. The Bible says that Jesus was buried according to the Jewish custom. This to many means he would have been washed. However others say the custom was for criminals to be buried with their blood. Obviously the Bible is referring to the general custom so he had been scrubbed down. The burial of criminals would not be the general custom. Jesus was not thought by the Jews to be a real criminal. Also, when the Bible says the women went to the tomb on the third day to anoint the body, the body was not treated as a criminal corpse. And they are said to have been sure that if there were soldiers at the tomb then they would be allowed in. Another hint. However, that visit was an eccentric departure from tradition for the body was considered to be decomposing by then and it shows (if the account can be trusted) how much Jesus was thought not to be a criminal when they were prepared to do such an over the top thing. Surely a body that is washed would last a little better than one that was not? They act as if they did not expect too much decomposition.

The Bible would tell us what it meant by the general custom had it meant Jesus being buried with his blood like a criminal for it tries to emphasise how demeaning for Jesus his death was. Plus the general custom has to refer to the washing for you don't speak of a custom for some criminals as the general custom.

If Jesus' corpse was washed then why is there so much bleeding after? If he bled like that then clearly he wasn't dead when he was put in the tomb. Even tiny cuts emitted blood indicating life. Dead men don't bleed. Big wounds may give out some blood but with this is not like bleeding and there won't be much blood. Was the Shroud created to indicate that Jesus was not dead at all to support the rumour that Jesus survived the crucifixion and that was how he "rose"?

Jesus and his followers did make a point of debunking Jewish traditions that were not scriptural but he would

have had no problem with the washing – that was only decency.

The believers say Jesus was not washed but the Bible must be taken as indicating that he in fact was. The Shroud was forged by somebody who did not know that Jesus was washed.

The blood has a painted appearance - I am only saying it looks that way and it shouldn't and especially so if there are indeed no brush marks on the image. You see no evidence that the blood was disturbed when the cloth when the body would have rolled and moved inside it during burial. The Shroud should have been rubbing over the body and distorting the stains as the body was put in the tomb. No smudges, smears or distortion are evident. The image has clear bloodstains which show an unmistakable intention to make it suitable for display - a major reason to deny authenticity. Jesus would have had messy blood marks for spices were used at the burial according to the custom and rubbed into his body. We should have a body that was all red with the blood rubbed all over in the spices and ointments but the Shroud shows the opposite.

All old blood shows the same blood type, AB, yet Christians pretend that the Shroud and another cloth the Sudarium might have come from the same person for the blood type, AB, matches. And we are not told that the alleged blood on the Shroud is not really blood.

There are errors such as the man's hair hanging down as if he was standing up and the face image should be distorted if the cloth was draped over the face.

Also, if a body had lain in the cloth on its back, the back image should be pressed deeper into the cloth and a lot of smudging should have taken place. But what we see is that the front and back images are light - they show no difference in density (The Jesus Relics, page 184).

The hands which should have fallen back to his side when they were not tied conveniently cover the private parts. All this shows forgery.

The perfect muscular physique of the Shroud man does not fit Jesus who lived rough and who should have been malnourished. Do you really imagine that Jesus would have been working out? Would a man who despised luxury and became a travelling preacher and who expected to die on a cross be imagined as being that into fitness?

Middle eastern pollen was reportedly found on the cloth. But interestingly, pollen from the huge preponderance of olive trees in Palestine was absent (The Jesus Relics, page 177).

The image was made so long ago that chemical alteration and ageing and fading have added to the mystery.

The believers like to claim that radiation miraculously made the image. But if that is so why did the rays not penetrate the cloth? All you have is some surface fibres scorched. And where are the reproductions made to prove the theory? If it was not possible centuries ago it should be possible now.

Independent and open minded and non-religious researchers are kept away from the Shroud (page 224, The Jesus Relics). Scientific access to the Shroud is limited - chiefly to a few who are prepared to deny that its a fraud or declare that fraudulence is inconclusive.

Many deny that the image is miraculous and say they can explain it.

According to The Jesus Relics, STURP, the body that exists to research the Shroud manipulates the investigations and tests in order to keep true to its notion that the shroud is genuine. They have used dodgy people like Frei to give the impression that pollen tests show that the shroud came from Palestine where Jesus died. They have used the mad Whangers to declare that images of Palestine's flowers can be seen on the cloth. They have not let sceptics study the cloth itself. Whanger used image analysis techniques to show that the Shroud and the Sudarium of Oviedo covered the same body but Whanger is not even a scientist. His work has been laughed at by forensic anthropologists (page 204, The Jesus Relics). Plus Whanger is not the respected scientist that he is called in Catholic literature but an eccentric ageing ex-psychiatrist. STURP used John Heller and Alan Adler to refute the

discovery of Walter McCrone that the Shroud was made using a painting technique even though they did not have the experience and prestige of McCrone. They used improper techniques to give the impression that the blood on the cloth was not paint but real blood (page 219, The Jesus Relics).

The believers claim that the Sudarion of Oveido supports the authenticity of the Shroud and that this cloth covered the head of the shroud man.

The shroud man has a bloodstain on the forehead like a mirror image 3. This is not on the Sudarion (page 205, The Jesus Relics). The forehead part of the Sudarion is largely free from blood marks while this is not the case for the Shroud.

Carbon-dating for the Sudarion has been performed - accurately we hope! But it points to a date from about 695 AD (page 209, The Jesus Relics).

If religion exists such desperation in the search for evidence for the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ and to find his image, is that not a warning that it is bad for the mind? The supporters of the shroud carry on like addicts.

The prestigious French magazine, Science and Life, reported in 2005 that it proved the shroud a forgery by making the same shroud from materials available in the middle ages.

The Bible, as you will see from my entry on MARTYRDOM, states that we must check first that the Old Testament God predicted the resurrection of Jesus before we have the right to believe the apostles' testimony that he rose. No such predictions exist so we can be sure that nothing supernatural happened meaning that if the Shroud is a miracle then it has nothing to do with Jesus Christ.

We don't need to be able to explain the Shroud to know that it isn't a miracle! It is not the only item in the world that is surrounded in mystery.

The Shroud is hailed by some as a miraculous photographic negative. But the positive image shows a man with white hair and a white beard (page 182, The Jesus Relics). This is not what you would expect of Jesus Christ who would have been dark and who was allegedly only in his early thirties when he was put to death. The Shroud does not have the properties of an actual photograph (page 188, The Jesus Relics).

Carbon dating has pointed to a medieval origin for the cloth but believers, including "scientists" sneered at the dating from the very start though there is no evidence that the Shroud existed in the first thousand years after Christ.

With all the reasons the Turin Shroud can't be that of Jesus Christ, it is clear why the image was made so subtle to keep the Church wondering what it was to give it a chance of becoming popular enough so that the Church would have to come to terms with the existence of the cloth. Otherwise the Church would have come down too hard too soon and the Shroud would have ended up on a pyre. And if for no other reason than that it depicts a man who was not dead for he was bleeding too much.

Even if the cloth is strange and inexplicable and even if there is real blood on it, it still does not give us any reason to think these effects came from a body. The image does not carry the huge distortions that would be seen if a body had lain in it and imprinted the images. The image has nothing to do with proving the existence or resurrection of Jesus Christ. It is very good for proving that many religious people have some kind of mental disorder. And it is worrying that sane people enable them to tell their lies.

Do you really want to believe in a miracle cloth that glorifies martyrdom purely for religious grounds? Christians believe that Jesus did not die to save the poor from genocide or for human rights but purely for religious doctrine.

[Top of the Document](#)

SLANDER

Accusing a person of an evil that they have never done. All world religions do this without exception mainly

through their teaching of free will. They say we have free will and are guilty of what we do wrong. If we are not free, we are not to be blamed or condemned.

It is no answer to say we feel free so we are free. Animals look as if they have free will and they feel free. They prove they feel free by the way they hate their freedom restricted. And nobody believes they have free will.

We could be programmed to feel free and not be aware that we are programmed all the time. And indeed it makes sense that we feel free even if we are not. And if the feeling is not inherent we certainly develop it. It is wrong to accuse people of free will over faith because religion should be made for people not religion for people. Its not faith that justifies such an accusation, it is evidence and there is none.

[Top of the Document](#)

SPIRITUALITY

A mental illness that is based on dealing with your imagined need for the divine. It is a sickness for it conditions people to have needs they would not otherwise have and the fewer needs you have the better for then the less you have to fear and be unhappy about. Spiritual people may dump material addictions: prestige, money, success, fame and power, for another one: religion.

Many say you can have spirituality without religion. But whatever. You cannot have religion without spirituality which is why there no justification for religion. Spiritual people should experiment without dogmatism to see what ideas and techniques help them instead of tying themselves to ideas and tenets that they are not encouraged or allowed to dissent from. To need anyone even God is to refuse to be happy if they do not do what you want. That is not love. What you do is you detach yourself from all things and realise that you are in charge of your feelings which will program you to change. Religion tries to make you need God and that causes fear and suffering. God implies that cruelty is good. To be in any way religious is to have a mental disorder.

[Top of the Document](#)

SPIRITUALIST

A believer in psychic abilities that allow gifted people to communicate and get messages from the departed. When it needs psychic powers to work, it is possible that the powers are inventing the entities which could be products from one's own subconscious mind. The powers could be divining facts about the dead while the medium thinks the revelations are coming from the dead who may really be non-existent. Spiritualism is black magic for it is a waste of time and the powers should be used on nurturing the only thing that matters, self-esteem.

Christians say that spiritualists are foolish for they open themselves up to powers they do not understand and which could be dangerous. Surely Christians are worse for they don't know if Jesus really was all-good and they try to open up to him. Maybe he is an evil spirit now. Maybe he has no power at all and evil spirits do meaning they are what Christians are opening up to. And the Christians expect us to open up more to Jesus than any spiritualist ever asked anybody to open up to the spirit world!

[Top of the Document](#)

STIGMATA

The phenomenon which makes some people seemingly unaccountably carry wounds similar to the crucifixion wounds of Jesus Christ. Given that in recent times brilliant magicians and conjurers have fooled scientists into believing in their miracles and then revealed that they were hoaxing that explains a lot of the allegations of past experts that they had seen inexplicable stigmata. The Church has never officially accepted the vast majority of the stigmatics as real victims of a particularly barbaric miracle. Like all Catholic miracles, the stigmata imply that God uses evil to do good which is a heinous insult for he does not need to.

The case of the fasting girl Molly Fancher, the Boston Enigma shows that some people have unexplained abilities. These abilities have not been explained but we know they are natural. That is all we need to know. Molly Fancher never made any supernatural claims. We must take her word for it.

[Top of the Document](#)

THEODICY

An attempt to prove that a good God can stand by and let us suffer, cause scandal and lead others to sin.

If people would believe in an amoral impersonal intelligence who makes all things rather than a God and that will give them a life after death there would be no need for theodicies.

To say that people suffer and a good force is creating the suffering and using it for a purpose is plainly inexcusable and malevolent. Believers can't deny that their doctrine: "God doesn't create or love human and animal suffering but merely permits it to happen", is a lie.

Suffering is bad energy and God created it and the power to suffer. Bizarrely, religion says that evil is not a power or a thing - it's a good thing in the wrong place. It's a lack. They say that if God created evil he would prove himself to be not all-good. So their answer is that he didn't create it. What blindness would urge them to exonerate a god who makes viruses just to torment us? Their desperation shows through. They cannot face the evil in the world so they water it down by saying it's part of God's plan.

Also, if God can be excused for the fact that things fall short of their good potential why can't we?

Evil by definition is that which is intolerable and useless. To say an all-good and all-powerful God lets evil happen contradicts this. Even if God can bring good out of evil the evil still should not have been allowed to happen. And the notion of God bringing good out of evil is ridiculous and subtly denies that evil is evil. God can only do good in spite of evil and not because of it.

It is better to say that suffering is totally useless and abhorrent for that is denying that it should happen, or be allowed to happen, to any extent. It's kinder. We might use suffering for good but that does not make it excusable. Believing that it is useless increases our resolve to destroy it. It is better to disapprove than to approve of suffering to be on the safe side. That can only be done if the existence of God is denied.

Theodicy is really saying that justifying God matters more than people or more accurately that if there is a choice between God and people then people do not matter. Or more accurately still, God as the good original of all goodness in people alone matters. God comes first for being perfect infinite love he has to naturally be the only really important entity. So the concept demands to be put first even at the expense of human welfare and happiness.

A baby suffers and dies in horrendous agony over a virus that God made. If you are properly horrified by human suffering, you don't even try to justify it. To try speaks of false compassion and a hardness in the heart. What would you think of a person who tried to justify even his own father committing the foulness of child sex abuse? The truly good person rejects certain evils outright and makes no attempt to excuse them and if a suffering and dying baby is not in that category nobody is and nothing is. Rejecting evil and suffering in such cases can wreck your own life and emotional health but you have to do it. It is not about you.

Are you doing it because you want to think better of God? Man is imperfect and is not entitled to all our devotion. God supposedly is perfect and entitled to our full and unreserved service. Religion says to do it for God.

This could be a mask for doing it for yourself.

People must assume that it is for you are certain that the baby suffered in a way that you cannot be as certain that God exists.

It is illogical to excuse the existence of the evil in order to please God when we would not do the same thing to please man. At least if you do it for man, you are doing it for people who you know are there. As for God, you tell yourself there is a person there but is there?

If you see terrible evil and you resist letting yourself feel and think the terribleness you are doing it for yourself. You are selfish.

God cannot ask us to sin. He cannot tempt us or create forces that cause temptation for that would mean he was tempting us. We then must cause our own temptation though we think we do not. This puts an impossible burden on us for all of us feel tempted to do wrong. Deny God and that removes the burden.

If you have time on your hands, spend it on helping people and not on trying to save God's reputation. That the doctrine of God asks for such salvation shows it is despicable. Evil is not justifiable and they try to justify God letting it happen and his making of the experience of depression.

Some people encourage suffering people to believe in God so that they will feel that God is with them all the way helping them and giving them inner strength. But is it not preferable to encourage them by saying, "There is no all-powerful God. All who die become perfect and they use their powers to help the living. They are not all-powerful and they absolutely hate to see you suffer. They cannot take your suffering away but they will give you inner strength. They will do what they can." A God that lets you suffer cannot be said to absolutely hate to see you suffer when he won't snap his fingers and take it away. Looking for inner strength from supernatural beings however is a sign that our friends and family are not sustaining us as well as we need them to. Or it could show that we are not letting them do so to the extent that we need it. The notion of supernatural help gets in the way of surviving on the sheer love of those whom we love. It gets in the way of learning to do this. If we say it helps, we forget that doing without it would help better.

Instead of caring if there is a God, we should care about being a benevolent and fair God to others. If there is no God and even if there is, we have to be as God to them. Christianity claims that though God is a noun we should treat him as an action word. If you say there is a God and that explains evil, it follows that you take responsibility for this and the only way you can do that correctly is by sacrificing your life for others and being where you are needed most say among the lepers. The vast vast majority of Christians do not heroically fight evil. Their doctrine of God suggests they do not hate and renounce evil as much as they say. It is evil even on Christian terms for people to be defending belief in God when they are not being God to others.

[Top of the Document](#)

THEOFASCISM

Theofascism - preferring God to people - is worse than sexism which looks down on women. It looks down on everybody for the sake of God or gods. To say such beings exist is to automatically say that you are not going to consider human beings the most important beings you know of in the universe. This is very seriously evil for you cannot prove that God exists to a sufficient extent to justify that.

Why should we worship say God then? Because he is good in himself and to us? Or because he is powerful? He does not need us to be grateful to him so he has no right to it. And to adore him because he is powerful is to make a tyrant of him. It's indecent. A human being trying her or his best deserves as much worship for they are trying to do the best they can and so are as good as God in their hearts. To say we should love God and have a relationship with him is opposing reason and what is best for humanity.

Those who say that they know God exists as much as they know they have a body are obviously suffering from delusion. They afflict themselves. One has to afflict this delusion on oneself to condone the evil ways of God.

God is the key to absolute power which is why Judaism and Christianity were theocracies in the past and would be today if they were able to pull it off. It works like this, "This is what God has commanded, kill heretics, don't use contraception to keep your wife if pregnancy could kill her, persecute homosexuals, pay us money, obey all we say, so you have to do what we the men of God and his representatives on earth want and if you don't you are evil - maybe not deliberately but you are evil and therefore should be worked against." Therefore it is about violence. Harboring violence inside you encourages you to become violent and stand by when others are violent towards those you despise.

If Tony hits Amy, that is bad for he hurt another person. It is not bad because he broke a law. It is bad because he hurt someone. To worry about the law would in effect be to care about rules and power and not persons.

Christians have to accuse him of more than hurting another person but of offending God. Belief in God then

means if you do wrong then you intended to offend and demean God as well. It makes the wrong you do worse. The belief is therefore evil. It is heartless to be more worried about offending God than hurting a human being.

Theofascism stands for absolute standards of morality. An absolute standard is one that must never be broken or diminished. To say you must love God completely with all you are is really to say that it is never right to risk that love by getting attached to a human person. It follows then that there may be other absolute standards that seem harmful. It would be no surprise then that it could be absolutely wrong to let a witch live as the Bible says.

Theofaschism says we have to detest sin and disrespect for God. In other words, we have to hate the victimless crime of sin. God being almighty and all-knowing cannot be harmed. He is perfect so his happiness cannot be tainted. Even if sin hurts people we have to hate it for God hates it and not for the sake of the injured. Religion condemns the person who hates because his family was tortured to death. This person is a better one than the Iceman and Ice Queen who focuses the hatred on a victimless crime - who cares only about God and not the suffering.

If you can't learn to respect yourself you cannot learn to respect anybody else. Genuine goodness starts with yourself not God.

[Top of the Document](#)

TOLERANCE

It's not very flattering to know that you and your ideas are only tolerated by others. Tolerating means putting up with something bad in the hope that it will stop. Why would you be tolerated? Because hating you and doing violence against you would be worse evils than putting up with you and your ideas. Tolerance is not the view that one belief or religion or opinion is as good as another. That is indifferentism and relativism. They do far more harm than intolerance ever did. They are self-deception and hypocrisy at their worst.

So you are only put up with for the tolerant can do nothing about you. In other words, they think its a pity they can't bully you or silence you or hurt you for being you or for what you believe. You can't say they love you. Love cannot be forced. To say those who want to hurt you but can't can love us contradicts that.

Without religion there would be less to tolerate.

Tolerance is indirect incitement to intolerance. It is intolerant towards the intolerant. But to force a person to be tolerant is as impossible as forcing them to be loving. It cannot be done. You may manage to make them seem to be tolerant but that is all. The tolerant only behave themselves until they get the chance to show their real colours.

[Top of the Document](#)

TOTAL DEPRAVITY

The total depravity doctrine stands for the idea not that man is as dangerous as can be but that man does nothing good or bad with real sincere and good intentions and so man can do nothing that pleases God. So it claims that there is nothing of value to God in anything human (as taught by 1 Corinthians 3:19-23). So the doctrine does not say that we are raging monsters but merely that we prefer our own version of good and not God's version. The reason nothing pleases him about us is because we are by nature sinners. That is to say that the Bible says we are not sinners because we sin but we sin because we are sinners. This merely recognises the fact that Christian teaching says that sin shows the kind of person you are. And it is the kind of person that you are that is the real problem. There is no room in this doctrine for silly notions about loving the sinner and hating the sin for there can be no distinction made between the two. No wonder Protestant Christianity as taught by the Reformers and even by Catholicism in the days of the Pre-Protestant St Augustine has led to so much hatred and sectarianism and bloodshed.

The doctrine accuses the good deeds of Florence Nightingale of being as bad in intention but not in consequence as the crimes of Nero for both were spitting the same hate and defiance towards God. One way, Florence's good deeds would be more dangerous than Nero's cruel ones for it is harder for her and nearly impossible for others to see how bad she is so she will not realise her need for God's mercy. The doctrine encourages evil among those who don't want to convert yet. It tells you to be a Nero and not a Florence Nightingale who may help others for

their sake and not God's and therefore sin.

Total depravity was taught by Jesus Christ (Mark 10:18) and the apostles (Romans 3, 7). The apostate early Church abandoned it to suck up to the Roman Empire until it was revived at the Protestant Reformation by Martin Luther. The doctrine implies that you should take your lessons in faith and morals from the God inspired scriptures and not from tradition for man preserves tradition and man is at least secretly anti-God so it completely refutes nearly every major doctrine of the Roman Catholic cult. Also, how could we be sure the scriptures are God-inspired when man hates God so much and when it was man that wrote these books? We end up enslaved to guesses. We know by experience that when we do good we do it for what is in it for ourselves. Humanists do not see this as evil but the Bible does – hence the doctrine of total depravity. Obviously if us humankind are as bad as Christians would like us to think then we should live by the rule: guilty until proven innocent!

The doctrine that human beings are universally bad and hate good though they use it for their egotistical ends incites mistrust and hatred especially against people who are not Christians. It also encourages people to be evil and devious for they believe that when they are born evil they should act evil and think evil if they can't act evil.

What if the atheist agrees with the Bible that humankind cares about what it wants good to be not what it is? At least he or she is not making the problem worse by saying we have to worry about God and angels and saints and priests and not just human beings and the animal kingdom!

The atheist would see the religionist as being worse than the humanist in terms of loving good on her or his terms and not on its own terms.

[Top of the Document](#)

TRANSUBSTANTIATION

Refers to the conversion of the bread and wine at Mass into the body and blood of Christ. This is a major and basic doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. The Church worships the consecrated bread and wine as Jesus Christ who it teaches is God. The bread and wine are given the worship due to God without qualification. It is blasphemy to worship something as God unless you have proof that it is God as much as you do that God exists at all.

It is against the Bible for it says that anything that cannot protect itself from desecration is not divine but is an idol, a false God. The Bible has no time for people making excuses for adoring as God what is not God. The idolaters of old made plenty - "O Apollo lives in the statue or somehow the statue is him and he let the robbers break it for a purpose we are unaware of." God makes it simple: if it is not immune to harm then its not God and there is no excuse for adoring it.

If you were pretending that the bread was the body of Jesus you would do what the Catholics are doing. If they are not getting carried away by playing charades then nobody is.

In John 6, Catholics claim to find proof that Jesus taught transubstantiation. The word mistranslated eat is trogein, which means to crunch or to gnaw like an animal or to tear apart with teeth. He says that whoever does this has eternal life and he will raise him up on the last day. This is clearly symbolism so the flesh is symbolic too. It is said he spoke that way to convey the reality of eating his body in the form of bread. But if he used an exaggeration to convey eating then what other exaggerations are there in the text? Maybe flesh and blood as well? Why couldn't he simply say that God has the power to change bread and wine into his body and blood without anything seeming to have changed?

We read 1 Corinthians 11:25 and learn that that the cup is the new covenant in Jesus' blood. The cup wasn't literally the new covenant. The cup is not referred to as blood in this account which Paul spells out in the context of correcting abuses. So you can be sure he did not require his people to say the cup was blood.

Why not say that you have transubstantiated your copper into gold and your gold into copper? The doctrine violates commonsense and if the Catholics have the right to spout nonsense like that then you have the right to say that you have turned your keyring into Napoleon

[Top of the Document](#)

WITCHCRAFT

Though witchcraft today claims to be a benign nature religion the fact is that all magic is evil magic.

All magic is evil magic for it is trying to avoid what really matters. What matters most is not spells, believing in God, a man who rises from the dead, miracles but believing in your natural power to accept - maybe it will take a long time - that bad things can and do happen so that you will cope better.

Magic is trying to manipulate reality and other people and to circumvent or drop the law of cause and effect. If you cast a spell for money, you certainly think that if you use cause and effect alone it may or will not happen so you need to get an effect that has no cause into the mix.

Believers claim that love spells are wrong for they are too manipulative for they are trying to make another person love you. They say that instead you should do a spell to make yourself more lovable to another. But there is no difference in forcing a person to love you and in forcing them to see that you are lovable and therefore attract them. Nobody can love anybody unless they see them as attractive. If love spells are wrong, then who will want to do magic?

God says that we should not suffer a sorceress to live (Exodus 22:18). He could have demanded some other treatment for her but he demanded execution. God evidently believes that there is something in this magic – why else be so harsh against it - but we know better! The view that God opposed it for he wanted to keep his people free from pagan influence doesn't explain the harshness.

Magic workers do loads of protection and health spells and still get cancer and have accidents and die young so magic is wasting time.

The magical doctrine that we must work with nature not against it says, "Okay I want to believe in this nonsense and to do that I must avoid evidence or proof that it is rubbish and just see what seems to be evidence in its favour." That is why the magician never tells you to do spells instead of getting your cancer treated. Trying to avoid the law of cause and effect, the law of nature and then saying you embrace it makes no sense. Magic is too much about what you want to believe to be a commendable venture. It has got that in common with miracles and prayers.

[Top of the Document](#)

WORSHIP

To give honour and praise to a deity. You cannot praise somebody without it being really about you. You judge they are to be praised and all we do is biased in our own favour. Everything I do I do it to please myself so all worship is a lie and a superstition. To need to do it when all you need is yourself for you should love others because you love yourself is indicative of a serious neurosis.

[Top of the Document](#)

A CATECHISM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, Catholic Truth Society, London

BERNADETTE OF LOURDES, Her Life, Death and Visions, Therese Taylor, Continuum, London, 2008

MEDJUGORJE AFTER 15 YEARS, Michael Davies, Remnant Press, Minnesota, 1998.

PADRE PIO, Patrick O Donovan, Catholic Truth Society, London

PADRE PIO, MIRACLES AND POLITICS IN A SECULAR AGE, Sergio Luzzatto, Metropolitan Books, New York, 2010

POPE FICTION, Patrick Madrid, Basilica Press, San Diego, California, 1999

REASONS FOR HOPE, Editor Jeffrey A Mirus, Christendom College Press, Virginia, 1982

THE BLEEDING MIND Ian Wilson, Paladin, London, 1991

THE JESUS RELICS, Joe Nickell, The History Press Limited, Gloucestershire, 2008

THE SHROUD OF TURIN!! Is it Genuine or is it a Forgery? Dr Johnson C Philip, Dr Saneesh Cherian, Edited by Gregory Anderson. Creative Commons. Copyright Philip Communication. First Edition 2014.

THE STIGMATA AND MODERN SCIENCE, Rev Charles Carty, TAN, Illinois, 1974

WHO CHOSE THE GOSPELS? C E Hill, Oxford University Press, New York, 2010

WHO IS PADRE PIO? Fathers Rumble and Carty, TAN, Illinois, 1974

