

## JESUS WHEN LOOKED AT WITHOUT THE GOGGLES IS A WASTER

Jesus is 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 gopeller 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.

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.

The atonement refers to 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.

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.

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.

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.

God the Son allegedly became man, later named as Jesus, in the womb of the Virgin Mary. This is referred to as the incarnation. 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.

John is the only gospel of the four that 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 cranny could make claims like that. The law meant two witnesses apart from yourself.

The evidence against Jesus being authentic is clearly valid and settles the story. He was not who he is claimed to be.

