

DISCREDITING THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

Discrediting the Miracles of Jesus

July 2007

[Revised - 2018]

All rights reserved to the author

ISBN – 978-0-620-38240-3

(Johannesburg, February 23, 2007)

[Written in South African English]

Email address – jlefthanded@telkomsa.net

DISCREDITING THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

[Revised - 2018]

Julio Carrancho

Other books by the author:

Recovering Reason
Free of Fundamentalism
The Unstable Gods
The Unstable Worshipers
Islam From Outside
While a Religious Man
Deus de Emergências [Portuguese]
Pai Nosso Que Estás Nos Céus [Portuguese]
Enterrando Cinzas [Portuguese]
Around Religious Forums
Tweeting Religion
Discrediting Our Father
An Angry God
God Told Us To Tell You

Dedicated to Intelligent People

PREFACE

Table of Contents

Preface	1
Introduction	5
Miracles	9
The next miracle	29
The incredible miracle	37
Five loaves and two fishes	49
Walking on water	57
Healing the born blind	67
Resurrection of Lazarus	75
Other miracles	85

WHY WOULD THERE be a need for a perfect Bible in the church? It never happened in history, because God is not perfect: God could be – if that – Impersonal Light, or a Cosmic Ocean of Energy, surely not able to write books made of paper and ink.

We would need perfection in more urgent matters than a mere book of miracles. For example, why are we all born the same way, all innocent, to die of a thousand and one painful ways, if there would be a perfect God? Why do we arrive in this world to enjoy life and many spend their existence suffering? It would be urgent of God to attempt perfection in such matters before thinking about a book with his religious ideas. Therefore, the church is wrong about the Bible. There is no need whatsoever for any perfect book in this world. Perhaps what we would need would be a perfect religion where no fear of any god or any man would exist: perfection in belief, where nobody would need to believe the incongruence and incoherence of religion, where no man would attack another with doctrines of eternal reprisals from an incompetent god looking for the worship of inferior creatures.

After many years believing the Bible as God's word, I now reason with myself how could I not see that there should be a better way to resolve our "spiritual impasse"? The Bible proposes that we, the human race, owe some Almighty a terrible debt that we can only pay by becoming Christians. God wants to offer us something we must accept, otherwise terrible reprisals will ensue. That is, we are not to decline the offer and still be on good terms with that Almighty. "He" is very temperamental, unstable, and incredibly nasty if "his" ways are not esteemed. But isn't the problem one where God allowed the situation to deteriorate to a point where "he" saw that only drastic measures would resolve it?

It is at that junction that one has to ask God: Wasn't there a better way to help us, without so much trouble on both sides? Was that the best plan the Almighty could come up with? In the face of so much evil in the world, and its immoral mess, where we are firstly born innocent, is God with no guilt whatsoever?

That's the theme in this book. I want to propose that the personal God of Christians failed his mission by not taking the adequate measures to fix the problem – whatever that was – at a time when the solution would be simple; which leads us to propose that such a God does not exist, and so the Christian Faith is a myth and a lie. The number one accusation we have against the Almighty is simply that "He" punished us in "Adam" but granted the Devil permanent residence and invisibility in our world. We were severely betrayed.

As for Jesus the presumed "Son" of that "almighty" God – some call Jehovah, some "Father" – there appears to be two of them in the gospels. One is to be interpreted as an impersonator, extremely dangerous and a fanatical figure, intent on promoting himself and his abstract "kingdom

of heaven" for his own aggrandisement, the one focused mostly in this book.

The other Jesus, the one who is revealed by expressing positive statements, like the Golden Rule, our innocence at birth, God is Light, and so on, is very inconspicuous in the gospels. With two to choose from, the church selected the wicked and the negative one, the fanatical Jesus, that who would say detestable things like he came to our tormented planet not to bring peace but a sword; in modern days he would say "a machine gun!"

This book stands against that nasty and unwelcome christ.

INTRODUCTION

MIRACLES STAND IN the Bible to be discredited before believed. A conscientious student is not going to play stupid and accept them at face value if they can be questioned. Even if thousands believe them, one student can discredit all, because, ultimately, it is the church that has been in the business of taking advantage of religious superstition and fear of brutal gods, insane demiurges, and weird, dangerous christs. If they can be pointed out as infamous and their deeds morally insulting we have then the absolute right to stand against the church and the miracles those “gods” sold to thrust ignorance upon the human race. It is therefore a fair proposition.

If it were possible, yes, we would believe the miracles and their performers; but the reality is another: the biblical miracles are so badly presented that to disqualify them from veracity is a simple job, for the data in front of the student is illogical and thus objectionable. To circumvent this intellectual immaturity of the gospel writers, their defenders propose that the scriptural material is divinely sanctioned and godly inspired. So to the better; that is, if we start the studying by assuming that God inspired the miracles and then inspired their representation in writing,

the more material we have in hand to question, dissect and discard them as real stuff.

Sure, we realize the indisposition and even hatred the churches react with against anybody trying to touch this sacred cow of the Scriptures, but the miracles represented in the New Testament are only credible if one disconnects his intellectual prowess or powers of reason. Sorry, but that is to ask too much and opening the door to more retail superstition and submitting to religious merchandising with the Bible.

The first objective step and sound policy regarding the miracles in the gospels is to deny them before accepting them as fact. Many dedicated students throughout the centuries have read those accounts with much disdain, but the powerful church of their days would pick up weapons and apply stringent reprisals if the business of religion was going to be disrupted. It is still the same today, with the only difference that the church in general has no lethal weapons to attack and kill. But be warned: when a church, a denomination or a “Church Council” is dominant in your area, country or state you are in danger of reprisals.

The church is a two-faced instrument of the Devil – if he existed – when it comes to defending its territory. Millions have been slaughtered and other millions traumatised for the crime of resisting an official church in their country. You stood up against a miracle and the church stood up against your livelihood. To next kill you was a short step. Go read the so-called “Fathers of the Church” of the second and third centuries and see for yourself how ravenous they were already to defend their brand of faith. Or, go read Paul’s letters to his groups and see how quick he was to launch an attack of anathemas to his opposition – Galatians 1:8-9. Why the gospel of grace would include cursing others of a different opinion is beyond insanity.

Therefore, to discredit all the New Testament miracles we need only to uncover the invisible details; the hidden content which the gospel writers carelessly didn’t notice; or better, were not intellectually developed enough to imagine that the readers could catch them, the superstitious folk they were.

MIRACLES

1 – first imponderable

IT'S THE APOSTLE John who states in his gospel that the first miracle Jesus did was to turn water into wine at a wedding party – John 2:1.

To believe this marvel is like believing the moon is a big lump of Roquefort cheese, for we can quickly detect several imponderables, if not outright absurdities. Two most prominent are Jesus lying to his mother and promoting drunkenness. Let us explain the details.

Miracles in the gospels are dishonest publicity and propaganda stunts in a context of no credible witnesses, with unrealistic chances of ever having occurred. Most liberal critics of the NT [New Testament] text agree that in all probability not one of the miracles ever took place in real life. The most obvious testimony against this one is that it is not recorded in the other canonical gospels.

Either it wasn't considered credible, or wasn't actually the first; in any case, both instances are very implausible to a reasonable inspection. Why wouldn't the synoptic start the list of miracles with this first spectacular

one, if we would have to accredit the theory that the gospels were verbally inspired by some indefinable “Holy Spirit”? Verbal or plenary inspiration would mean proper order and/or historical sequence. Nothing like that can be detected in the “chronology” of the gospels.

John appeared in the “canonical plateau” 60 years after Pentecost – assuming correct the conservative and orthodox dates. Wouldn’t this logic be enough proof of two things: one, there is no verbal inspiration, and two, there is also no inspiration for any historical sequence? In other words, the entire narration of the gospels has no chronological credibility, but a “document” with an ad hoc and random presentation; excepting perhaps the “last week of the Saviour”, sort of plan. Surely we would accept that situation if we lived in those dark, backward days where little or no intellectuality of substance existed.

Most people couldn’t read, never mind to apply any reasonable logic to the hearsay going around. We need to stress here that John gave no credibility to the “miracle” of the virgin birth story, which wasn’t yet “official dogma” in his days. That would be a miracle with much more commercial value to represent in his gospel. Why didn’t this “John” mention the virgin birth? He never thought about it; in his days, that “choreography” wasn’t yet an item in the religious list of commercial artefacts to help an elite of lazy agents to gather under the same “religious umbrella” – read general Christendom.

Also, we could actually say that John lied to his readers. Luke had written his gospel – again, accepting the fundamentalist dates – some thirty years earlier and never referred to any water turned into wine, after declaring in writing that he was going to be the most accurate possible – assuming the “Inspirer” would lead him to the right information. This is to prove beyond reasonable doubt that at least some of the gospels do

include serious inaccuracies. We need to remember that, had this “first” miracle happened, it would have been around the year thirty, whereas the gospel of “John” being written conservatively 60 years later.

What about the details’ accuracy? Certainly much folklore had been circulating in the churches about Jesus’ miracles all based on anonymous eyewitnesses – see Luke’s honesty in disclosing this source right at the start of his gospel. Luke wins on points over John, exactly because he wasn’t shy to tell his readers up-front the source of his documentation: anonymous storytellers. John, on the other hand, wasn’t that honest in several areas of his narration of miracles, including his different “vision” and exaggerated details. A major stumbling block in his production is the prayer in chapter 17, where he is remembering verbatim the entire prayer in a scene where all were sleeping, sixty years after it would have happened. Consequently, if we had to choose between John and Luke, John would be second.

Meanwhile, in the circles of Higher Criticism the gospel was not written by any apostle John, but by an unknown impersonator more than 100 years after Pentecost. By that time, “miracles” had been an enlarged feature in the repertoire of the Messiah, to convert him from an adventurous revolutionary into a god of sorts. Check much studying material on the Internet, including that from the Roman Catholics, those who naturally thought to discard the Bible as their only source of truth, for all its tortuous information, how clever, really. That’s why the popes opted for a second bible they assembled for their own use: the “Traditions” of sinister opportunists like themselves. Cheeky, but clever indeed.

2 – second imponderable

Another imponderable is that nowhere in the description does Jesus

say that the water was changed into wine. It is “John” who inserts the comment in the story. The story is so badly presented that it ends up being a monument to unbearable credulity. Why would Mary be the person to worry that the budgeted wine had already been consumed? Well, it is apparent that Mary had nothing else to worry about at that moment but to keep the lot of guests including herself and her son occupied with drinking alcohol. Naturally, we can also establish that she was used to drinking the stuff, and perhaps more than what was enough, otherwise she would rather say that it was too bad the guests had already finished with the whole lot. But, no; Mary got rather worried that the wedding wouldn’t go well without more wine to keep the guests happy. Do you see it? It is right there in front of your “spiritual eyes” I would guess.

Mary was, no doubt, worried with the shortage of wine, inferring that she was used to drinking the joyous stuff – why do you take wine to a wedding? The text is incorrect by saying that they wanted wine – verse 3 – when in fact they wanted more wine to help them get on with their happy festivities. It is true that there are always a few guests that indulge too much in wine and other spirits and become the uncalled for attraction of the party. It’s Mary who first wants to help to get more wine, and approaches Jesus for the solution.

How Mary knew that Jesus could supply the inebriating “spirit” the text doesn’t say. But it is rather clear that Mary’s call to her son for help was for something spectacular. They had drunk already all the wine supplied for the party, and surely some were intoxicated; therefore, Mary wasn’t the saint the popes worship. Instead of leaving the disorderly party, she actually asked for more of the inebriating substance. I assume here that Mary could have also gotten a little drunk and speech-inhibited in

the end; perhaps Jesus and the disciples too – check below how much new wine was supplied.

3 – third imponderable

The next terrible imponderable is when Jesus lies to Mary by telling her – it appears rather abruptly, if not rudely – that it wasn’t the time to do miracles [and surely it wasn’t], but next performs the supposed-to-be enchanting first one. Please, go see how the “orthodox” Bible commentators do their usual tricks to soften and change the text. Do you know how much controversy this “miracle” has caused all through the centuries in matters of understanding its reason to be mentioned in the so-called Holy Scriptures?

It could be inferred from this “incident” that Jesus had not planned to start his public ministry at that particular wedding, although he had already chosen his disciples. Imagine deciding to impress them with a miracle where natural water of the fountains of God on Earth was going to be converted into the wine of men to encourage drunkenness. Certain Baptist factions will insist the stuff was pure grape juice, with no alcohol, in spite of the text clearly mentioning wine. Wine has always gone through a process of fermentation, and thus it contains alcohol. New wine would also produce drunkards – see Acts 2:13 “These men are full of new wine.”

If Jesus intended to supply grape juice, he was then not too clever to perform the miracle at the end of the common supply of real wine. The real miracle would be to get rid of the fermented liquid supplied to the wedding and replace it with a blessed amount of the purest grape juice or any other divine one. This miracle, therefore, is not for Baptists to change and preach sermons about grape juice.

However, let us not forget that the other three canonical gospels leave

out from their narrations this “spectacular” miracle. In other words, we could assume that Mary’s interference in her son’s life wasn’t appropriate or sanctioned by the Holy Spirit; that is, not an inspired intervention, but forced the “original” plan to have to be suddenly changed. This “miracle” does certainly look like the odd one out in the coming collection, so far; but there are even weirder ones than this as we’ll see.

Now, when the Scriptures are attacked and discredited like I just did, the staunch fundamentalists will arrive quickly to discredit our “assumption” and replace it with a “spiritual” explanation; that is, to state that such a miracle had been planned by God and all that, and it has imbedded in a spiritual lesson. Well, the facts in the text of the four gospels negate that theory, because no such miracle is mentioned in the other three texts. Where is the infallible inspiration to determine that such a miracle was indeed planned as the “initiation” for the public ministry of God’s Son? Nowhere; nowhere can we confirm such an assumption.

In other words, the writer of this gospel by introducing this particular “miracle” as the starting moment of Jesus’ public ministry commits himself to a confrontation of discredit in the eyes of the intelligent students. Jesus’ disrespect towards his mother, plus his promotion of alcohol abuse and drunkenness, perhaps also getting a little knocked out with wine and cheap talk, all that is a demonstration of no inspiration in the Sacred Writ so-called.

In the presence of this overwhelming evidence, we will reason that [this] “John” made a serious mistake in the manner he presented Jesus to his readers. He utterly ridiculed and discredited the Master he intended to exalt. No wonder, a dedicated and intelligent student will react with some horror to this, the weirdest “miracle”, right at the outset of Jesus’ public ministry. If the wedding was a propitious occasion to perform

public miracles dignified enough according to the moral ground of the guest, surely something more humane could have been chosen. No; Jesus is portrayed here as an immature amateur, messing up his ministry right away in front of all. As already said, it is not only that the details are not clear but what was the moral lesson for this performance? This “John” – an impersonator from the second century for sure – says a little later that Jesus did some other amazing miracles, but why on Earth not present those in place of the wine one? What spiritual lesson can a student retrieve from this miracle of special wine?

4 – next imponderable

The other imponderable is that no disciples, just assembled by Jesus the day before, is said to have tasted the divine wine, and yet they seemed to take great amazement in the “miracle” and then believed Jesus’ divinity. Sorry, it doesn’t ring clear, and it doesn’t hold to logic. Verse 11 says: “This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him.” What? To change water into wine to satiate a crowd of happy drinkers was the best way to manifest Jesus’ glory? Hardly; first serious mistake John did with this incongruent statement.

Why not rather, we repeat, list one of the apparent real miracles mentioned in verse 23? We read over there that Jesus performed many miracles in Jerusalem, but not one of those would be revealed. How inspiring can that be? It is in the previous verses that Jesus attacks the vendors in the Temple, a misdemeanour mentioned at the end of his ministry in the synoptic gospels. Was that more important than to describe the miracles Jesus did in the area, as some solid testimony to his divine powers? Sorry, but again John missed the point. I maintain

that he wrote several sections of his gospel without thinking, never mind inspired.

5 – Jesus lies to his mother

But now, consider this other inference in the story. When Jesus said to his mother “Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come”, it was a lie, for in fact, in the subsequent narration, was exactly at that time that his hour had arrived to show the miracle stunts. Clearly, Jesus started his public ministry with a lie to his mother, followed with a miracle to help heavy drinkers satiate their peculiar thirst. No, it doesn't tie up with the divine attributes of a Saviour arrived to save the world from drunkards and other sinners. It is this John or another one who would state that drunkards would not enter into heaven. Well, Jesus did a miracle to help them drink more. How come later they were not allowed in heaven? Weird, if you ask me. Of course drunkenness vis-à-vis alcoholism is evil for the suffering it causes to the victim and family, plus society at large, but Jesus did indeed promote drunkenness at a wedding party to initiate his public ministry as the Great Teacher and Saviour. Come on!

Of course the fundamentalists will not see it like that, and will stretch their commentaries to elongated exaggerations to excuse the textual contradictions and elaborate on their private prejudices.

I believe, from my side, that “that Jesus” was never around anywhere in Palestine, but was a figment of the superstitious imagination of the second century, 100 years after Pentecost. No such “Jesus” ever lived on Earth, nor did he ever change water into wine. The entire scenario is provocatively dishonouring to the original plan to save the world from vice and alcoholism. This is a “miracle” that leaves a dreadful impression

in the reader about not only the Son of God but also his mother and his disciples; a bunch of victims of a certain impersonator by the name of “John”, whoever he was.

Now, honestly, if I don't have the right to interpret the Bible my own way, and try to make sense of it all and particularly this weirdest of miracles, why do other students? Why must a fundamentalist come all aggravated to tell me that I must accept only his private interpretation of the biblical text? It is unfair if not deceitful.

6 – how much wine was it?

The three containers would hold six hundred liters of the happy stuff but the story is so badly presented that we find nowhere described that water had been turned into wine. However, if the containers were holding that extraordinary amount, surely there would be enough reason to exalt the Saviour for all his benevolence. Imagine the euphoria and jubilation of that intoxicated crowd after drinking another six hundred liters of the up-brightening liquid!

There are two proverbs – 31:6,7 – teaching the reader to drink the stuff to heal a heavy heart and the miseries of life:

“Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink, and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more”.

We assume that Jesus never read or wanted to observe that instruction. Nobody was going to die or was sad at the wedding to take the extra toast; therefore, the rule was reversed. For the fundamentalists the Bible is the absolute word of God, infallible and inerrant, all come from real divine inspiration, but in those words we see God unable to help the needy “Chosen People” of the “Promised Land” with a genuine

gesture of grace. The same God that inspired the Bible is there instructing the use and abuse of alcohol to overcome the terrible injustices of life. It is a God who could not solve the problem at its origin, when it would be quite easy, but later suggesting the drinking option.

Jesus would later say to his audience that he liked to drink wine: “The Son of Man has come eating and drinking, and you say, ‘Look, a glutton and a drunk, a friend of tax collectors and sinners!’”, Luke 7:34 (ISV). Funny it was that it had to be the religious elite to accuse Jesus of drinking with his friends, the same elite Jesus accused of being the greatest hypocrites in the forum.

What was wrong with a drink or two? In other words, the Bible is not the model for total abstinence, period. Baptists who forbid any use of wine drinking are an authority unto themselves; not biblical, and not in the fashion of Jesus, who liked to drink whenever the opportunity arrived. He felt no conscience whatsoever by drinking with his friends; it was normal to use wine and strong drink in those days like always. In fact, this particular “Jesus” enjoyed good wine, could make it out of water, of the best quality, and started his public ministry to become the Saviour of drunkards involved with a crowd of wine drinkers to whom he supplied more of it.

Who knows, if he would not at other occasions make the bright liquid and enjoy it with his disciples. If he did, John left it out of his gospel, although he would say at the end of the script that Jesus did many other miracles and wonders that would fill the pages of many books; logically an absurd exaggeration, but it illustrates the point that perhaps miracles were often repeated. Why, in other words, make the best wine only for other people, when what he needed was only a few liters of natural water

to present his friends with an opportunity to celebrate whatever they wanted.

Let us be frank and honest: wouldn't you do that miracle often if you had the genuine talent for it? Why not even be popular for that particular miracle? Why not even do business with it? Is it too strange, do you think? Didn't anybody ever do business with miracles? Have we never encountered religious charlatans industrious enough to take advantage of our superstitious credulity? Have you heard of “apparitions” and their subsequent perpetual parades for profit? Jesus was too immature to see the disastrous implications of that “miracle” at the wedding.

7 – not a canonical miracle

What other miracles were less important than to mention the water to wine? One thing we realize quickly: this “first” miracle is not acknowledged by the synoptic gospels – the other three in the NT. There is also no concordance regarding miracles in the four canonical gospels. As a matter of fact, Matthew's first miracles start at chapter 8 with the cleansing of a leper. I find those miracles of healing the lepers one most amazing contradiction of Jesus' ministry, in the sense that he would prefer to heal the lepers rather than destroying the original bacteria of that dreadful disease. Why was this allowed to develop over the centuries by the Creator, when he could have stopped it right at its outset? Logically, we have enough mental capacity to reason that the Creator would accept that we humans somehow deserved to be attacked by disease. It is therefore a most dishonouring attribute of God to send his Son to heal some few lepers while leave the source intact to carry on its devastation throughout the generations. In other words, a very suspicious God.

The second miracle in Matthew is the healing of the centurion's

servant; the next is the healing of Peter's mother-in-law; followed by the rebuking of the winds and the sea. For Mark the first miracle is the casting out of a demon from a possessed – 1:25; then was the healing of a leper – 1:41); the next is the cure of the paralytic man lowered from the ceiling – 2:3; and then Mark mentions that many other miracles happened, those he doesn't bother to detail – 3:10. And for Luke the first miracle is the exorcising of a demon – 4:34; the next is the healing of Peter's mother-in-law – 4:38; and in verse 40 is inferred a list of many other miracles, not detailed.

In John, the next miracle after the water made wine is the healing of the son of an official of the king – 4:50. Where is therefore any inspired order? All random, ad hoc, absurd stories.

8 – wine to fight stress

If we'd accept the Old Testament [OT] together with the New, the comments about wine would involve a terribly contradictory message.

Of course we know that the “dogma” of drinking or not wine has a vast scope for debate, because some favour drinking the stuff, while others absolutely condemn it. A student could write a PhD thesis on “Wine in the Bible”, I would guess.

I was a Nazarene for many years and did regularly hear messages about the sin of drinking wine, and I knew I could not belong to the church's board if I wasn't totally abstemious. I don't drink by principle, sure, because of my religious background in that particular denomination, but I also know that many other groups accept moderate consumption of wine.

However the challenge for the staunch fundamentalists is to explain

how come the OT even instructs you to drink wine and get drunk if life catches you with its miseries.

We can find two proverbs – mentioned above – instructing and sanctioning the use of wine if we're going through a difficult time in our life. But of course, Paul would later change that and condemn drunkenness. I agree with him on that score. But where did he get the “doctrine” stated at 1 Corinthians 6:10 that no drunkards shall inherit the kingdom of God? How did he know that? That is false theology, if we took the context that “the wages of sin is death”, in this physical body, since once we die we cannot sin again, etc.

Sure, Paul was terribly wrong in his apostleship of instructing religion to the deprived of a normal intellect; for, wanting or not, all drunkards will go to heaven after death, because all humans are evolving into Oneness of Light, where we all will lose our earthly “personality” – my belief.

Obviously Paul never understood this divine concept, being a man victimised by Judaism, where a traumatised God Jehovah ruled unchallenged in all “his” cruelty. Paul never understood the beauty of spiritual evolution as well, but I assume he is by now above all of us in that process and wouldn't care much for the kisses the popes give to his image in the Roman Catholic altars – tongue-in-cheek.

Jesus told the Pharisees that he came not to call the righteous but the sinners – Matthew 9:13 in the Minority Text, Vulgate and all modern versions. Later, some uninvited “inspector” added “to repentance” to that verse; he did that because he could not understand that type of true repentance – cleansing of a contaminated spiritual life in this immoral world – would be done only after death; when we will lose our material and physical “personality” and become one with divine, impersonal Light; so we guess.

Proverbs 31:6-7 say “Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish, and wine unto those that be of heavy hearts. Let him drink, and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more” (KJV). The context was a sober instruction to keep kings and authorities away from intoxication, but next it is contradicted regarding other individuals, those who when drunk would commit much injustice in their immediate environments. So much for the beauty of God’s word, you understand.

The message should be standard in both Testaments, if we have to assume that both texts were Inspired Scripture. They were not: how come the same God offers two different instructions? That “God” is therefore not the same yesterday, today and forever; a religious slogan repeated ad nauseam in church.

Commentators like to use the first part of verse six “Give strong drink unto him that is ready to perish” as a sort of prophecy regarding Jesus refusing the “vinegar” some soldier offered him on the cross, practised to mitigate the excruciating pain. Some versions say “wine vinegar”, or simply bad quality wine; otherwise, if it had been good quality the soldiers would drink it themselves; not the vintage Cabernet Sauvignon Jesus could produce by miracle for weddings. Surely God “abandoned” his Son to his tormentors, but at least one compassionate human being – unaware of whatever prophecy – tried to help him in the horrific execution God had prepared – all believed without facts, as it were.

Matthew contradicts the other three gospels by saying firstly that Jesus didn’t drink the “wine”, but then observes the contrary – Matthew 27:34, 48. One could believe that Jesus took it and had time to thank the “unknown soldier” – before expiring – but no disciple was nearby to hear and later register that Sacred Scripture. All his friends abandoned him, even Peter who said he would never do that; so much so that not one of

Jesus’ friends helped him to carry the cross: a stranger had to do it – Luke 23:26. Surely, all things being equal, some “scripture” was uttered right there, but unfortunately followed by an earth tremor, which made the “anonymous eyewitnesses” to quickly forget it, and so a vital part of the Sacred Writ was irremediably lost!

One could believe that Jesus pronounced – apart from his universal prayer for the criminals killing him and for the whole humanity, Luke 23:34 – other important verses that would be holy content, but unfortunately nobody paid any attention to him. The tremor, the sun’s eclipse for three hours (!) and the crosses standing up in spite of all that (!) occupied the gossip in Jerusalem for weeks; who would for the moment worry with Jesus’ last words; at a much later stage the gospel publishers would organise the Holy Script with its necessarily invented suspense.

The New Testament is therefore incomplete; and I mean it. The entire NT is terribly tampered with and vital information was never registered or was later reorganised, while part removed by some sinister hands, Rome bishops. To accept that all was done with divine integrity would mean to believe an impossible fairy-tale. That’s the way I interpret the passage, which is my individual prerogative. “Interpretations” mean God’s carelessness in representing the truth without different angles; in such a way that nobody had any business trying to find the “hidden truth” behind the encoded text – nothing is beautiful in the choreography.

The dismaying context for that verse in Proverbs would be God’s cruel, unfeeling and hardhearted attitude for the dying. How come God is merciful, in a world where we are born all the same way, but to die God convened a thousand and one? Why would this weird God write in his word that a man dying a terrible death should be helped with

“strong drink”, with the highest alcohol content, instead of allowing the condemned to pass away without pain? What sort of god are you worshiping? Therefore, if the Bible were the true word of the Almighty God, we would have enough ammunition just in that verse to condemn “him” for his heartlessness and inhumanity. But, surely, the Bible is just a religious, manmade script, saturated with incongruity.

That God would say about the dying: “Hurry! Give him strong drink, pure alcohol if possible, so that he breathes his last quickly and with little pain! Hurry!!” Is that the God you worship? That’s one of the many reasons you need to reject Jehovah as the Almighty: he never did a decent gesture of mercy to anyone; he was an Egyptian idol invented by a deranged patriarch called Moses. The true God is to be some Impersonal Light with no darkness, if IT exists.

Proverbs does clearly tell you to drink and become drunk if life has dealt you a nasty blow. Check how other versions put it for clarity. One instructs us to drink and get drunk to fight depression – Living Bible! That is, God seems to have no other solution for his “Chosen People” in his “Promised Land”, which a good psychologist would contest. Another is a beauty of condescending from the same God: “Beer and wine are only for the dying or for those who have lost all hope” – CEV. In this case, not even God could help the poor soul, should he lose all hope. But surely God could intervene by his own initiative, could he not?... Surely God could mediate and should have done it at least at the time when the problem was minor in size, minor. Sadly, not even when the solution for our handicapping seemed quite simple and easy. God didn’t, and so disqualified himself from the holy pantheon. Terrible, is it not? God is condemned for incapacity.

And that is the quandary Bible exegetes and commentators are

tormented with: why would God look from heaven, see the misery his “Chosen People” in his “Promised Land flowing with milk and honey” and instead of fixing the problem suggested drunkenness to overcome it, even if temporarily?

It is terribly weird, don’t you think? You must ALWAYS remember the overriding and stinging argument that puts God off balance: Why would God not act on our behalf when the situation began to upset us? That question can and should shake God’s throne, and I have not encountered one single Christian capable of a reasonable reply either. That is, there was a time in our human history when the very first human resorted to abusing the fermented liquid, at a time when the problem was indeed small, and of a quick and honourable solution from God’s point of view, if we understand the dynamics of a merciful and loving God. Did God do the honourable thing to help that human being? No. Look at the disastrous consequences of Noah’s abuse of wine: civilizations were affected – well, that is, if we take the story or fable seriously, tongue-in-cheek.

Wine is a tremendous industry worldwide. How can God now stop it? God’s final solution for alcoholism and all its terrible miseries, it seems, is going to be a nuclear devastation at some weird location called in “abstract Greek” Armageddon where millions of innocent humans will be instantly incinerated, drunkards or not. If that God existed, we would recommend that a team of psychiatrists should urgently check his mental ability to perform normal duties; surely he would be quarantined and isolated somewhere in the outskirts of the Big Bang; or “his” case would be declared untreatable, and banished to live forever in the darkest black hole. Christians believe in a god like that and worship him with no intelligence, for it surely is idolatry.

But in the end, they are all innocent victims of religious charlatanism.

I say: it is a criminal activity of certain men to take advantage of our natural fears of the afterlife, if that exists, as it is also criminal to intellectually molest naïve and innocent children with stories of Adam and Eve, Noah, Moses, King David and the Child Jesus, plus apostles, saints and miracles. Religion has not advanced our intellectual maturity, and will continue on its disastrous route of spreading the ambiguous fear of invisible vacuum until we dispose of it – not with violence; not to emulate the religious brutality of the past and present. Therefore: do we have to believe that the Old Testament is the infallible word of God? Certainly not.

Paul blocked drunkards from arriving at the kingdom of heaven, but he never explained what that “kingdom” was all about; he didn’t know; he imagined it was a monarchy where he would receive a crown for good services. What good services? Who can help us after 20 centuries of guesswork? Nobody knows a thing about that “legendary” “kingdom of heaven”. John the Baptist was announcing it two thousand years ago, and Jesus, in all immaturity of his early thirties, followed his madness that ended in a massive revolt and massacre. Jesus’ disciples could never understand it either, nor can we.

Jesus refused to tell them in Acts 1:7 the “when” the illusive “kingdom” would come. And we now know why Jesus wouldn’t tell his best friends the truth: it would be at least two thousand years for the “phantom” kingdom to be “restored” – after a nuclear war at some “Armageddon” never spoken before to anyone. Imagine the deadly radiation.

Sure, drunkenness is evil, because of the moral devastation it causes worldwide, and all that. Yet, God is surely to blame for it, for those two reasons already mentioned: one, the Bible instigates the use of alcohol to “remedy” our human misery; and two, such a powerful God with so many portentous attributes couldn’t do a honourable act of mercy to protect us

from that horrendous vice when the problem was small. There you have it. A real God seems to be some Impersonal living Light: the One we are evolving to, if that, who knows. It’s not a kingdom: it’s oneness, one would say. If it’s not like that, who would know what it is, and why care?

...

Here’s how those verses of Proverbs appear in different translations:

Verse 6:

1. Beer and wine are only for the dying or for those who have lost all hope – CEV.
2. Use wine and beer only as sedatives, to kill the pain and dull the ache – Message.
3. Give strong drink to one who is perishing, and wine to the sorely depressed – NAB.
4. Give strong drink to him who is perishing, and wine to those in bitter distress – RSV.
5. Hard liquor is for sick men at the brink of death, and wine for those in deep depression – Living Bible.
6. Give beer to those who are perishing, wine to those who are in anguish – NIV.
8. Give strong drink to the despairing and wine to the embittered of heart – REB.
9. Give strong drink to one who is perishing, and wine to the sorely depressed – Catholic.

Verse 7:

1. Let him drink, and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more – ASV.

2. Let him have drink, and his need will go from his mind, and the memory of his trouble will be gone –BBE.
3. Let them drink and forget how poor and miserable they feel – CEV.
4. Let him drink, and forget his poverty, and remember his misery no more – Darby.
5. Let them drink and forget their poverty and unhappiness – GNB.
6. Of the terminally ill, for whom life is a living death – Message.
7. When they drink, they will forget their misery, and think no more of their burdens – NAB.
8. Let them drink to forget their poverty and misery – Living Bible.
9. Let them drink and forget their poverty and remember their misery no more – NIV.

THE NEXT MIRACLE

1 – the second

SINCE IT IS impossible to determine which one was the first miracle, the second or the third examining the canonical gospels, we will take the one described in John 4 as the “next”, without implying a sequence.

The “second miracle” according to John was also in Cana of Galilee, but right away there is a problem: it was performed months after the “first” – according to Matthew Henry’s commentary – when Jesus returned to that locality, after some serious problems in Jerusalem and other places, which creates a consternation for the fundamentalist Christians to resolve if the canonical constitution of the gospels is to be upheld. Why would John tell us that Jesus’ public ministry would start with a miracle and next perform the second one months later? Nicodemus observed to Jesus, in the previous chapter of John – third – that he was amazed at the [many] miracles performed. Why were those miracles never mentioned?

Well, wait. Here comes the avalanche of Bible commentators trying to explain that when John said “second” he didn’t mean that. But for

goodness' sake what was the obstacle to have a clear sequence and clarity in the chronology of events? Why was the text written without order? Why would we need "commentators" and Bible exegetes, plus theologians and teachers to explain the text for us? Because there is a serious problem right there: if the "Inspirer" had done it on purpose, then we have the right to complain strongly against the scheme: where is a proper sequence and order in the gospels?

We will have a serious problem with the many different "interpretations" that "elite" arrived at, and so, to be on the safe side, I have to award myself with the right to interpret the text my way. Par for the course; fair is fair. You don't agree with me, I don't agree with you; or perhaps we all agree to disagree, while God could have had the problem sorted out when it was still minor in size. That's my strongest point about God's inability to rescue us from ourselves. A nice God would have sorted out matters in our favour, so that we would not need to fight and hurt ourselves about subjective religion, as if we were all victims and losers.

Am I wrong? Certainly not. Theologians have disagreed with each other for centuries, and we have to presume that those individuals are the literate students, with erudition of the highest standard. But what if we cannot trust them, and disagree with their mutual fighting and theological struggles? Do we blame them or the "Inspirer" and "his" inability to be precise in order to avoid disagreement? Do you see how strong my argument is? Therefore: do you agree with me or not? I win, thanks; call me presumptuous as if I cared.

What the hell is then the matter with having to believe "miracles" when the folks in need thereof were victims of diseases or genetic problems God could eliminate from the Earth, and no more need for miracles? God's psychology is wrong.

Why must I accept and believe Matthew Henry, Adam Clarke, Scofield, Calvin, Luther, Barnes, Darby, Augustine, Aquinas and the other dozens if I am intelligent enough to spin the text myself. Ah, I think this argument is irrefutable, and no "Bible interpreter" can argue against it. If the Holy Spirit could not be absolutely clear and chronologically accurate, then, goodbye verbal or plenary inspiration and Holy Scriptures' status: it is a game and/or a trade of religious opportunists. Actually, the income produced by the Bible and interpretations galore thereof count into the billions of dollars annually. Many men take advantage of our gullibility, superstitions and fear of "Invisible Vacuum" [gods] to live a parasitical life from expedient at that expense. When you give money to a church you become a voluntary victim of a particular "Bible interpretation".

But returning to the "second" miracle, the same experts will defend that in the interim between the first two Jesus performed many others, albeit the Holy Spirit wouldn't care much for their details and so this "second" instead of being the fiftieth was labelled the next after the first. Sure you would have realised soon that those Bible defenders are always in the business [literally and figuratively] of explaining a divine book where much content doesn't make sense, although we have the right to question John's honesty in this scenario. Do you know how much text has been dumped on paper in the "exercise" to explain this divine book saturated with inexplicable folly and square circles? Well, divine books are all written in that fashion: always in need of some students trying to make sense of them, by interpreting their context according to certain propensities.

What about the many others presumed miracles done in the interim? Were they not worthy of mentioning in the holy book or entitled to a sacred description? We can surely imagine that basically Jesus performed

the same type of miracles all the time: healing the sick. So, after a while it became like a monotonous routine [like in Charismatic churches... and their charlatanism], the spectators demanding better excitement.

The water changed into wine was something really spectacular only in John's appreciation, hence calling it "the first". The other disciples didn't see anything fantastic in that special wine; somehow they discovered the trick and resolved that any other amateur christ or serpent enchanter could do the same. After all, that wine wasn't anything that special; the master of ceremonies was already drunk enough to talk nonsense. When he shouted "This is the best wine!" it wasn't the first time he talked rubbish and tripe that afternoon. Every other disciple noticed it, including Mary, except John. He was too young and easy to mesmerise with Egyptian tricks, and so he remembered the "miracle" for the rest of his life. Sixty years later, at 90 years of age, suffering from arthritis, deafness and loss of memory John was still charmed by that "wine". Did he ever wonder if there was any spiritual lesson in the trick?

Surely – and here is wisdom – that impressed the young apostle to a point where he sort of forgot the other many miracles Jesus is said to have performed in and around Jerusalem. John was amazed with water converted into wine, oh, yes, he was. He could never forget it; therefore, he mentioned it as the first, and discarded as inferior the other rather more dynamic and serious ones of healing the sick. As if he could reason to himself: "The sick will always be with us, unfortunately, even if Jesus would heal all in this year, but, boy, water changed to wine, oh boy, it's unique for sure! I will put it as Jesus' first miracle in my best-seller!" Well, we can see the age of John in describing the "first" miracle and leaving the real ones out: he was a naïve, superstitious simpleton, believing in [Egyptian] magic.

Jesus had learned miracle-doing while in Egypt for some years – the unknown ones of his life, from twelve to thirty; surely he had been somewhere – and was probably more at ease with that trick of changing water into wine when all the guests were already drunk. "Fantastic!", thought John to himself. And sixty years later that miracle was still vivid in his deteriorating memory.

Matthew Henry tries desperately, like other Bible doctors, to rearrange the sequence, but because those godly men did that trick all the time, trying to reorganise the chronology of the Lord's life we offer them the cold should and read their comments with a pinch of salt to avoid having to call them liars. Each and every one of those "commentators" went out to defend and promote the brand of faith they believed. Some, should they have enough political power and social authority, would impose their subjectivity on the rest, and apply reprisals to enforce it. Do you remember the Roman Catholics? That type of offence.

2 – no witnesses

So, the "second" miracle was the one described in John 4:46-54. If he had already read the other three canonical gospels, he discarded as irrelevant the order of miracles presented there. The gospel of John is therefore a document with lots of question marks in matters of truthfulness and accuracy. Did he notice that no other gospel quoted his "first" miracle? If he did, oh my goodness, he passed his expert opinion on their distortion of the "facts". That is, John is a silent but conspicuous witness against the miracle presentation of the other three canonical gospels. And that is also strong evidence that, again, there is no way the "orthodox" commentators can defend "Divine Inspiration" in the Bible.

No miracle has credible witnesses to certify them. This particular

“second” is like all the others: the source is not disclosed. Jesus returns to Cana and “a certain nobleman – his name is not important to mention, you see – approached Jesus for the healing of his dying son – again, no name.

That is the pattern: most miracles are in the region of the anonymous individual. Funny that John and the other writers could remember the impact of the miracle but they left out the name of the beneficiaries. They observed the miracle’s impact on the superstitious folk as it were. This nobleman was well known in the area, the text so implies, his name not unknown. Why would his name be withdrawn? What “inspirational principle” could be applied for the omission?

It is a strong point against this miracle’s authenticity. Meaning that if the name of the nobleman couldn’t be remembered, how can we trust the other details of the miracle? John, John, my friend: you messed up the miracle right away; your second one, do you see it? How can we believe the rest of your production, dear apostle? In the “first” miracle you said water became wine; your own impression, for no other individual confirmed it; you made it up all by yourself, we have to assume. Neither Jesus, nor his mother, nor anyone else clearly confirmed the six hundred liters of water were real wine. But now, here is another opportunity for you to recover your self-respect but you failed again. Not a good start, dear John, as far as miracles are concerned; that’s why you don’t mention many. You seemed to remember only the weirdest.

3 – a small miracle

The nobleman implored Jesus to go with him to Capernaum, a day’s walk, and heal his dying son, but observe carefully how John puts Jesus’ reply. Jesus could have answered the nobleman in the simplest words: go, your

son is healed. Yet, to convert this pathetic miracle into a propaganda stunt, Jesus himself takes the opportunity to advertise his miraculous powers when he replies instead: “Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe.” That healing was not to be a “sign” or a “wonder” of publicity of a particular Christ. There was a real need, it appears, like there had been many other needs for centuries but no Christ ever appeared to sort the problem out once and for all. The fact that children would die in their young age was a real problem that God should have fixed in some beginning when all children were innocent. Why, dear Jesus, would you not see the problem from its real angle: that is, that a child has the human right to be protected by the Almighty Creator, free of terminal diseases, if God is so benevolent and merciful as the Bible claims he is. And, instead of healing all dying children right away, you took the cynical opportunity to advertise you miracle skills. Come on, Jesus! We’re not blind; we can see where you’re coming from. You came to advertise a certain “kingdom of heaven” where no children would be dying from any disease, but you failed in that endeavour, and now we have the right to be suspicious of christs, prophets, gods and the like, have we not?

The nobleman wasn’t worried a bit with your private plan of a kingdom that never came; he was worried that the Almighty Father needed you to go to his house and heal his son! How come that could be classified as God’s plan? God’s plan would be to react to terminal disease when that curse appeared in the world for the first time. So, here we see again what a Christ is made of: another man with a sinister plan of world domination, trying to become a superman with some inferior miracles.

Of course the child was healed. It had been two days since his father left looking for Jesus. In two day the problem could have been sorted out, but John makes sure that what he adds to the story brings enough

applause to his master. It doesn't hold water, sorry; it is impossible to prove the veracity of this other miracle, too.

There is though a clear lie from John in the following details of this "spectacular" miracle. He wrote that the nobleman left to return home and when he was arriving, after a day's walk, the servants appeared to tell him his son was now fine. We know he didn't have a horse to go faster, because he took a day to arrive. When the nobleman asked when that happened they said yesterday. He arrived home a day later.

Well, "yesterday" meant that he had been with Jesus the day before, after hearing about Jesus going out of Judea into Galilee, and gone looking for him. That took at least a day. The next day he met Jesus, told him the situation, and went to spend the rest of the day somewhere to start the walk back the next day. When he arrived back home was already the third day after he had left.

He wasn't followed by any disciple, according to John's story; therefore, here is the pertinent question: how did John know about the details after the man left to his home in Capernaum? He invented the rest of the miracle. He had to! Nobody in the story goes back to Jesus to tell him the child was healed. Sixty years later, when John is finally writing about that "incredible" miracle, much superstitious folklore had been added to many never done miracles, this one too. If that was so, we are dealing here with a disciple in possession of a fertile imagination we cannot trust fully about what he is going to tell us next.

THE INCREDIBLE MIRACLE

1 – dishonouring

THIS NEXT MIRACLE should have never been included in the gospel – the healing of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, in Jerusalem, the centre of national religion of Jehovah, John 5:1-16. It was very dishonouring of Jesus to say at the end that he was doing miracles on the Sabbath because his Father sanctioned it, while working too in the same project. "But Jesus answered them, My Father works until now, and I work.", MKJV. It was a BIG lie, because his "Father" had had many Saturdays to work out a solution for that problem at the pool, healing all those desperate people at once, but never did. Christians would say: "No! Our God cannot do that: we have free will to do good or do evil and harvest the consequences!"

The "doctrine" of "Free Will" is not mentioned in the Bible, but nonetheless is a religious psychological offence, if we consider that then we have free will to ask God to help us resolve the universal problem of suffering; considering that once upon a time there was only one small problem to resolve, but that God, upon being asked to help sort out the

small situation, looked the other way. It seems that God had free will to reject our plea when the situation was a small discordance. We are free to ask, and ask, and ask, and ask again, insisting until we get beyond desperation, but God has the free will to tell us one time we are wasting his time. How can we trust or worship a deficient God like that? Are we then free to reject “him”?

A God that looks the other way when there’s a tiny problem to fix is not a nice, most merciful and loving God: “he” is an idol carved by a charlatan artist. If God had the perfect free will we humans don’t, then he chose not to give us a second, third, fourth and fifth chance when the initial problem was tiny and small.

Now, I have the free will to ask you this: how would you defend God against this indestructible logic? An acquaintance tried to challenge me with the typical observation that spiritual matters are not all resolved with “logic”, meaning that the “spirit” has its own tools to find the truth; to which I replied that he used his brain and his logic to tell me exactly that. There was nothing “spiritual” in that instruction. If he could use his brain to tell me I cannot use mine, his logic is altogether defective. Besides, I added, “spirit” has no definition anywhere; in the Bible meant “wind”, some invisible force, impersonal and yet sometimes evil. The so-called “Spirit of God” seems to be in an eternal struggle with the other “Spirit of Evil”, but we, innocent victims of celestial conflicts, were caught in the crossfire. Accordingly, God has never won any major battle in our favour, anything that we can objectively categorise as vital. Can you argue against this declaration of fact? You certainly cannot.

“The spirit – the antagonist meant his own spirit – has its own tools to find the truth”, he said. But it is now twenty centuries after the truth walked on Earth and we are still fighting to define it. It has been a time

of intense struggles to agree even on minor matters like how to baptise, if by sprinkling or by immersion – Catholics against Anabaptists; and many were killed in the scuffle – why wouldn’t the Bible be clear over such a simple matter? That tells you much about God’s infallible word. Come on! “What is truth!” exclaimed Pilate, and left without receiving an answer from Jesus.

Was Jesus advertising such a God? Biblically speaking, yes. His “Father” never helped anybody in a real crisis. We have an objective history of two thousand years to demonstrate the thesis, and disqualify the God of Christianity as an incompetent Almighty, therefore only a commercial device to extract a lifestyle for an abusive elite of religious conscripts.

But again and again: wasn’t there a time when there was only one sick man at the pool; when to do the “job” would have been a piece of cake and a real divine pleasure? What excuse would the Almighty offer to defend “his” reluctance in helping the needy; considering that Jesus told the Pharisees that his Father was also at work helping the sick – verse 17? Was that the joke of the day from Jesus? Any God with a bit of self-esteem and godly pride would start working right away and would not let the situation reach alarming proportions: hundreds of the sick waiting – verse 3 – *hundreds?!!*

Oh, heavens, what a disgrace, and one Almighty God and powerful angels, too! If Jesus meant real work, man, much of it was left undone; a divine disgrace, really.

The healed man had been there by the pool – we assume – for thirty-eight years, for goodness’ sake. Why do gods want us the fragile humans to suffer so much? Don’t tell me Jesus’ “Father” didn’t have one chance to take care of that sick individual? Wouldn’t he get worse over that period,

while the “Father” looked around to do his “work”? Why not heal the man and bless him with a happy and productive life; instead of sitting by that putrid place, by a pool where sheep went to drink, where him and other sick defecated and urinated; oh heavens, the stench of the holy city.

Dear reader, where is the truth in these miracle accounts? Are we so childish that we fail to see the deception Christians impose on the evangelised, by telling them the Bible is God’s word? It is not: the Bible is a manmade book of fables and impostors. This “miracle” is one of the weirdest of all. How can a Christ tell such horrible lies to his audience? How could he think we would all be uneducated like those of his days? Why didn’t Jesus heal all those sick in an instant some other day, outside the Sabbath, to avoid the Pharisees’ consternation and hatred? The God characterised in the story suffered from character arbitrariness in dealing with a serious problem of so many sick in the capital of his religion. Those are the capitals where the gods have their headquarters and soon become centres of infirmity, fear, political struggles and wars.

To heal the man on the Sabbath, while watched by the pestering, pernicious and implacable Pharisees was really dumb and stupid; Jesus could have done it either on Sunday, or on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. He lost a great opportunity to demonstrate manly intelligence. Jesus acted like the tribal god Jehovah, which was constantly looking for “glory” but never satiated; angry forever, a bipolar almighty!

Why is it that in the Old Testament we read of such a god, “The glory of Jehovah”, etc.? Why not the glory of sick people being healed all in one glorious sweep? A God constantly looking for our depressing praise – while we are surrounded by so much human misery – has a serious psychiatric problem to resolve, some pathological depression to repair. “He” should not be allowed to rule anywhere until a thorough

examination of his holy character could be revealed, or his dementia declared incurable.

We would gladly offer this God all the glory “he” deserved if we were not constantly molested by his holy insensitivity. Friends, if there is “God” – obviously, nobody ever saw any god – then it can only be Impersonal Light with no darkness as I observed earlier, the Oneness we are all evolving to, some say; I don’t need to repeat myself. All other gods are covered in darkness and live to attack us one way or another.

2 – six months later

Look, it was only a mere six months into his ministry, after starting it by switching six hundred liters of water with wine and thus promote unruliness by excessive alcohol, and already the religious authorities were plotting to kill him. Why, for goodness’ sake? Why wanting to kill a nice prophet, teacher and miracle-doer so soon in his venture? Something was terribly wrong with Jesus. It is not possible that Jesus was condemned for telling the truth: he might have told many lies in six months. Remember this: the miracles are all described by the mesmerised bystanders and never by the performer. That is a crucial point to understand “miracles”.

Healing one man at a pool wasn’t a big deal: the real miracle would be to heal all those unfortunate victims sitting in stench for years, come summer or winter. Did Jesus fail to see the dirty conditions all those sick lived in? Did he fail to hear the cries of the other hundreds of sick, when they saw the healed man walk away – finally, after suffering for thirty eight years? Mercy, Lord, mercy!!”, they would cry, but it wouldn’t be registered in the gospel, to avoid embarrassment for the miracle performer. One would be enough propaganda. If there were two hundred sick men in the porches, then Jesus did only half of one percent of the job he was

supposed to do; that is, he failed to heal the sick – Luke 4:18! A christ that fails that badly is suspicious, don't you agree.

“His Father was also working”, Jesus said. What work? Two Gods in action and only one miracle?... Sorry, folks, it looks all the more dubious; that's why I said this miracle should have not been included in the menu: it's a serious obstacle to define God and the Saviour as our heros. We had to expect more from this Duet of the Trinity. The angel would come once in a while and “agitate” de dirty and contaminated waters – it was a stagnated pool with no chlorine available in the holy city, not a stream – and see the rush of all those sick men desperately trying to jump in. What a spectacle! In that, many were hurt even more – physically and psychologically – and the cries and agony so depressing. But, alas, one sick man would that time benefit from the divine exercise of that mediocre “trinity”: Angel, Son and Father.

The angel would soon depart – after his dirty job – and leave behind hundreds of crying and weeping sick people, desperate for years, waiting for a bit of mercy that wouldn't come – from the All Merciful Three. Some were blind; how could they ever reach the pool in time to be healed? And yet, all the blind in that holy city would be by the pool the moment they had a hint that the angel was on his way to stir the “swamp”. Oh, heavens and the cosmos, how nice to have such a concerning seraph in the glory! Who would benefit this time? Imagine the front page of the newspapers if it happened today? For less spectacular “miracles” – “I saw the Virgin Mary!!” – the media go berserk for weeks.

“The angel is coming! The angel is coming!! Jump in the pool! Quickly!!” But one blind man would exclaim: “It's winter! Why wouldn't that weird angel come in summer, the idiot! The last thirteen times I

jumped I only caught a nasty cold and swallowed a lot of the filthy water; nine times I almost died!”

You see, he healed one every six months, from the day when there was only one at the pool, always losing ground to the Enemy: now hundreds were waiting, and this untrustworthy angel wouldn't accelerate the process. Or was it a game he played for his own pleasure, at the expense of human suffering? Angels like that one are a dishonour to their union, I say. They should be demoted and ostracised to the outskirts of the Big Bang, after paying a big fine. We do not need such angels in our universe; how are the other ones like, one wonders?

But Jesus lied again to the Pharisees, because of two clear aspects: one, none of those around him and the future readers of this story had ever seen such a “Father” – they knew another god, their nasty one, called Jehovah, also some Invisible Vacuum – and two, why then wouldn't that Father finish the job quickly and honourably? Why were there at the pool so many sick people, waiting for some weird angel to “agitate” the waters and give a chance to just one to be healed? What sort of plan was that from the Almighty in mercy and a God of love? Who designed this “mechanism”? This is a “miracle” that should not be here.

3 – verse four

This story is utterly discredited by Higher Criticism, mainly because of the “problem” of verse four. It is found that the verse was some later gloss or interpolation to sort of complete the sequence. Well, if that verse – like in many other cases in the NT – wasn't “genuine” scripture, not only the story is false and thus not Holy Scripture, but also discredits the entire New Testament. Do you wonder why so many leave the faith after discovering such facts? Simply because by studying the Bible they

arrive at the most disconcerting conclusion: that is, the text is not to be trusted – a scholarly finding, even though the Bible was not written for the intellectual and well-learned.

It appears that Jesus came here telling lies to innocent, naïve and superstitious folk. Or maybe he never did or said anything John concocted from his weird brain, when he was in his late eighties, suffering from memory deterioration, after a life of religious trauma. How come God was working at the pool with so many sick people in the waiting list, unless we have to believe such satirical stuff in order to be accepted into the kingdom of heaven?

Some translations say “multitudes” of the sick lay around the pool, a place in terrible disarray and dirty, where sheep came to drink and defecate – verse 2. Imagine the blind walking over all that stuff, even falling on it? Wouldn’t the angel help those first? Imagine the smell around the area, with all that excrement and urine not only from sheep. “In these lay a multitude of invalids, blind, lame, paralysed.”, John 5:3 (RSV). According to Jesus, God was “working” on the problem, and only that particular Saturday could he take care of one of those hundreds of sick people – finally sorting out the problem after 38 years! How would God define “a problem”; what’s “a problem” in God’s mind? Did that Jesus tell the truth about the Father?

I firmly believe that such a “job” was never finished; neither there nor anywhere in the world: an incompetent Father we have here. How can we honestly believe in his future promises? That is, the number of the sick dwindled eventually – many dying on the spot in winter – for they had to realise that the trick didn’t work out well for everybody. Besides, Jerusalem – the eternal city of peace, the headquarters of Jehovah’s best plan – ended up completely destroyed sometime later, the magic pool

emptied of its precious water and stench, and filled with rubble. Do you still believe in miracles?

4 – a Saturday miracle

But again, why had Jesus to upset and confront the religious Pharisees with a Saturday miracle? Was it one miracle one problem? When Jesus told the Pharisees that his Father had been at work healing the sick at the pool he really messed it up with no chance of recovering. How could his Almighty Father have been at work and the sick were all still there and growing in number? If one God could not do the job with precision and honours, would two? Three years later, at Pentecost the sad news arrived with more victims: no, neither the Father nor his Son managed to fulfil the originally marvellous-to-be promises of the prophets; all ended up in the hands of a special elite of merchants, doing merchandise with fear and superstition, said one of the benefactors – 2 Peter 2:3. Horrible, if you ask me.

I would like to ask this weird Jesus – it appears that there are two different ones in the gospels – why he wouldn’t heal all the unfortunate right there in front of him; oh, yes, I would. What excuse do you think he could offer? The next question would be why on earth did he decide to heal that particular person on the Sabbath? Didn’t he know that the Pharisees would be terribly upset? Where was his wisdom to act in love and understanding? “Blessed are the peacemakers” and what? Oh, the Sermon on the Mount, and Jesus’ inobservance thereof.

Why teasing the Pharisees those rabid dogs and swine – Matthew 7:6? Why not build a better world, where divine power would heal all the sick at the pool some other day to avoid unnecessary confrontation and eventually another crucifixion of an innocent agitator, and instead

promote good human relations everywhere? Healing all on the next Monday morning would create a better world for all of us. The sick could hold on another forty-eight hours, what the hell.

Jesus was God, wasn't he? So, come on! Isn't this world in a moral mess and many sick and wounded? If the idea was to heal to demonstrate real divine love – oh heavens of mercy! – let us have a job properly executed. Don't send us down here an amateur Christ, for Christ's sake! Nobody had to mock God's inability to "heal the brokenhearted and set at liberty them that are bruised" – Luke 4:18. Healing one sick man in Jerusalem in the first century wasn't a big deal: any other proletarian christ could do better.

That shows us how dangerous some messiahs are. Why provoke instead of pacifying? You can clearly see the immaturity of this "Jesus" in this apocryphal fable. Now, don't you again go around town calling the Bible the precious word of God, fully inspired and inerrant; don't, please; you're unwarrantedly fooling yourself.

The healed man had been sick for 38 years, and later when Jesus finds him in the Temple tells him to sin no more because something nastier would happen to him the next time. This "Jesus" that John invented advertised the nastiest Jehovah of the Old Testament. It wasn't God Light where there is no darkness – 1 John 1:5 – this time. Do you see the message in this warning? For thirty-eight years that poor man had been punished for some whatever undisclosed sin he did in his younger days, after which he could sin no more due to his handicapping for life, but now Jesus is telling him God would punish him even more if he sinned again. "Oh, no, not another 38 years by the dirty pool, no!" Why was God worried with that poor soul, if in the next twenty centuries millions more would upset the same deity without much punishment?

To accept Jesus' words we would need to know exactly what that sin had been; but the Bible is always short on detail, imperfect. And now we have a history of millions of evil people who never got any disadvantage in this life, neither had to "wait for the moving of the waters" – how's that for divine injustice!

Later, Jesus would contradict this "teaching" when he healed the blind man who was born blind for God's glory: "Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him", John 9:3. "*Works of god?!?*" Of a merciful God, who lets an innocent child be born blind for a future publicity stunt of some Saviour? Oh, my goodness, what's going on here? Couldn't God find a better way without attacking us? Look at the horror: one is born blind, innocent, with no sin, because years later the Saviour of the blind will need a miracle stunt to impress the spectators at the expense of that innocent child; while another unfortunate is made blind because of some undisclosed sin he did in his youth, and threatened with something more horrible if he relapses again. Who therefore sinned the most: the man or God?

Please, scratch this passage from your Bible; it wasn't a dignified miracle.

FIVE LOAVES AND TWO FISHES

1 – gambling with ignorance

THE NEXT MIRACLE in the story this second century John was producing has some easy flaws to find the truth he deceptively tried to hide. Why would Jesus end up with an excess of twelve baskets of crumbs and what happened to them afterwards? But firstly, where would he find the baskets, and what did they contain? Certainly they were not carried to the place empty. Was this a miracle too big for the stage?

This “wonder” in John 6 is the only one represented in the four canonical gospels, and yet there are several differences in detail, if the reader worried too much with it. Perhaps the most visible is that in the first three accounts no dialogue is portrayed between Jesus and any disciple. “He said to Philip, Where shall we buy loaves so that these may eat? And He said this to test him, for He Himself knew what He would do. Philip answered him: Loaves for two hundred silver coins are not enough for them that every one may take a little. One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter’s brother, said to him: There is a boy here who has five barley

loaves and two small fish, but what are these among so many?"; John 6:5-14 – t'was quite a meal for this little boy.

Ah, the scornful laughing. What about the food the disciples had with them for their Lord and the "apostolic college"? Didn't they eat that day, or were they fasting? Did Jesus have a preaching break at noon to have lunch with his entourage, and forgot to keep a few loaves and fish for the afternoon miracle? Do you see the cynical situation? Nothing like that is mentioned in the preamble. But if they had brought no food along for their own consumption, did they eat from the "miracle" bread and fish, too? Therefore, the miracle was also for their private benefit, while avoiding the detail. I have to assume that if they had no food with them, they had already eaten somewhere, possibly at some lodge, down in one of the surrounding villages, and the Lord forgot to bring along some loaves and some fish for the necessary miracle later on. Now, dear reader, that's why I say that to discredit any miracle in the NT we need only to find the hidden detail in their coarse presentation.

A sudden dead-end to discredit this miracle is the double-talk of Jesus asking where to go to buy bread to feed the crowd. What about Jesus himself and the twelve? If they would have time, after the sermon, to go down the hill and find some restaurant to buy their meals, so could anyone of the crowd. Maybe many did exactly that, for they preferred meat to fish; or were vegetarians. But to cover up the mistake John did through Jesus' lips he, of his own volition, added quickly that Jesus insinuated it as a sort of a joke to impress or test the disciples.

Why on earth do gods have this propensity to "test" us? It hasn't helped us anything. It's us who must test the gods, rather, to see if they deserve our praise. That is, John is saying that Jesus knew it would be impossible, even if the money were available, to go down the hill to

the nearby villages and contract a catering company to climb up the escarpment with a packet meal for each registered participant in that seminar, some seven to ten thousand mouths, including hungry children and women.

Come on, John, didn't you think we would quickly catch you with your fake story? By saying "Jesus knew what to do" the process turns into a farce, for in that case he prolonged the teaching to force the miracle. That is, he could have ended the sermon three hours earlier, to dismiss the congregation [after collecting the tithes and offerings to purchase food for the next sermon in the next chapter, Matthew 15]. But if his divine intention was to extend the sermon by three extra hours, why wouldn't have he thought to bring the necessary "elements" for the afternoon miracle? What transpires here is that Jesus did not after all know what to do earlier on that morning; it doesn't go well with a Messiah's credentials, I'm afraid. This miracle, therefore, is another coarse one in the collection.

Oh dear me, dear John, many years absorbed by religious imponderables doth make thee mad, paraphrasing Acts 26:24. Besides, it looks like those three hours of less preaching wouldn't do the listeners much moral or spiritual damage, since very little of the ethereal substance is transpired in the text; all those people would eventually forget the magic and the magician and abandon the Lord to his fate.

The gospels tell us that Jesus was for the greater part of his ministry followed by the crowds. It is then logical to understand that there were many hungry people following him just for the food supply once the news spread around. In fact, the gospels say exactly that: many stuck with him for another feeding miracle, John 6:26, but Jesus got tired of it quickly and wouldn't perform more than two "multiplications" in the synoptic and one in John. The miracle backfired and the "performance"

had to be cancelled. How's that for compassion and commiseration when he had the power to convert water into wine and multiply loaves and fish at his discretion? Later on, the same weird "Jesus" would state that the poor would always be at the street corners, John 12:8, whether or not we had a Messiah or a hundred of them on earth. But what did he do from heaven when the first poor appeared in the first street? Nothing! Christs do miracles only for their own propaganda ends. There is no memory of one true Christ putting to his heart to really help us when we were being hurt by the living conditions on this planet. Poverty is a clear case; hunger another. And you cannot forget that statistically there was a day in our human condition when it would be much easier to be helped from heaven. Sadly, we were left at the "mercy" of the Devil – 1 Cor 5:5 in the NIV.

2 – the baskets

Again, the text reveals its limitation in vital detail. Jesus instructed the disciples – not the crowd – to gather the fragments of the leftovers, but we don't hear what happened to that food. Bread can hold its flavour for a while until it turns mouldy, depending on what kind it is, but what about the fish? Was it cooked, raw, dried or pickled? Isn't that important detail to accredit the miracle? We might assume that the "sample" from which Jesus "cloned" the harvest was roasted in the fire; what difference does it make? Why must we take miracles at face value or literally? Why must we believe the Bible without enough freedom to analyse its content and ask for better detail? "Oh, no, it's divine inspiration, and pure scripture with no need for anything else", shouts the inspired teacher. He can shout his lungs out, but we also have a brain and intelligence to find the truth.

Naturally, the twelve baskets of bread had to be carried by the

disciples down the mountain afterwards, and stored somewhere for later consumption, the next day. Since it appears Jesus didn't have permanent domicile, we again assume the baskets were left out there in the open, perhaps covered with some borrowed cloths. We presume too that no fish was left being, except all the bones and the litter scattered all over the "park", to feed the prides of hundreds of cats. If Jesus performed this miracle today he would be prosecuted for the litter left behind, or get some suspended jail sentence. He would not be allowed to go on from town to town violating the local by-laws and damaging the environment.

The disciples quickly found the twelve baskets, which leads us to ascertain that the crowd had brought them along filled with "something": what else if not food, lots of it. We can also establish that there were many more than those twelve; perhaps a thousand. That is, the disciples had at least two meals for free that day and the next – one basket of bread per disciple. Nice job. Did they return the baskets and the cloths to their rightful owners? I doubt it; it's unimportant detail. One thing, however, we can estimate: if each basket carried 20 kilograms of crumbs, the local Salvation Army was suddenly blessed with 240 kilograms of bread to support the needy for that week. Why doesn't Jesus do this miracle anymore for that philanthropic church: the need for bread today among the poor is astronomical.

What is important is that there was plenty of food amongst the crowd, and in the end the miracle of multiplied bread and fish helped only a few in the front row. It was cheap magic, some would leave saying, and reject the magician; well, John only quotes those anonymous, unauthorised and unquotable who called him a prophet: "Truly this is the Prophet who was to come into the world!" – in the ISV. Let go six more centuries and yet another Prophet would appear in the same Middle East to carry on

the world's evangelisation with lethal weapons. Funny that "authorized scripture" comes always via the anonymous voice, from that who called those messiahs "Prophets". It's been a landscape of victims to help the prophets go. None really helped us carry the suffering load imposed on us by some Almighty with the help of some Devil: we are innocent victims of both. We cried for bread and were given stones; for fish and received snakes; for eggs and got scorpions, Luke 11.

3 – from another angle

One detail that is perhaps purposely missing in the fable is the natural diligence of those in the crowd. That is, Philip found quickly a lad with some food. What does that mean? Did the child leave home with enough food for himself, assuming he would be out for the day, or was his mother or father nearby, and the food had been brought along for their own use? I mean, five loaves and two fishes was a meal for a family of three in those difficult days, was it not? You see, this is enough evidence that maybe most of those in the crowd had brought along their lunch, clever enough to understand that they would spend the day out in the field. Many went along only to see the "prophet", not to change their religious allegiances, taking the day off for a picnic too. Come on, why be so spiritual and all the fun of life removed? Why spend you life cloistered in a monastery for the sake of pleasing the Invisible?

Well, isn't this missing detail enough evidence that the story is going to be exaggerated and made to sound like a miracle? Oh, heavens, how then so simple the miracle was going to be. Besides, we understand through textual studying that John is writing his gospel sometime in the second century, after he read the account in the other canonical gospels. That is, by that time much folklore had been disseminated in

the churches, mainly made of illiterate people, unable to read, therefore inclined to believe all that said to have happened a century before. John wasn't happy with the flat reading in the synoptic, and so endeavoured to build a bit more detail into it.

However, how dishonest of commentators like Matthew Henry and Darby when they purposely or conveniently forget to mention those important details omitted in the miracle. We can easily find those godly men painting the story with their own theological colours, and bending the details according to their doctrinal whims, the liars.

4 – the incriminating evidence

Meanwhile, what gives this miracle represented in the four canonical gospels away is the second one only mentioned in Matthew and Mark. The detrimental evidence is simply found in the words the disciples expressed in Matthew 15:33 (MKJV): "From where should we get so many loaves in the wilderness, so as to fill so great a crowd?"

Do you see it? Not long before, in fact at Matthew 14:17, the same disciples had seen Jesus provide the multiplied bread and fish from five and two. How is it possible that they so quickly became incredulous about the repetition of the same situation?

That's why these two multiplication miracles are all the more unsubstantiated. It is, in other words, the question in Matthew 15:33 that discredits those two miracles as genuine stuff. You see, John describes only the first; the one mentioned in the four gospels, albeit with some differences in the details; whereas the second multiplication appears only in Matthew and Mark. Why is this default accepted in matters of inspiration? It is evidence of its inexistence. There is no "verbal

inspiration” of any kind in the canonical gospels; besides, the dates of “production” fight against the principle.

However, pay attention to this other incriminating detail, this time in the words of Jesus in the previous verse, Matthew 15:32, where he comments: “I have compassion on the multitude, because they continue with me now three days, and have nothing to eat: and I will not send them away fasting, lest they faint in the way.”

Three days, but again, what about the food Jesus and the disciples were eating every day themselves? That is, Jesus and his entourage had had enough food for three days, while the crowd went without it. Why didn't Jesus provide them with his own food multiplied in the first day? In the first day, because the Lord was supposed to divinely know that his sermon would take three full-day sessions. He would have performed the miracle in the first day with enough food to last for three; with the instruction to preserve it carefully without anything spoiled. No, this time Jesus is the evidence against himself. Sorry folks, if I have hurt your religious susceptibilities.

WALKING ON WATER

1 – an important lesson

THE MOST STRIKING “spiritual” statement one gets from this “miracle” has a tremendous bearing on the future characterisation of the apostles: the import subliminally reflected in the fearful cry “It's a spirit!” Nothing is of greater psychological value to define the intellectual immaturity of those “apostles” than that scream. Sure it has to be sacred scripture.

Imagine twelve men supposedly of the highest moral integrity frenetically rowing without direction in the dark of the night, with the wind howling around their ears, wet and cold, suddenly “seeing” a ghost walking over the water in their direction to frighten the hell out of their souls. Imagine their agony and scrambling in fear. Those men were going to be the pillars of the faith, the spiritual giants of the church, the saints on its altars; but the evil spirits of the sea knew their cowardice and superstition, and would not let them out of their constricting fear of the dark. They would in an instant lose, so terrified were they, all the

spirituality recently acquired at miracle stunts by the Master, and cry in unison “It’s a spirit! It’s a spirit! It’s a spirit! Virgin Mary, deliver us!!”

This “vision” of the evil apparition walking over the waters hadn’t been the first under those circumstances; fishermen were fearfully aware of it, on occasions of storms while out fishing in the night. The tragedy they feared the most was when the God of the Jews let this horrendous ghost snatch a fisherman or two to drown them in hatred and revenge. The next day, the whole village would be told about the tragedy, and run to the synagogue to thank Jehovah for the ones that escaped the jaws of that Sea Monster!

But they were now partners with a Saviour, who called them fishers of men, no longer of simple fish. But the terrain where they were going to catch men with their religious nests had to sometimes return them to a real sea, and subject them again to that horrendous Spectre that regularly snatched some of them.

Poetically put:

What the sea fishermen in their life dread the most is the wrath of that diabolical ghost.

Naturally, then, the agony and crying of the twelve, when they imagined the Malignant Foe was coming back for some of them. Other stronger men had before cried in that same sea dragged down to their death by the Invisible Satan.

“No; it’s me, the Lord; don’t be afraid!”

Oh, no, Master! Do you think it’s funny to play the Devil with us! Come on, why didn’t you shout from the shore “I’m coming! It’s me!”, and then you came! Why would you walk over the waves without forewarning us?! Really!! You scared the hell out of us, it’s not nice! You could have

done this miracle some other time in the daylight so that we would be notified in time!

Jesus could have shouted from the nearby shore because after eight hours rowing without direction, and tossed to and fro by the wild wind, they could still be near the dock and he wasn’t too far away. No miracle was actually necessary; and sure Peter would have walked over water on firm ground so to speak, until he felt a hole under his feet and cried to Jesus for help. No miracle had been necessary. Be as it may, there is a great deal of omitted detail to make the story spooky.

Maybe some preacher will insist that Jesus had a spiritual lesson in the offing to teach them; and, commiserating, we could assume it was the initial idea. Unfortunately, due to unforeseen circumstances nobody paid any attention to it, and so we don’t know now what it was supposed to be. That is, one more miracle wasted in the sacred canon. Well, we can only lament Jesus was scared and nervous to perform this “wonder” in the daylight so that no detail could be omitted and credit given where it was due. There is going then to be this perpetual unanswered question: why didn’t Jesus walk over water while the sun was shining? My reply is: he would sink like any other man and drown if he couldn’t swim. Doing it at night, he could hide vital detail to make it look real like a good magician does.

Folks, even the miracle in the dark never happened, we can unguardedly assure ourselves. This one was a failed attempt to glamorise another christ doing the rounds in Palestine. What lesson could this god Jesus have in the offing for his disciples based on fear of ghosts? Preachers who distort the story to find spiritual value in it are dishonest to the text, for the text itself doesn’t point out any lesson.

They had just a few hours earlier on witnessed the spectacular portent

of eating a good meal of fresh bread and well roasted fish for free with the complements of the Christ, where many spectators saluted him as the prophet they were expecting, and now they were all lost in the sea, screaming like children terrified by a ghost walking on the surface of the water.

Nevertheless, this passage of Scripture is but a clear portrait of what was coming in the religious world if Christ would succeed with his “mission”. He didn’t, among the Jews who would kill him in time – so they thought. But the evangelism fields were vast out into other nations, and soon the superstition would spread like wildfire up to Rome where the apostles would install their headquarters from where to launch the armies to conquer the world for Christ. The formula would be: superstition with weapons to recover the world from the Devil to return it to the Almighty; how did God lose it in the first place was never debated; and why was God still the Almighty after losing something so important wasn’t included in the discussions’ agenda either. But the war never succeeded in twenty centuries, after a billion of casualties. The last effort will be nuclear Armageddon, and more billions of innocent victims. It’s the gods who haven’t got a better plan, due to cosmic incompetence.

All that mess could have been avoided if we had the Almighty on our side: that is, if he had been wise enough to act in our favour when the problem was still small. The Almighty lost the greatest opportunity in his reign to be of some good use. For that, he is already condemned to demotion, without appeal. That is, no Almighty that fails disastrously in a small matter has to keep his throne. This Almighty will stand up before us to be justly judged for his unwarranted insecurity in protecting the human race from the Devil, and condemned to spend part of eternity isolated in a camp by the outskirts of the Big Bang where he will learn

to be just next time. Surely, we cannot tolerate such an Almighty God in power for fear of other major failures in minor issues.

2 – superstition

The faithful apostles were nothing but a bunch of superstitious individuals believing in walking spirits – “phantasma” is the original word they shouted. How sad that we after all have clear evidence in the gospels that Jesus’ disciples were never prepared mentally or spiritually for the intended task ahead.

On the other hand, how disastrous of Jesus to perform this weirdest “miracle” with no other value than to reveal the sort of men he was surrounded by. Jesus would have been very unwise in his immature nature if he had performed this totally useless and unnecessary stunt to scare the hell out of his disciples; but we assure ourselves that such a “Jesus” never existed, and his “miracles” never happened.

What spiritual lesson can we derive from this saddest incident, therefore? None. Is it then sacred scripture? Oh, yes, you bet it is. It is very important scripture in the gospels and vital evidence to analyse the character of those “pillars” who would later be the foundation of one of the most aggressive and dangerous religions in the world. Millions upon millions of innocent victims perished or were slaughtered in the name of that Christ and his superstitious “directors”.

It’s at this “miracle” that Jesus can be accused of messing the disciples’ life with unnecessary exhibitionism. His wisdom failed him badly at this occasion, like in several other ones. He failed by sending the disciples to the other side during the night, forgetting that the wind would arrive and could capsize the boat and goodbye the holy squadron.

Next, he failed by spending needless time inland praying and

forgetting to pray for the security of the boat. Had he prayed, “Father, let them have a safe trip” no turmoil would have happened, for his prayer would have been heard. It’s right here at this junction in his “ministry” where we can confront Jesus with a hard question: what was he praying about for eight hours that night, if he didn’t pray for his disciples’ safe trip? What was more important than to save twelve giants of the coming faith from drowning? Was he praying for the salvation of the Eskimos and forgot the protection of his sacred crew nearby? Or was it that he prayed for them but the “Father” denied him the answer in order to also take part in the fun with the disciples’ superstition?

And finally he missed it altogether by walking over the waters, when, being already three in the morning, could have rested the twelve on the shore that whole night, the next morning hire a boat and securely go where he wanted to in the light of the day. Besides, why the hurry, if eventually they only arrived there the next day after the multiplication? Were the twelve then prepared for the ministry of that day, after spending a terrifying night labouring against the dark forces of the Buoyant Ghost? You see, young christians mess up our lives and still want to be worshiped – Matthew 14:33. It’s a tragic farce.

John ends his description of the “miracle” by saying that immediately after Jesus entered the boat they were suddenly at the shore on the other side. Sure, John, and you think we believe that cock-and-bull story? That would mean the miracle was done right there, the preliminaries totally unnecessary. But Jesus could have instead told the rested company early that morning, “Let’s go guys”, and suddenly they were there via transmutation. No fuss, no danger, and no ghosts: a clean miracle. Peter’s episode of walking over the water to reach the Lord and show

how superstitious he was wouldn’t have been necessary either. Folks, the gospel is a mess, a big mess.

3 – three accounts

John is, of the three accounts, the shortest with seven verses. Mark has eight and Matthew twelve. Is there a “spiritual” lesson in this disparity? Yes, of course. And that is that we cannot trust the accounts. Luke, who wasn’t a disciple of Jesus, naturally omits this “story” for the simple reason that it happened in the dark, with no “eyewitnesses”. He was honest enough to remove it from the collection of fables he selected, because he said right at the outset of his production that all the material he got was obtained from “eyewitnesses”, anonymous at that, don’t forget. Perhaps he was tempted to include the legend in his bestseller, but he was intelligent enough to realise that we would catch him quickly red-handed with lies.

However, where did Mark get his version of the “events” if he positions it inconspicuously between the longest narration of Matthew, which includes the story of Peter walking over the water towards Jesus, and the shortest of John with the minimum fuss and detail to dispatch it as fast as possible to the realm of the incredible?

Well, Mark, like Luke, wasn’t a disciple. Thus, naturally, he also heard it later, decades after it “happened”, from whom we don’t know, and by now we don’t care. It is a “divine” characteristic of the sacred scriptures never to disclose the source of the report, but insisting every word is god-breathed and profitable for teaching [what, we don’t know], sort of policy – 1 Timothy 3:16.

That is, here comes Mark, presumably the first to write it in scripture form, telling us one of the most incredible stories of Jesus’ life without the honesty to disclose to the future readers whence he got the details.

Are we, intelligent as we are, supposed to believe the superstition of Mark and/or the other canonical writers? Of course not, we aren't.

John's account is rather interesting, when compared with Matthew's. It is apparent that the disciples left the shore when it was already dark. That would have been utterly stupid, unless they knew the crossing would be quick. But suddenly the wind came and started howling and tossing the little boat about, and soon the rowers couldn't control it anymore.

The other accounts put it that by three o'clock in the morning – fourth watch of the night – they were still rowing “in the middle of the sea”, but who knows where they were in the dark, with that much wind? That is, they had been out there in the sea now for some eight hours, unable to arrive at the other side. With all that wind no beacon of fire could be held on the beach, and also by the end of the first quarter all were sleeping and quiet in the surrounding villages. I'm sure they quickly forgot about the multiplication miracle the previous afternoon and by now were instead, terribly exhausted, cursing the elements and praying to all saints for a rescue. I imagine Peter, the foul-mouthed that he was, spitting blasphemies against the Greek god of the winds for that turn of events.

Meanwhile, totally oblivious of the danger his bodyguards were facing in the sea drama, Jesus was filled with the Spirit speaking in tongues somewhere in the mountain. That's why his Father couldn't help the “sacred college” escape the wrath of the sea, for he could not understand what Jesus was praying all about. It is still the same today: you go to a Charismatic or Pentecostal church where two hundred members pray together in tongues rebuking, casting out and binding the Devil but he is back free every Sunday.

Now, in terms of miracles, the real one was to keep the little boat

afloat and save the Holy Twelve from drowning, which would have dire consequences for the “Sacred Magisterium”. Nevertheless, wouldn't have been even a better miracle if they arrived on the other shore without a scratch, and avoid disclosing to the readers of the Bible all the superstition those “servants” of the Lord were constricted with? Again, the Lord failed in his miraculous endeavour, for this particular “miracle” wasn't altogether necessary. If Jesus performed miracles to assert his Godhead to the Twelve, and convince them of his divine powers, why didn't he walk over water that morning, in the clear light of the day? Something smells rotten in this miracle, friends.

Matthew found an extra dramatic episode to add to his version, which the other two reporters didn't include: the challenge Peter put to the Lord and its consequences – six more verses of extra hogwash. If they later read it they would be flabbergasted with the exaggeration, for John being present in the boat couldn't at all recall the incident – and he had an excellent memory, capable of remembering Jesus' prayer in Gethsemane word-for-word while tired and sleeping – John 17. I can imagine John, upon reading Matthew's report for the first time, exclaiming in horror, “Where the hell did this dude get Peter walking over the water?!”

Peter, who was going to become the Head of the Church, a foul-mouthed character, who would, after walking with the Lord for three years, never reform his manners in front of women, by using unclean language to deny the master three times, is here portrayed as the most superstitious of them all. After eight hours of exhausting rowing, when he saw Jesus “walking” over the water, after first screaming that it was a ghost, a “phantasma” coming to torment them, is so scared and traumatised that he challenges it to do a most stupid thing: “Lord, if it is really you, tell me to come to you on the water.”

How brainless, really. Imagine that it wasn't Jesus but indeed the evil, cold and ferocious Spirit of the Dark where there is no Light. Peter would drown quickly and no more Peter the First; the Church would be stuck. Well, I guess that would have been a good thing, don't you? Imagine this world without this and the other "Peters", a world without the Roman Catholic Church, and its well-documented history of crimes with millions of innocent victims slaughtered to uphold God's divine attributes – mercy being a popular one. Just imagine how wonderful the world would be today, without religion scarring the landscape, a world where science and progress would have developed centuries earlier, where we would have reached the moon five hundred years ago. It was this Prophet's Church that seven centuries later started a fight with the other Prophet's Mosque that has not ended up to now; with millions of innocent casualties.

Why, then, we ask, didn't Jesus let Peter drown? That was a crucial instant when Jesus would have revealed sufficient wisdom on behalf of humanity, but failed. Judas would have been a better pope. But the Lord was also looking for religious applause, popularity, and admiration, unfortunately to be made a god of sorts, the Messiah that was going to come to bring peace on Earth and good will among men – so were singing the deluded angels thirty years earlier on at his birth – Luke 2:14.

One could even say, with respect, in this scenario, why wouldn't [that] Jesus drown together with Peter, too?... Oh, the whims of destiny, and the failures of the gods!

HEALING THE BORN BLIND

1 – too much detail

THIS MIRACLE OCCUPIES an entire chapter in John's gospel – 9:1-41). But right at the outset of its description we collide with a most distressing proposition in the words of Jesus. The disciples asked him who had sinned in the case of that unfortunate child born blind. Would you in the whole universe ever guess the terribly disingenuous answer Jesus was going to offer them? Oh, heavens, the bloody gods!

“Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him”, verse three.

The works of god, in what God's name?! Why wouldn't God work to prevent blindness when the first blind child was born in this terrible planet of many gods? There was only one case at the time to work on. Oh, Jesus, the nonsense, the nonsense, the nonsense in your lips! That God you followed had never been born, dear healer; a God that was still working to prevent blindness in the year when you were born could not be serious.

You were taken for a ride, and in foolishness you spent your short days on Earth.

As if we could exclaim in great stress: Jesus, the fortune of one innocent child the Father blinded to prove his powers. No, it is not possible; it's simply not possible God would be so morally blind!

He had said some other occasion that a child is born innocent, – Matthew 18:6, 19:14 – but here he excuses his Father of taking an innocent child and let him be born blind for the purpose of demonstrating how powerful his Son would be in doing miracles. Would this situation ever be true, ever be true?... Oh, the gods of the christs!... Why didn't this bizarre Jesus stand against this weird "Father" who molests babies bringing them to life blind; why wouldn't this Jesus scream to his god: "NO! NO! NO, FATHER, PLEASE, NO! Babies are born innocent! Don't blind them! NO FATHER, NO!! Give me any other task to do but healing born blind children; please Father, I cannot stand such an injustice! I detest using children as guinea pigs to demonstrate my healing powers! Please, Father, anything but that! I'll die twice on a cross but to hurt innocent children for a commercial stunt is too much for me, I cannot bear it!"

Apparently his Father didn't oblige and went ahead with the wicked deed. If that were true, Jesus would have the duty to heal all such cases; and surely, he passed by other similar ones. He didn't, and so he was telling lies to his disciples. A christ that tells lies is a charlatan. That is, Jesus took the situation of an unfortunate to score points for his own party. That is divine dishonesty in a moral book.

Was Jesus telling his followers that all those born blind were to be used as guinea pigs to highlight his miraculous powers? Jesus messed it up once again, and the church still applauds him. Suddenly, we are confronted with this unimaginable quandary: if God had allowed that

innocent child to be born blind and allowed him to reach adulthood for the simple purpose of making him the object of a miracle to advertise his special Son's powers, we have here a clear case of divine injustice. Unjust gods are charlatans, too.

When Jesus said it wasn't the fault of anyone, he lied again to defend his weird "Father". Surely blindness would be blamed on God for not taking care of our fragile human condition in this life. Surely God would have "designed" this world with the possibility of genetic defects that could cause blindness. Surely, too, the living conditions in this planet were not appropriate for our complete happiness. How come suddenly Jesus has the indecency to excuse his "Father"? If he said that God is Impersonal Light, not involved in the running of the universe, would have been a much better proposition, even though we would disagree or confront the statement some other way. But when he defended God's actions against innocent children he sinned against us and himself [as also a human being].

He, then, had to die for his and his Father's sins, how terrible.

There were many other chances for God to prove his Son's potential, like finding the evil people who molest children or rob the property of others. Stop war if a God can do that. Jesus would have done a priceless job to those where he lived if he had the miraculous ability to do right justice in bringing to trial the criminals, the robbers and the like. Didn't, a failure all the way to fame.

2 – the Good Samaritan fiasco

He NEVER did one single miracle in that intrusive area of our living. Many robbers and thieves could have been found in the places where Jesus walked, but not one such case is ever recorded in the holy book.

On the contrary, he had the guts to actually tell a story of a certain Good Samaritan – Luke 10:30-37 – who found a naked and beaten up man by thieves on a public road, but did he go a step further and find the criminals themselves to bring them to justice? No way Jose, that Jesus wasn't that interested in the hard struggles of our daily affairs. Churches rebuke the Devil every Sunday morning in the name of this Jesus that could not locate the thieves who attacked the innocent man; it's a joke of a big loser, sadly.

Then came down a "certain" priest and next a Levite who in typical fashion passed by the injured man without helping him. Only when a compassionate Samaritan came across that place was the wounded man properly helped. Then Jesus asks the lawyer who challenged him about "who is my neighbour" this most disturbing question at the end of his story: "Which now of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbour unto him that fell among the thieves?" He didn't want to say "which one of these four", including himself, who saw the crime taking place.

The Samaritan was, the challenger would reply. Yes, religion didn't help the man in need; neither did Jesus nor his Father. The lawyer wasn't clever enough to reply that that Father of Jesus observes crime every hour of the day to use as illustration of our wickedness. But, the lawyer would add, what did your Father do when the very first man was assaulted, naked and wounded by robbers? And, Jesus – he would conclude his intervention – what did you do to catch those criminals, since you know the story happened like you told it? Nothing, dear Jesus, nothing! Don't come telling us the story of a crime you witnessed and also did nothing to help the victim.

Who then said that we needed this Christ in our suburbs, tolling bells early on Sunday mornings to awaken us when we needed to sleep a bit

more? But on the other hand, why would God need to prove anything if at one time in the human affairs he had had the unique opportunity to do the right thing to prove his love towards us the human race but left it escape his attention, and now we were stuck in perpetual misery surrounded by misfortune and disadvantage? What sort of God was that of that Jesus who needed applause through the misfortunes of our suffering race? It is preposterous, ludicrous, and ridiculous!

3 – John lied to all

What are we dealing here with, dear reader? And then John spent an entire chapter of his gospel using this unfortunate innocent man to highlight Jesus' saving qualities, come on! Something is terribly disturbing in the gospel of John; or was his mind awfully unstable at ninety years of age, from the hashish fumes? You see, writing a gospel at that age has to be suspicious, for how could he remember verbatim what was said? Surely he added in much of his own imagination; besides, today's textual students are convinced that nothing in John's gospel can be accepted as genuine content.

My computer's word counter counted 876 words in this chapter nine, 128 representing what Jesus said in the whole transcript, just a few short sentences. That is, there are 748 words added by John to explain the detail of the miracle; that is Jesus' words are only 15% of the entire narration. John lied at ninety years of age; and he lied to all the generations of Christians who would believe God hurts little children with blindness to promote his Christ. Do you go to church on Sunday morning to support this gospel with your money?

With this miracle, therefore, the apostle John makes a God of love to look awfully debased and horrible. What love would that be to allow

a child to be born BLIND, go through life handicapped without sight, depending on the social welfare or charity and subjected to a life of ostracism and rejection for the only reason that Jesus would one day pass by his house and heal him to show off his miracle powers? That cannot be a serious intention. What God would not find a more dignified way to advertise his begotten Son? I repeat: the apostle John did lie in the name of Jesus and what he never said.

Do you see how quickly a “nice” miracle is terribly discredited, if one has the normal ability to read the encoded facts?

4 – spittle

As for spitting on the ground and collecting the “clay” to rub the blind man’s eyes, it was excellent discernment of the writer NOT to mention exactly where that happened, otherwise we would have some Catholic or Charismatic church raising some altar on the spot and start selling divine saliva and holy clay to heal blindness. Surely they would find some gimmick to “prove” the miracle, and maybe some sight-impaired individual would get a better vision, for we can [in some cases] heal ourselves if shocked enough with strange phenomena. Well, surely a tremendous business if it could be arranged.

There was a time the popes were selling all sorts of relics by the ton to build St. Peter’s Cathedral or whenever they needed cash from their superstitious followers. Religious dishonesty gets to those levels. For centuries, at special occasions, they sold milk from Mary’s breasts in small vials [against which Calvin wrote some harsh words]. Read on the Internet “Forgery In Christianity – A Documented Record of the Foundations of the Christian Religion” by Joseph Wheless.

Next, after “anointing” the blind man’s eyes with that “healing clay”

medicine, Jesus, sort of rudely, orders him to go wash his eyes in some pool without explain the technicalities. The Bible does always leave out the detail we would need to properly critique the text. What intrigues me is that this Jesus had no compassion for the individual by taking him by his hand and leading him to the pool, like a kind person would do. No; the blind had to go there by himself, asking people around the way if he was on the right track.

Not one of the twelve disciples offered to help the blind man, either, so much for charity. It is still like that in many forms of religion, where the adherent has to support the system without a simple thanks. The blind man went, wash his eyes and came back seeing. Well, that is debatable, how much was he seeing? The story then degenerates into a sort of a theological debate with many other actors, obviously all INVENTED by John, since no disciple was present to witness all of it. That is the usual misdemeanour in the miracles, ending up disturbing the local peace. Only a blind man can see any moral or spiritual lesson in this affair. Jesus is the hero, but he and his disciples were also inconsiderate, both to the blind man and to the Pharisees for doing another “miracle” on the Sabbath.

RESURRECTION OF LAZARUS

1 – miracle number seven

WHEN THE CONSCIENTIOUS Bible student arrives at John chapter eleven, he has already studied six other miracles and found them forged propaganda to promote a christ that would end his life a complete failure in the primary endeavour he had been chosen for [the salvation of the Jews and the inauguration, arrival, of John the Baptist's "Kingdom of Heaven" where Jesus Christ the Jewish Messiah would sit on the physical throne of king David, sort of utopia dream. This angle is not only terribly traumatic, but disturbingly disrupting, for when a Christ fails, so does his divine integrity. And a Christ with no integrity is a charlatan, a dangerous impersonator we need to expose before something terribly grave takes place and many innocent bystanders end up dead. In this Jesus' history, the procedure wasn't implement in time.

He came, not in the *pleroma* [fullness] of the time – Galatians 4:4 – but millennia before Armageddon (!), and millions had to die an inglorious death for nothing of real value. Religion has always propagated a vicious form of hatred whereby its custodians are ready to kill to defend that

Christ's holiness. If, on the other hand, the original plan was formulated with its intrinsic defects to sort of camouflage some undisclosed purpose, the more we have reason – yes, we reason the entire process – to get angry at God for not finding a more honourable way to save us from that nasty Enemy he allowed in our territory. Sorry, folks, but either way, the “plan” of salvation, or the “arrival” of that weirdest “kingdom”, that never came, is corrupted with many flaws.

A corrupt programme has a lot to say about its designer's incompetence. There would have been a much better possibility to save the world without the victimisation of so many throughout history. A God that finds acceptable to ill-treat us is terribly suspicious and untrustworthy. The church has, in this respect, betrayed all – its supporters that give it cash – a gross misdemeanour. That is, how can the church take God's side, go on a perpetual accusation against us, and in the process has the guts to charge us a fee to tell us all that bad news? What destroyed our trust in “the church” was its elitism. That is, those accusing us of offending God are only playing the virtuous when in the end they are also of the same offensive species. That's why nobody should give any church any money to keep that elite of “special humans” to carry on with its parasitism.

Therefore, the very first question the attentive student wants to ask this John – writing his choreography in the second century, 100 years after the events supposedly took place – is whether we can finally believe this resurrection miracle is the genuine one in the collection.

The first miracle failure was water changed to wine at an unknown town called Cana. The second was the healing of a child three months later also at that location; the third, the healing of the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda; the fourth the multiplication of loaves and fish; the

fifth the walk on water; and the sixth the healing of a man born blind using spit and clay.

There are only seven detailed miracles in the gospel of John, though he says Jesus did many others, so many that to detail all of them the whole world wouldn't have enough space to store all the books – John 21:25. Obviously it is a preposterous exaggeration, in the fashion of the entire gospel; for to inflate “miracles” in the second century wasn't a declarable sin whatsoever. You see, when this John wrote that sentence he gave his frame of mind away as an absurd exaggerator; that is, his miracles follow the same route. Do you see how simple it is to read the hidden material?

“And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen.” Well, any small “book” in John's days would be a massive and heavy handwritten volume of papyrus leaves inaccessible to the majority of people. And who would read them? Yet it is only vanity to say he was capable of memorizing each event of Jesus' life in detail to fill up all those books. Hence, an exaggerating apostle is not to be fully trusted, for certainly part of his writings wouldn't be true. He could never remember the details of a thousand miracles, but in apostolic fashion would compensate the “variances” with his fertile imagination. He would do that also to the seven he decided to record in his production

I prefer to believe that if the whole life of Jesus could be represented in writing, John would be surprised by the secretive part of his unknown years. Why write about a thousand miracles if we could not know who this christ was? There are apparently 18 years of his life we know nothing about. No proper biography can omit that period in the life of its subject.

Why Jesus is so secretive about those years has to be suspicious. In

some “traditions” he spent that time in Egypt among the radical Gnostics, and learning the occult sciences, miracle-doing one of them. Rather, then, not to trust a “Messiah” whose life is not fully known to all. If he had to flee to Egypt, the “Father” who planned this was already failing somewhere; from that day in the foreign land the original plan was defective. If the new “Messiah” had to run away to save his life, the rest of his endeavour is but a defective decoration.

Saddest of all is that we already know enough of what Jesus would eventually produce in a world saturated with his religious propaganda. It is undeniable that Christianity has not helped the moral fibre of the human race improve much. It has been a dedicated 20 centuries of aggressive evangelism to rescue the moral world from the Devil and we are still subjected to his curses. Be careful, therefore, with Christs. The church – for its own convenience – is constantly asserting that God takes care, but it is already 20 centuries and there is still much territory to conquer. We have enough reason to be dismayingly demoralised. The most terrible part of that fantastic plan of God to rescue the world from the grip of Satan is where a brutal war at some “Armageddon” will be discharged. That is, cleaning the moral world with nuclear weapons! No, surely we have the wrong deity on our side; deserved better.

So, what about the “many” miracles? If Jesus did a miracle a day, it would be 365 in the first year. If his ministry was of three years, we have a prolific miracle-doer with a list of more than a thousand, maybe many more. How come then John only mentioned seven, all extremely weird? Surely this means that he was telling lies from the beginning. Would John select the best miracles, or would he choose the ones that endorsed his particular viewpoint about his Master? If the latter is true, then he might have left behind the most important miracles his Lord performed. Ah,

isn't that something important? Sure it is. It means we do not have the whole picture of Jesus' doings. Which, by implication, means that there is no “verbal inspiration” anywhere in the canonical gospels, which then makes the present gospel a side chosen by its particular followers; which also means that they might have directed the course of events towards what they fancied.

And then? Are we supposed to believe that the brand of gospel followed by Catholics and Protestants is the one envisaged by Jesus? Certainly not. By the second century, Gnosticism was picking up the teachings of Jesus and amalgamating them with the pagan forms thereof. Therefore, this John was in this connection dishonest to present us with the miracles that favoured his lineage. He is here selling a product we have the right to reject.

In fact, careful studies in the literature we have from the second and third centuries reveal more than a propensity for “godly” hyperbole and exaggeration, outrageously dishonest. Much content in the gospels was “interpolation”, glosses and additions of another party, including, some think, this last chapter of John 21. Therefore, we have to be careful to look for this propensity in this John, for he is not going to tell us what really happened. Exaggeration in the gospels is directly connected to miracles. By the time the bishops had to select the New Testament books from the hundreds available, the confusion was indescribable.

Three of those miracles are in the physical realm: replacing water with wine, multiplying bread and fish, and walking over water. One is healing from a distance without any contact with the sick; one is performed right next to the impotent man without touching him; one is healing blindness by physical contact, and the other raising a dead body without touching it.

Did John think to organise his list in that fashion? At ninety years old, the apostle knew exactly what to select and include in his report, therefore we certainly believe there is nothing rightly chronological in this gospel. That's why the bishops had eventually to choose another three to complement the collection.

But of course, I hasten to say that every student of the Bible has the right and liberty to interpret it his own way, since the apostle John did exactly that with his gospel. He didn't follow the "chronology" or "theology" of the three synoptic. His gospel is different – and, surely, this John is not the disciple. On the other hand, there is no natural or spiritual law written or inferred anywhere awarding anyone in particular with the absolute rights of interpretation. Since that has clearly to be the universal norm, which created a plethora of points of view – for it started right there with the very writers of the NT content – eventually the party with more votes would gain, firstly, social acceptance, then political power, and finally access to lethal weapons to impose its preferences.

Constantine was the first emperor to help the Church acquire political power and next weapons to evangelise the disgruntled to heaven. And that's why we have Roman Catholicism's dogmas like "*Unam Sanctam*" to isolate and reject other opinions.

2 – no Lazarus in the synoptic

Why is this portent not mentioned in the other three gospels, and why would John mention it only sixty years after Pentecost? There must be a strong reason for the incredible omission and sinister delay. If Jesus performed more than one thousand miracles, raising the dead many times, we are told, why wouldn't the synoptic mention even one clear case?

When Jesus gathered the twelve disciples around him, he soon dispatched them to the surrounding districts with the strict instruction to go "preach" the arrival of the eagerly awaited "kingdom of heaven" – who was really waiting for it, we don't know. As usual, the text is very limited in detail, forcing us to make liberal use of our imagination. Jesus told them to go heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils, and more.

Then he added the most disconcerting words never observed to the letter by the future hierarchy: "Freely ye have received, freely give." If this had been obeyed, we would not have today religious empires, organisations and popes all of them despising the stern order. Where did Jesus ever tell his followers to build churches, cathedrals, headquarters, Vaticans, altars, publish Bibles, raise billions in real estate, and more? The truth is that all the disrespect towards the commandment to give the gospel for free was never followed. Religion was to carry on being a business with fear of inexistent wrathful demiurges. The churches, consequently, are in direct confrontation with that statement of Jesus; the rest is cheating the contributor.

Do we next hear of anybody raised from the dead? Not one. Do we hear of any leper cleansed of his disease? Not one. What about devils cast out of the possessed? No documentation whatsoever. But if the disciples ever raised one dead corpse the incredible feat was forever forgotten. Why? Because it wouldn't have been performed by the christ in fashion at that time, the only one with rank high enough to be detailed in the sacred gospels.

Oh, how cynical, is it not? We had here twelve highly energised disciples on the go to perform the most amazing portents to welcome the arrival of the eagerly expected "kingdom of heaven", and not one raised

one single dead? Oh, heavens, what's then about lepers being cleansed, the sick being healed and the demons being expelled? not one sample to present? No, I don't believe it. There must have been many performed by the twelve ambassadors. Imagine, on the other hand, those terribly immature evangelists, preaching the kingdom, and doing miracles, just imagine. If Jesus created a revolution, imagine twelve of the same calibre. Isn't that also true of the church in general? How much offence and prejudice does the church create wherever it goes to evangelise?

Sorry, folks, it is irrational. The biblical truth is that there isn't one single sample of one miracle acted out by a disciple. Nothing even inferred in that department, not one. The adventure was a complete flop. Meanwhile, observe Jesus in the following verses threatening anybody who would reject the new evangelists – Matthew 10 and 11. Immaturity aflame. Those passages of Christ threatening those who were simply sympathetic enough to hear him out always angered me. What right did he have to intimidate others to bring in the “Kingdom of Heaven”, the ignorant. Just bring the kingdom without any fuss, for goodness' sake!. But it was the greatest delusion a christ ever brought out from heaven into this disillusioned planet. He lied to his supporters; for that he was crucified, if that story could hold water; the data we get is not convincing, unless you run a business from it. Religion is cheating other humans with stuff you know nothing about.

I would like to tell this Jesus that if there was something wrong with us the human race, his “Father” was to blame, not us. Had he forgotten that such an Almighty God was once upon a time in our human history with a much smaller problem to resolve and let it escape his attention?! That was the time when the “offence” had been only minor, easy to

resolve. But sadly, that Jesus' almighty Father wasn't competent enough to succeed in such small matters; a terribly disappointing Supreme.

Surely, dear reader, such a God never saw the light of the day in this universe; therefore this Jesus we're talking about could only be a fraud. Why wouldn't he preach the gospel of LIGHT where there is no darkness – 1 John 1:5 – and forget about cursing those who lent him an ear to receive him. The gospel of Jesus was soon spotted with the blemishes of curses and bullying. Terrible.

3 – Matthew 10

It is in this chapter ten that Jesus pronounces the infamous words of verse 34: “Think not that I am come to send peace on Earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword.” Oh, horror of horrors! Why did you then come, Lord, since we already had lots of swords down here. And where did you find that sword in heaven? Did your “Father” give you the sword and sent you down here to bring war, more war? Such a Christ was never invited to come; you came uninvited, you intruder, Today you would not speak of swords, you would say “I came to bring a machine gun!”, the most brutal of all christ we had suffered. Oh the false Christ, who told him we needed him? No, Christ, you must return to heaven and make war over there, if your spirit is that disturbed, leave us alone, we reject you!

But next this weird Christ would say even worse, when he said that to follow him we needed to hate our family, those we love, them who never did a wrong against us – Luke 14:26, in the KJV. Who wanted a Christ like that, and dwell next to him in his “kingdom”?

Naturally, then, when Jesus told the disciples of John – who he sent to find out who this Jesus was – that they would tell him about the miracles, including raising the dead, jesus boldly lied to them, for

not one example is recorded from that first missionary expedition of his immature disciples.

Jesus told the disciples of John the Baptist that the dead were raised, and many other miracles. But there wasn't one single example of that portent, not one. Only sixty years later would John, 90 years old at the time, sick in mind and body and psychologically disturbed, reveal that yes nobody had ever been raised from the dead except what he was going to elaborate upon in chapter eleven.

A true Bible student will find these discrepancies in the text, but if the church subsidizes him he will have to keep his mouth shut for fear of reprisals. The tragic sequence of events is that normally such an honest-to-himself student only realizes the truth about the Bible when he is already stuck in "ministry", from where he gets his living earnings. In an instance of frankness and honesty his ministry will be over. It happens regularly around the world. Dishonestly, many stuck in ministry don't want to jeopardise their livelihood.

4 – Jairus' daughter

This 12-year-old girl wasn't dead or was raised to life by the Jesus – Matthew 9:18-25; Mark 5:22-43; Luke 8:41-56. There is nothing in the text to substantiate her death. Jesus would tell the mourners that she was not dead but only "sleeping", probably in coma or so sick physically, incapable of movement with a very light breathing. The father of this little girl did not tell Jesus "my daughter is dead", as the commentator will explain based on the Greek word, which would mean "about to die".

Therefore, this is not a clear case where Jesus raised a dead corpse to life in the synoptic gospels. It wasn't the case, period. That means that there are no such cases in the three first gospels to support and

corroborate the theory that Jesus and the disciples performed many such miracles. There is nothing in that department from both or either teams of miracle-doers. But surely, if we have to accredit this miracle, we would recognise that Jesus had enough energy to heal people. That is not a great mystery, for other human beings have been observed having such powers. That lies in the paranormal "science" whereby certain individuals arrive on Earth with - or later acquire - positive karma that other humans are influenced by; if that.

Apollonius of Tyana was one such individual wondering around Palestine at that time of Jesus, or as some believe, "Jesus" himself was this other famous healer by a different name-de-plume. What we can find in the gospels without a doubt is that there are two characters acting with the same name of some "Jesus". One would be full of positive energy perhaps healing some sick people while dispensing some helpful morality. The other, that followed by the church in general, was a terrible sample of Old Testament immoral aggression, always claiming to be the Son of some weird Father which the church would identify as Jehovah. Yet, to prove he was that man is altogether another matter.

5 – widow's son raised from the dead

This miracle – Luke 7:12-17 – has no parallel passage in the other three gospels and is particularly interesting for it is proof against the raising of the dead. Its suspicion lies in the fact that Luke replaces Lazarus' miracle with this one. Since Luke says in its introduction that he would endeavour to find the true gospel, it then stands to reason that he never heard of Lazarus' resurrection. How could that be, since Luke was supposed to have been written many years before John? Had he heard about Lazarus? Obviously not, otherwise he would have mentioned it on its own or

together with the other one. No true gospel writer would miss the story of Lazarus.

But did John hear about the widow's child? If he had been near the miracle, he considered it of inferior quality to that of Lazarus; that's why he preferred the latter; a conflicting situation, is it not, for on one hand we have John telling us about one single resurrection of one person, and by its lengthy description he wanted to emphasise its importance. But on the other hand we have Luke making no reference at all about Lazarus and finding the widow's child miracle the only one relevant to mention. And who would have told Luke about this widow's child raised from the dead, since no other canonical gospel mentions it? An anonymous eyewitness or a disciple Luke refused to mention by name?

You see, this is enough evidence for the careful student to discredit both cases of somebody being raised from the dead. Besides, the context of John's disciples arriving to inquire whether Jesus was the true prophet does not agree with the parallel sections in Matthew and Luke. In Matthew, John's disciples arrive after Jesus spoke about the cost and benefits of discipleship, whereas in Luke immediately after the widow's child raised from the dead. There is no parallel sequence. Jesus would tell John's disciples to report back to him about the miracles, including raising the dead, but nothing like that happens in Matthew; Jesus resurrects no widow's child.

Verse 16 uses the word "fear" [phobos] to describe the reaction to this miracle. So, naturally, the writer (Luke) wanted to express the superstitious tendencies of that folk observing the event. Also, in the next verse, he uses the word "rumour", as the story was told around town and elsewhere. Among those who witnessed the "miracle" was the disciple John, who would not record it in his gospel. Yes, much of the

stuff Luke heard from anonymous eyewitnesses was nothing but folklore exaggerated by superstitious folk. How can we then formulate theology based on two mutually discrediting resurrections in the gospels?

OTHER MIRACLES

Other miracles in the gospels

THERE ARE OTHER weird miracles in the synoptic gospels. In Matthew, after the extremely incongruent episode of his temptation by the Devil – chapter four – in itself a disruption worthy of a book, Jesus starts his ministry with this false statement: “Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.”; 4:17. It wasn’t, the liar, and it will never be. No such kingdom was ever seen on Earth since that day, twenty centuries ago. We have seen many kingdoms on this tormented planet, all excluding this weird Jesus from them. The kingdoms of men came one after the other, bringing war and misery, not least the so-called “Holy Roman Empire”, which disrupted and destroyed the lives of many millions of innocent people while this lying prophet looked.

Rhetorically speaking, Jesus is directly responsible for all that brutality, for if the intention had been to “bring in” the deceptive “Kingdom of Heaven” but something packed up before its inauguration, the victims of posterior kingdoms have a lot to say in condemning the failure. Literally, millions of innocent people became victims of this weird

Jesus and his cousin's plot – or, perhaps more realistic, the guy was never around anywhere.

Now, when a christ arrives on Earth to start his mission with a lie we are in for millions of victims, I repeat. What the hell then with the miracles, if the main one would never happen: the honesty of Christ to tell us exactly why God needed him on Earth if there had been a historical moment when to resolve the need for a future “Kingdom of Heaven” was a piece of cake? Why wouldn't God bring in that fabulous “Kingdom of Heaven” right away when the problem was minor? This question, as said elsewhere in the book, is enough to disrupt and haunt the Almighty's holy integrity, for we have enough mental power in our faculty of reason to withhold our challenge.

God can go red in anger and attack us with nuclear weapons at some weird “Armageddon” and all that, but the question will stand objectively true throughout the destruction. Jesus and his cousin the Baptist came announcing a kingdom that never saw the light of the day; both prophets lying through their teeth to the innocent and naïve bystanders.

You be careful with prophets and christes, please, for there has not been one capable of resolving our predicament and victimization at their hands and of their gods. In other words, we have had no real friend in any of those weird characters doing miracles and all that. Miracles for what, if the suffering of our species has never ended in millennia of exploitation by religion? For heaven's sake, leave us alone; we do not need any christ on Earth; and the same goes for the church. We need new genes to save ourselves from certain destruction.

1 – Calming the sea

This miracle's typical exaggeration is reflected in the expressions “arose a

great tempest in the sea”, “the ship was covered with the waves”, and “but he [Jesus] was asleep”. Matthew 8:23-27.

How could a human being sleep under such terribly conditions? If the waves were “covering” the little boat, wasn't Jesus soaking wet? Wouldn't he awake with water splashing on his face?

“Lord, save us: we perish!” But Jesus still sleeping retorted: “Why do you fear, you of little faith! Go back to sleep and my Father will check the boat and let us arrive at the other side unscathed, you fanatical Pentecostals!” – my paraphrasing.

“Yes, Lord, our faith is the least in this boat, or do you think we could cross the sea sleeping like you?! What can faith do against this nerve-racking storm, really, come on: do you think we are divine like you?! The facts are that gods spend their time sleeping while we suffer in this world. It's not that we are right now in the middle of a massive storm, but that there have been horrendous ones where faith or no faith many perished! Was it all a matter of faith, to cross the voracious seas without a scratch? Come on, Master, it's not the right time to joke about our fear: what shall we do now, before we all perish? Why wouldn't you foresee this storm and keep us inland until the sea was calm again? And, by the way, what spiritual lesson did you want to teach us, poor victims of gods and christes? Lately, we haven't learned a thing from you!”

When Jesus heard these valid observations, ashamed he stood up and ordered the wind, the waves and his disciples to calm down, for those were not nice moments to teach spiritual values.

2 – the poor swine

The next miracle in Matthew – 8:28-34 – is the exorcising of “about” two

thousand devils from two poor victims. The parallel passages mention one man, and have other differences; ah, so much for scriptural accuracy.

This “miracle” is a disgrace and a disgusting flop; nothing in the gospels is more despicable. Why would God allow so many evil spirits inside a defenceless man? Didn’t God see the evil spirits attacking and possessing him one after the other? What can we do against invisible spirits, when it was God who gave them that advantage?

Wasn’t it Jehovah – presumably the “Father” of this deluded Jesus of the miracles [nothing is really clear in the Bible] – who “punished” the “Serpent” in the Garden of Eden by granting him permanent residence and invisibility in our world? Come on! We are victims of that orchestration. Jehovah punished our “father” Adam by putting us “at the mercy” of this cruel lucifer. What God would not rush to protect the innocent?! What sort of God are we dealing with here?!

Poetically put:

How many more devils are out there in the “air” as if God would care?

What happened to God’s mind when there was only one, easy to squash? Come on, is this the gospel of grace, mercy and compassion?

If Jesus deserved one time to have charges laid against his wrongdoing was when he dispatched the evil spirits to the “herd” of swine, which next ran into the sea and perished. What on earth was going through this weird Jesus’ mind, for heaven’s sake? But most importantly, what happened to the evil spirits after the swine were drowned? Oh, of course, they escaped to go back and infest the same individuals or another innocent victim - spirits don’t drown, do they.

Jesus himself would later confirm this criminal activity against an innocent member of our society – Luke 11:24 – when he said that if the

unclean spirits are not completely eliminated they return to the same human body. So, naturally, Jesus kicked them from the demon-possessed for a few minutes but they went back to their original hideout.

Jesus is, in this episode, guilty of messing around with those spirits instead of destroy them once and for all. The excuse some preachers offer is that evil or unclean spirits are indestructible, therefore eternal. Where did the preachers get the information is another thing – if so, Jesus did something terribly wrong, by interfering in the natural process his Father Jehovah had implemented.

Since Jesus, subsequently, had to run away from the enraged owners of that pork industry, we know nothing else about the two exorcised men; but the unclean devils were free to infest them again, that’s for sure. Nobody actually knew whatever happened to the men, so much so that Mark and Luke write about only one. Thanks, Jesus, for your unkindness.

But why wouldn’t God the Father of this weird Jesus keep the evil guests away from the poor victims when the very first managed to infiltrate his body? What the hell is wrong with the system that Jesus only appeared in the scene when the spirits had multiplied in front of God’s eyes – which the Bible says perceive everything, Hebrews 4:13 – and had invaded the victim by the hundreds? What would be the problem to hold off the very first one, to protect an innocent man: our innocent human race, for that matter? You see, this miracle is a devastating proof against the god this Jesus was announcing: he used the two poor men only as publicity propaganda to promote his Christ. If this is divine honesty, honestly I don’t see it.

But, most critical of all, what did Jesus do to keep the devils, demons and evil spirits away from this planet, if he was so passionate and powerful to exorcise them? You see, the miracle failed right there in two critical

areas: one, he didn't destroy the evil spirits, which would leave the swine and be free to invade somebody else's body; and two, he left all the other possessed in the world still at the mercy of Satan. That's why I said the "miracle" was a disgrace and a flop. That is, this incompetent Jesus didn't do a clean job at all. And next comes the church telling us he was God and we must worship him, with the disadvantage and aggravation that we have to give the church our money to keep this massive fantasy going.

The devils were very clever in this fable, for they managed to trick Jesus to let them go into the swine. Jesus couldn't see it quickly enough, for he wouldn't be able to drown spirits. Ah, what a laugh the evil spirits had afterwards. They knew that to escape the herd would be only a matter of jumping into the lake and drown all of them to be free again, the clever demons, I tell you.

However, Jesus should have been prosecuted right that day for destroying other people's property. Why would he not be intelligent enough to instead dispatch the devils to the outskirts of the Big Bang and leave the innocent swine alone, which never did a wrong thing to Jesus? Why sacrifice blameless animals for a miracle? If that happened today, Jesus would be in trouble with the local SPCA. What sin had the innocent swine done, while enjoying the day in the fields getting fat for a more productive end? What divine right had Jesus to destroy private property!? The Bible teachers and commentators appear here by the dozen to defend Jesus with the lame excuse that the Jews were not allowed to raise swine for the law said so, and more crap. Why then did Jesus leave out all the other pork industrialists in the nation, if he was such a law-abiding enthusiast? I smell a rat in all those comments to help Jesus escape ordinary justice.

Every Jew was democratically free to violate the Law of Moses, because Moses himself never respected it. The Law said: "Thou shalt

not kill or murder", but Moses was the first to infringe it, when he killed innocent children, their pregnant mothers and delivered innocent virgins to his deranged militia – Numbers 31:17.

He came down from Sinai with the two plates and as soon as he arrived back in the camp, he ordered the killing and murdering of three thousand of his followers – for a minor offence, after all – it had been his fault he spent too much time up there doing what – Exodus 32:28.

By doing that, those Bible teachers become partakers in the same crime. In fact, Jesus didn't heal anybody as far as we can see in the text, but aggravated a lot of people and had to run away to escape a well-deserved hiding. Since when did a christ make miracles and then had to escape the wrath of the spectators? He didn't do any miracle over there. Jesus was stubborn enough to do miracles on the Sabbath and go out in the farms to kill swine. The only word he says in that pork miracle is "Go"; all the rest is Matthew's choreography - all the apostles were liars. Yes, but they came back and are still around, after 20 centuries, many in the churches and their leaders, who constantly tell lies in the same fashion to earn an easy, parasitic living.

3 – two against one

Matthew mentions two blind men, but Mark and Luke mention only one. As usual, the details of these parallel miracles are different, which is a good example of the way the story about miracles was propagated all along the decades after they had supposedly happened. See Matthew 20:30-34; Mark 10:46-52; Luke 18:35-43. Mark, who wasn't a disciple at the time of this miracle, managed to find the name of his blind man, Bartimaeus the son of Timaeus. Luke leaves the blind anonymous for fear of Mark's mistake. Luke had heard the story from anonymous

eyewitnesses themselves, therefore avoided any possible complications for his sources. In Matthew the two blind men cried out “O Lord, thou son of David”, whereas in Mark and Luke the one blind man cried out “Jesus, thou son of David.” In Matthew Jesus touched the two men’s eyes, and said no words, whereas in Mark and Luke he pronounced two different sentences. In Mark he says: “Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole”, and in Luke he says: “Receive thy sight: thy faith hath saved thee.”

Therefore, we have here likewise in many other passages proof that nothing is genuine in matters biblical. Sure enough the Bible exegetes arrive in droves to rearrange the text and pronounce the most incongruent disparities to find a divine way to harmonize the conflicting texts, but we already knew that “science” from the very second century, when others tried but failed. They failed because it is already the twenty first century and those harmonizers have not yet finished the job. If you have to believe the Bible, please, believe only what is positive and gracious, the rest discard; it is a sound policy and acceptable doctrine.

Yet, the main point about miracles of giving sight to blind based on a divine principle of love and mercy doesn’t hold even a drop of water, for why wouldn’t God demonstrate the same mercy to all? Why is it that if we had not discovered the remedy for many diseases no God would appear to help us? Jesus didn’t even wash his hands before a meal – Matthew 15; there is no record in the four gospels of him ever taking a bath; or wiping his backside after defecating, which is today regarded as the ancient reason for many contagious diseases, which Jesus also transmitted to others, I’m sure. When he imposed his hands on children, who knows if the next week they wouldn’t be dying in bed with some influenza or other viruses?

But, surely, the most important of all rhetorical questions directed at

God is the “WHY” wouldn’t God protect our sight from enemy attack when there appeared in the world the very first blind man? If love conquers all, according to some other scripture, God missed very badly the unique opportunity to be worshiped in spirit and in truth.

We could be a blessed species, enjoying this world and its life-giving pleasures and would be happy for evermore if we had the gods on our side.

The End