

## 19 QUESTIONS

FOR CHRISTIAN CLERGY

by

Edip Yuksel

Copyright © 1993 by Edip Yuksel

All rights reserved including the right of reproduction in whole or in part in any form without permission in writing from the author, except via electronic mail, or internet.

I'm grateful for the critical review and the editorial assistance of John Spooner, Gatut Adisoma, Kathryn Kolton, Martha Schulte-Nafeh, Lisa Spray, Douglas Brown, Emily Sterrett, Jim Williamson, Abdullah Arik, Raymond Catton, Chris Moore, Linda Moore, Jerry Patchen, and Apameh Bashar.

---

## CONTENTS

### Congratulations

1. Did Jesus ever claim to be Lord?
  2. How many Jesuses are there in the Bible?
  3. Is  $1+1+1=1$ , or  $1=1+1+1$ ?            10
  4. Who was St. Paul: a saint or a hypocrite?
  5. What Gospel did Jesus preach?
  6. A forsaken God?
  7. Is "Human God" a product of translation errors?
  8. Genealogy or Mythology?
  9. Quadrinity?
  10. Contradictions?
  11. Revised, re-revised, re-re-revised. What's next?
  12. Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation or ....?
  13. Priests or peddlers?
  14. Images, icons, idols, saints, priests OR God?
  15. Why do you abuse or ignore many verses?
  16. A human god?
  17. Is this how you defend the deity of Jesus?
  18. Who is "Parakletos?"
  19. Can you witness a miracle?
- The Arrow Test  
An invitation

## CONGRATULATIONS!

By opening this book you have shown that you have the courage to critically

examine your faith. These 19 questions are directed toward you, the educated Christian. This is one in a series of books that examine the major religions, Islam, Christianity, and Atheism which we also consider a belief system.

Throughout history believers have simply followed the crowd. Children have grown up believing what their parents and their priests said instead of making their own decisions. By reading and attempting to answer the questions in this book you are proving that your faith is based upon your own thought and convictions. You are no longer a passenger on the "bandwagon" of religious fanaticism, but a pioneer in the search for truth.

#### Breaking the atoms into pieces

Discussing any religious faith on the basis of logic and knowledge is a difficult task for two reasons. First, the majority of "believers" inherit their religion from their parents, and most of them do not use their intellectual faculties to question the status quo. Second, any criticism at a logical fallacy can be countered with a logical shield such as: "We cannot comprehend God" or "We cannot understand God's wisdom."

So, throughout history, questioning minds have created tension in traditional religious circles. Asking "Why" and even sometimes "how" is considered a threat. "Close your eyes, have faith and enter our tunnel; then at the end you will see the light" is the ultimate invitation. Many corrupted religions and cults use "personal experience" to maintain their survival.

Einstein, having had a hard time with bigoted scientists, expressed this attitude in terms of physics: "Removing fixed misconception from the people's mind is as difficult as breaking the atom into pieces." Nevertheless, when you remove a fixed misconception from someone's mind, it starts a chain of reactions which can ignite intellectual explosions and revolutions in the walls of bigotry.

#### One God, one religion

There are many examples of intellectual revolutions in the history of religion. All of them were triggered by unpopular, intellectual revolutionaries, such as Abraham, Moses, Socrates, Buddha, Jesus and Muhammad. All of them fought against clerical exploitation, idolization of humans, and blindly following parents. Their common struggle was to stop leaders from abusing the name of God and to prevent professional religionists from oppressing people mentally, politically, and economically. They invited people to One God and one religion.

Ironically, whenever those brave pioneers passed away, they became popular and their "followers" started idolizing them and putting them in competition with one another, making claims such as, "Buddha is the Lord; he is the savior," or "Jesus is the Lord; he is the savior," or "Muhammad is the greatest; he is the savior."

Further, leaders and religious scholars started to abuse the pioneer's names in order to make money and gain authority and power over people. The Crusades, the Inquisition, papal indulgences are just a few words from that rich "holy" history!

Today, there are more than half a million clergy members of all faiths in the United States. All of them make money from their religious preaching or service. The U.S. Department of Labor estimates a \$38,000 average annual

income for Protestant ministers, in contrast to the fact that neither Moses nor Jesus, neither Buddha nor Muhammad asked for or made money for their teachings. Indeed, in the USA alone, hundreds of thousands of clergy members make quite a bit of money from preaching doctrines that has been falsely attributed to Jesus.

Though we directed our challenging questions to clergy members, our real audiences are the sincere followers. We do not expect the clergymen to evaluate these questions, or the Pope to answer them. Very few people can accept the truth at the expense of losing their jobs and followers. If you are making money from Christianity; if you are a respected member of a religious corporation, you have many reasons to defend falsehood.

P.S. If you have religious friends and relatives, I suggest you to read the chapter titled "Arrow Test" on page 93, before reading the questions .

#### QUESTION 1

Did Jesus ever claim to be Lord?

"There is condensation and editing; there is choice, reproduction and witness. The Gospels have come through the mind of the Church behind the authors. They represent experience and history." (Kenneth Cragg, the Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, *The Call of the Minaret*, p 277)

Jesus never claimed that he was literally the son of God, or God. There are many verses in the Bible confirming this fact. None of the verses quoted directly from Jesus support Trinity or deity of Jesus, if we eliminate the interpretations of St. Paul and his disciples. We will present those verses in the coming questions. It is a well known historical fact that today's Christianity is the product of the Nicene Conference (325 AD). In that conference, the clergy established the Trinity and banned many Gospels that did not contain their distorted ideas. In today's Bible there are a few distorted verses about the divinity of Jesus, which contradict the whole Old Testament, and the majority of the Gospels.

Some outstanding Christian scholars have reached the conclusion that the deity of Jesus is a mere fabrication. As the examples of critical studies on Christianity, here I list the name of two books: *The Myth of God Incarnate*, John Hick, ed., The Westminster, Philadelphia, 1977, and *Jesus: Myth & Message*, Lisa Spray, Universal Unity, Fremont, California, 1992.

The doctrine of modern Christianity with its implication that God Almighty has a multiple personality, and that He sacrificed one of His personalities for the salvation of human kind, has nothing to do with Jesus, as we will discuss in the next questions.

Two translations, two meanings

Here are two translations of Matthew 7:21. One is from the version authorized by a king (not God), King James, The other is The New American Bible, which was translated by the members of Catholic Biblical Association of America. Notice the contradiction between the two translations in the first three words of that verse:

King James Version:

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom

of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven."

The New American Bible (1970):

"None of those who cry out, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of God but only the one who does the will of my Father in heaven."

In light of the verses that follow (Mt 7:22,23), which clearly indicate Jesus' anger and displeasure at people who call him "Lord, Lord", it is obvious that both translators distorted Mt 7:21 in a different manner. Ironically, by comparing them side by side, the true account inevitably emerges: "None of those who call me, 'Lord, Lord,'. . ."

Our question for Christian Scholars on Mt 7:21 has two parts. The simple part of the question is:

Which One Is Correct:

"Not every one..." OR "None of those..." ?

And the difficult part is: Why?

## QUESTION 2

How many Jesuses are there in the Bible?

"Although Matthew 1:21 interprets the name (originally Joshua, that is Yahweh is salvation) and finds it especially appropriate for Jesus of Nazareth, it was a common one at the time. Josephus, the Jewish historian, refers to 19 different persons by that name." (Encyclopedia Americana, Jesus, 1959)

Most would answer this question easily by stating that there is only one Jesus in the Bible. But, the fact is that the Bible is full of characters bearing the same name.

Jesus is not the original name of the prophet who brought the New Testament. It is a transliteration of Joshua. The same name can be found as Hosea, Hoshea, Jehoshuah, Jeshua, Jeshuah, Osea and Oshea (See: Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible). These names are mentioned hundreds of times in the Old Testament. They are all different spellings of the same word which means "Yahweh is salvation."

But, Matthew 1:21 tries to create a human-god out of a transliteration inconsistency:

"She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins."

Besides, there is more than one Christ (Anointed) in the Bible. Isa 45:1; 1Sa 24:6,10; 26:9-23; Nu 3:3 are few examples.

Related Questions:

1. According to the Bible, Jesus is a common name. Then, why do you try to make it unique by spelling it differently?
2. "Christ (Anointed)" is used for many. Do you still claim that "Christ" is unique?

### QUESTION 3

1+1+1=1 or 1=1+1+1  
Trinity?

"We worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity; neither confounding the Persons, nor dividing the Substance (Prayer Book, 1662). The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and yet there are not three Gods but one God." (Athanasian Creed).

Millions of Christians believe in the "Holy Trinity" on faith. Through this formula they have made Jesus the "Son of God", and even God himself. However, history, logic, mathematics, the Old Testament, and the New Testament prove the contrary: Jesus was not Lord, he was a human just as we all are.

What is the Trinity?

The doctrine of Trinity is found in many pagan religions. Brahma, Shiva, and Vishnu are the Trinitarian godhead in Indian religions. In Egypt there was the triad of Osiris, Isis and Horus; in Babylon, Ishtar, Sin, Shamash; in Arabia, Al-Laat, Al-Uzza, and Manat. The Encyclopedia Britannica (1975) gives a critical piece of information:

"Trinity, the doctrine of God taught by Christians that asserts that God is one in essence but three in 'person,' Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Neither the word Trinity, nor the explicit doctrine as such, appears in the New Testament, nor did Jesus and his followers intend to contradict the shema in the Old Testament: 'Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord' (Deut. 6:4) "

This information on Trinity contradicts the faith of most Christians. They believe that Matthew 28:19 and John 1:1 and some other verses clearly provide a basis for the doctrine of Trinity. However, the New Catholic Encyclopedia (1967 edition, Vol: 14, p. 306) acknowledges that the Trinity doctrine does not exist in the Old Testament, and that it was formulated three centuries after Jesus.

Three centuries after Christ

It is unanimously accepted that the doctrine of Trinity is the product of the Nicene Conference (325 AD). Huw Parri Owen, a former professor of Christian Doctrine at King's College, University of London acknowledges this fact:

". . . the early Church formulated the doctrine of The Incarnation. Here the two main landmarks are the council of Nicaea in 325 and the council of Chalcedon in 451. Throughout the centuries christology has been determined, directly or indirectly, by the formulae that these two councils produced. . . . After Nicaea, then, there was no doubt in orthodox circles that Christ was divine." (Christian Theism, T&T. Clark, Edinburg, 1984, p. 38-39).

However, this information is enough to create a lot of doubt about the divine source of the Trinity in intellectual circles. The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible in the article "Deity of Christ" suggests the same fact:

"The clearest and fullest expression of the deity of Christ is found in the Nicene Creed which was originally presented at the Council of Nicea, AD 325. In the English Book of Common Prayer the translation appears as follows: '. . . one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten, not made.' " (Vol. 2, second ed., 1977, p. 88)

Reading this, one has to ask oneself why it was that Jesus himself, in his teachings, did not express the doctrine of the trinity "as fully and clearly" as the Nicene Council did 300 years after his departure.

A divine mystery?

Questions such as, "How could the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit be totally different and yet participate in the one undivided nature of God?" have given Christian scholars a hard time for centuries. To explain the nature of the Trinity, they have written volumes of books full of interpretations and speculations ending up with a divine paradox, or a divine mystery. So, it would not be worthwhile to question the meaning of Trinity further as the answer, ultimately, will be that it is a divine mystery which cannot be understood. Instead, we will question the compatibility of the doctrine with the Bible.

If we truly believe...

Christian clergymen have enthusiastically praised the Trinity for centuries. They have employed impressive language to defend this fictitious concept. Let's read E. J. Fortman's glorification:

"If we truly believe that 'the ground of reality is not the nuclear composition of matter but the Trinity,' not the division of the infinitely small but distinction at the heart of the infinitely great, we cannot but dedicate all the resources of our logic, all the energies of our mind, all the fire of our heart to the loving study of the Father, his Word and their Spirit." (The Christian Trinity in History, J. Fortman, St. Bede's Publication, 1982, Introduction).

Fortman tries to hide the plain contradiction between the Trinity and Unity by using gobbledygook and inflated language, starting with a big "if". This is one of the common defense strategies of priests when they encounter a difficult problem regarding their teachings. William Lutz, a professor in the English Department at Rutgers University has a clear definition of this attitude:

"A third kind of doublespeak is gobbledygook or bureaucratese. Basically, such doublespeak is simply a matter of piling on words, of overwhelming the audience with words, the bigger the words and the longer the sentences the better. . . . The fourth kind of doublespeak is inflated language that is designed to make the ordinary seem extraordinary; to make everyday things seem impressive; . . . to make the simple seem complex." (Doublespeak, William Lutz, Harper Perennial, New York, 1990, p 5).

A Copernican revolution

As a matter of fact, modern studies on the historical development of the doctrine of Trinity lead many researchers to the same conclusion that the Trinity is a deviation from the original teachings of Jesus.

"Returning, then to the theme of the exaltation of the human being to

divine status, the understanding of Jesus which eventually became orthodox Christian dogma sees him as God the Son incarnate, the Second Person of the Trinity living a human life. As such he was, in the words of the Nicene creed, 'the only-begotten Son of God, . . .'" (The Myth of God Incarnate, John Hick, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1977, p. 171).

In this book, John Hick suggests a "Copernican revolution" in the theology of religions, consisting in a paradigm shift from a Christianity-centered or Jesus-centered to a God-centered model of universe of faiths.

In answer to John Hick, Huw Parry Owen, the author of "Christian Theism", tries to defend the doctrine of incarnation. After making a distinction between the irrational and supra-rational, he asserts that the doctrine of incarnation is supra-rational, not irrational as claimed by J. Hick.

"We cannot understand how God became man. We cannot explain it through any concept drawn from our experience. This is inevitable. If God himself is incomprehensible his act in becoming man must also be so." (Christian Theism, Huw Parry Owen T&T. Clark, Edinburg, 1984, p. 30).

There is another thing that we don't understand: the source of this "incomprehensible" paradox which is INCOMPATIBLE with the clearest verses of the Bible.

Although there are distortions in the existing Bible, the overall message of the Bible can be heard clearly: there is no God besides God; do not worship any except Him.

In order to expose the contradiction between the main theme of the Bible and the doctrine of the Trinity, we will ask some simple questions concerning the Bible.

#### Related Questions:

1. Why is the Trinity not taught in thirty nine books of the Old Testament? Is it not an important principle of faith? Why didn't Noah, Abraham, Moses, David etc. preach that doctrine? Why did they preach just the opposite (Deuteronomy 4:39; 6:4; 32:39. Exodus 20: 2-3. 1 Samuel 2:2. 1 Kings 8:60, Isaiah 42:8; 45:5-6)?
2. According to the Bible, are we not all children of God? (Matthew 5:9; 6:14, Luke 20:36; John 8:47, 1 John 5:18,19)
3. What about Mark 10:18-19?: "Why do you call me good?" Jesus asked. "Only God is truly good!" Do these two verses not clearly state that Jesus was not God?
4. If Jesus is God, what does Mark 13:32 mean?: "No one knows about that day or hour, not even the angels in heaven, nor I myself, but, only the Father." If Jesus was Lord, how could he not know the future?
5. What about Mark 12:29: "Jesus replied, 'The one that says, 'Hear, O Israel! The Lord our God is the one and only God. And you must love him with all your heart and soul and mind and strength.'" What about Matthew 4:10; 6:24, Mark 10:18, Luke 18:19?
6. Matthew 12:17-18 quoting from the Old Testament, states that Jesus was the Servant of God. Is there not any difference between the Servant of God and God?

7. Why do you ignore the verses expressing that Jesus was a "messenger of God" (Matthew 21:11,46; Luke 7:16; 24:19; John 4:19; 6:14)?

8. Why does John 1:18 have a different text in different versions? Did Jesus see God or not?

9. Why are all the verses used to justify the Trinity questionable? For instance, many Christian scholars acknowledge that the crucial word "begotten" in John 1:14,18 and 3:16,18 does not exist in the original manuscripts. Why, is the phrase "son of God" changed into "the only begotten Son of God"?

#### QUESTION 4

Who was St. Paul? Was he a disciple of Jesus or a hypocrite? Did he curse Jesus or was he cursed by Jesus?

"On the face of it, Paul's doctrine of Jesus is a daring departure from Judaism. Paul was advocating a doctrine that seemed to have far more in common with pagan myths than with Judaism: that Jesus was a divine-human person who had descended to Earth from the heavens and experienced death for the express purpose of saving mankind." (The Mythmaker: Paul and the Invention of Christianity, Hyam Maccoby, Harper & Row, San Francisco, 1986, p. 12).

In reality, Paul, or Saul never met Jesus. Before converting to "Christianity", he was a vicious enemy of Christians. He raided churches and tortured people who converted to Christianity (The Acts 8:3; 22:3-10). By claiming that he met Jesus on his way to Jerusalem and Damascus, he tried to explain his so called conversion. Instead of Jerusalem he went to Arabia (Galatians 1:17). He claimed that he was chosen by Jesus as a minister and as a representative (The Acts 26:16-19). He travelled many places and sent letters in Greek, to preach his version of Christianity. In this way, he distorted and mutilated the original message of Jesus.

He provided ground for the Doctrine of Trinity; he created the story of Jesus' sacrifice for our redemption; he raised Jesus to his "Father's right side" for judgment; he nailed the written code to the cross (Colossians 2:14), opposing Jesus (Matthew 19:16-19). He perverted the main message of Jesus, which was to worship God alone.

Thus, Paul had intense arguments with Peter (Cephas) and Barnabas (Acts 15:36-41; Galatians 2:11-14; 4:10-14). The disciples did not trust him and escaped from him (Acts 9:26). They knew that he was a wolf in the midst of sheep.

You may ask "why would Paul choose a life of persecution rather than being the persecutor?" Though we may not be able to identify the exact motive of Paul, we can find many answers to this question in psychology or history books. The history of religions are full of dubious or sincere people with strange missions or delusions.

When Saul became Paul...

To provide some more information on Paul, I want to quote two paragraphs from Hyam Maccoby's book The Mythmaker: Paul and the Invention of



Christianity, Harper & Row, San Francisco, 1986, pp. 4, 16:

"We should remember that the New Testament, as we have it, is much more dominated by Paul than appears at first sight. As we read it, we come across the Four Gospels, of which Jesus is the hero, and do not encounter Paul as a character until we embark on the post-Jesus narrative of Acts. Then we finally come into contact with Paul himself, in his letters. But this impression is misleading, for the earliest writings in the New Testament are actually Paul's letters, which were written about AD 50-60, while the Gospels were not written until the period AD 70-110. This means that the theories of Paul were already before the writers of the Gospels and colored their interpretations of Jesus' activities. Paul is, in a sense, present from the very first word of the New Testament. This is of course, not the whole story, for the Gospels are based on traditions and even written sources which go back to a time before the impact of Paul, and these early traditions and sources are not entirely obliterated in the final version and give valuable indications of what the story was like before Paulinist editors pulled it into final shape. However, the dominant outlook and shaping perspective of the Gospels is that of Paul, for the simple reason that it was the Paulinist view of what Jesus' sojourn on Earth had been about that was triumphant in the Church as it developed in history. Rival interpretations, which at one time had been orthodox, opposed to Paul's very individual views, now became heretical and were crowded out of the final version of the writings adopted by the Pauline Church as the inspired canon of the New Testament.

"Paul derived this religion from Hellenistic sources, chiefly by a fusion of concepts taken from Gnosticism and concepts taken from the mystery religions, particularly from that of Attis. The combination of these elements with features derived from Judaism, particularly the incorporation of the Jewish scriptures, reinterpreted to provide a background of sacred history for the new myth, was unique; and Paul alone was the creator of this amalgam. Jesus himself had no idea of it, and would have been amazed and shocked at the role assigned him by Paul as a suffering deity."

The real followers of Jesus

Indeed, "The Mythmaker" provides important information on early followers of Jesus, the Ebionites. This group had earlier been called the Nazarenes and was strongly against Paul and his paganist doctrine. Nazarenes were led by disciples of Jesus, such as James and Peter, who knew Jesus and his message much better than Paul who met Jesus only in dreams and visions.

Unfortunately, when the Romans occupied Jerusalem in 70 AD, they destroyed the Nazarene Church. So, Jerusalem Nazarenes immigrated to Caesarea and even to Alexandria in Egypt. Since that defeat, the Pauline Christian movement did not encounter serious opposition from the true followers of Jesus Christ. Finally, they were declared heretics in about 135 AD, by Pharisee rabbis, since they refused to accept the doctrines of Paul. The descendants of Jerusalem Nazarenes survived about four centuries under the title "Ebionites" (poor men).

Self-appointed disciple changes the name

Disciples and early followers of Jesus were never called Christians; they were called Nazarenes. We find this original name in the New Testament (Acts 24:5). It is interesting that the names "Christians" and "Christianity" were invented decades after Jesus in Antioch (Acts 11:26). Not only did Paul change his own name and identity, he changed the name and identity of Jesus' message.

Cursed by whom?

According to Paul, the founder of Christianity:

"Christ had redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hanged on a tree."  
(Galatians 3:13).

"By whom was Jesus cursed?" Most Christians without hesitation reply "obviously, cursed by people." But, the one who made that allegation has a different answer.

Paul's hidden answer

Obviously, Paul is not honest while quoting his reference, ie., Deuteronomy 21:23 ". . . that is hanged is accursed of God; . . ." He, stealthily, tries to hide "GOD", just to make it easy for people to accept the connection between the Old Testament's curse and Jesus. When you accept the connection, you automatically accept Jesus to be cursed by God Almighty, without knowing. Because if you make a sober connection between Deuteronomy 21:23 and Matthew 27:38, Mark 15:27, Luke 23:33, John 19:18 you will end up with a "God cursed by God"!

What could be the reason for Paul insulting Jesus indirectly? What could be the reason for Paul distorting Jesus' teaching by creating the doctrine of the Trinity? Jesus himself had prophesied the reason with a warning.

The prophecy and warning of Jesus

The Gospels are full of condemnation of and prophetic warning about Pharisees. Here are some examples:

"How is it that you do not understand that I spoke it not to you concerning bread, that you should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then understood they how that he bade them not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." (Matthew 16:11-12).

"But woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for you neither go in yourselves, neither suffer you them that are entering to go in. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! . . . Woe unto you, you blind guides, . . . You fools and blind: . . . Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! You serpents, you generation of vipers . . ." (Matthew 23: 13-33)

". . . Beware you of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known." (Luke 12:1-2).

Here is the Pharisee!

Paul confirms this prophecy by acknowledging that he was a Pharisee:

But when Paul perceived that the one part were Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out in the council, Men and brethren, I AM a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee . . . (Acts 23:6)

Please notice, that he does not say "I WAS a Pharisee."

Here is the hypocrite!

Paul may be the only person in the history of religion that was proud of his hypocrisy. Dictionaries should substitute the word Machiavellian with Pauline, since he preceded Machiavelli. Let us read what this dubious character tells about himself:

"While working with Jews, I live like a Jew in order to win them; and even though I myself am not subject to the Law of Moses, I live as though I were, when working with those who are, in order to win them. In the same way, when with Gentiles I live like a Gentile, outside the Jewish Law, in order to win Gentiles. This does not mean that I don't obey God's law; I am really under Christ's law. Among the weak in faith I become weak like one of them, in order to win them. So I become all things to all men, that I may save some of them by any means possible." (1. Corinthians 9:20-22).

If a person "becomes all things to all men, in order to win them", how can you trust that person? It is obvious that he became a Christian with Christians in order to win them. But the real followers of Jesus recognized his evil work and rejected him.

So,

1. Why follow "a hypocrite, a fool and a blind" Pharisee?

2. What was the real reason that the disciples of Jesus escaped from Paul? Were they the most cowardly people among Christians? Why, could the reason not be the warning of Jesus about Pharisees? ". . . Beware you of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy. . . ." (Luke 12:1-2) Why don't you beware of the leaven (doctrine) of a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee?

3. Did Jesus become "all things to all men in order to win them", like Paul? Did his real disciples become "all things to all men in order to win them", like Paul? What is the definition of hypocrisy in your dictionary? After all, why do you hesitate to call Paul a hypocrite?

4. Why do you call yourself Christian, since it is a name fabricated by Paul years after Jesus (Acts 11:26)? What were the disciples of Jesus calling themselves in the time of Jesus?

#### QUESTION 5

What Gospel did Jesus preach?

"People have been reading the Bible for nearly two thousand years. They have taken it literally, figuratively, or symbolically. They have regarded it as divinely dictated, revealed, or inspired, or as a human creation. They have acquired more copies of it than of any other book. It is quoted (and misquoted) more often than other books. It is translated (and mistranslated) more than others as well. It is called a great work of literature, the first work of history. It is at the heart of Christianity and Judaism. Ministers, priests, and rabbis preach it. Scholars spend their lives studying and teaching it in universities and seminaries. People read it, study it, admire it, disdain it, write about it, argue about it, and love it. People have lived by it and died for it. And we do not know who

wrote it." (Who Wrote the Bible, R. Elliott Friedman, Harper & Row, New York, 1989, p. 15).

The New Testament consists of four Gospels and 23 books. Catholics add 7 more books to their Bible, which Protestants consider doubtful (apocrypha). So, each sect accuses the other with the following verses:

". . . If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: And if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life." (Rev 22:18-19).

Unfortunately, we do not have a Gospel according to Jesus. The four Gospels are not word for word from God. The Gospels were written decades after Jesus' departure. The original Gospel was transmitted orally for about 30 or 40 years. Years later Christian scholars and priests recorded and collected those narrations, and created hundreds of manuscripts. There was an proliferation of Gospels. Thus in 325 AD, two thousand Church fathers gathered at the Nicene Conference wanting to put an end to this chaotic situation. Finally, they limited them to four Gospels. The authorized Gospels were called the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John.

The Gospel of Matthew:

The Gospel ascribed to the disciple Matthew must have been written in Hebrew or the Syriac language, because Matthew was a converted Syrian Jew. However, the oldest copy of Matthew is in Greek. We can easily find out that this Gospel was not written by the disciple Matthew:

"And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he said unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed him." (Matthew 9:9).

This verse points to the fact that there is a third person besides Jesus and Matthew and that person wrote the "Gospel according to Matthew." J. B. Philips, an Anglican translator of the Bible, in the beginning of the Gospel of Matthew acknowledges this fact:

"Early tradition ascribed this Gospel to the apostle Matthew, but scholars nowadays almost all reject this view. The author, whom we still can conveniently call Matthew, has plainly drawn on the mysterious "Q", which may have been a collection of oral traditions. He has used Mark's Gospel freely, though he has rearranged the order of events and has in several instances used different words for what is plainly the same story. The style is lucid, calm and "tidy". Matthew writes with a certain judiciousness as though he himself had carefully digested his material and is convinced not only of its truth but of the divine pattern that lies behind the historic facts." (The Gospels, J. B. Philips, Geoffrey Bless, London, Introduction).

The Gospel of Matthew, a digested copy of Mark consists of 28 chapters. It starts with listing the genealogy of Jesus, trying to make David the prime ancestor of Jesus so that Jesus could be the promised Messiah. The Holy Bible of the Catholic Biblical Association in the introduction has good information on the history and source of the Gospels. It reads:

"Matthew's Gospel in its present form was written in a Jewish milieu, probably after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. There are evidence of the fulfillment of the Mosaic law (1:19; 5:18), and also references to violence (21:38-41), to the burning of a city (22:7), and to punishment in

the wake of Jesus' death (27:25). . . .

"Matthew is obviously an expanded version of Mark, considered the first gospel form to be written. Very few scholars hold that Mark is a condensed version of Matthew. . . .

"Both Matthew and Luke, neither of whom can be proved to have copied from the other, seem to have had, besides the Gospel of Mark, another source of some 240 verses which Mark does not include. This source, not found but deduced, is designated simply as Q from Quelle, the German term for "source". . . .

"Current and more common opinion dates the composition of the Gospel of Matthew between 80-100 AD, or roughly 85 AD. There is also the compelling evidence for the dependence of Matthew on Mark: namely, the 600 of Mark's 661 verses found in Matthew, as well as the relationship of language and order in these two gospels."

#### The Gospel of Mark:

Mark was not a disciple of Jesus. Christian scholars are not sure about the author of this Gospel either. It is the shortest Gospel with 16 chapters and begins: "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." It narrates the teachings and miracles of Jesus in a very simple language. It's narration of the events is clumsy. Christians dispute the last part of Chapter 16. There are two different endings (16:8-16:20) claimed by modern editors. Many Christian scholars confess that these verses are non-existent in the original manuscripts. The date of composition is around 70 AD.

The Holy Bible of the Catholic Biblical Association of America claims that "Modern scholarship has shown quite clearly that Mark's sources cannot be explained solely in terms of Peter's preaching. On the basis of manuscript and stylistic evidence, Mk 16:9-20 derives from a hand other than Mark's."

#### The Gospel of Luke:

Luke was not a disciple either. He is known to be a follower of Paul. His Gospel is supposed to have been written between 80-90 AD. The author is an intellectual person and his literary skill is good. In the beginning of his Gospel, Luke confesses that he had never seen Jesus. Luke is also the author of "The Acts". The Gospel of Luke, with 24 chapters, mentions some important things that others do not mention; nevertheless, Luke also uses the Gospel of Mark freely, like the author of Matthew.

Because the first three Gospels are similar, they are called Synoptic Gospels. The number of common sentences between these three gospels are:

|                                |     |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Between Matthew and Mark ..... | 178 |
| Between Mark and Luke .....    | 100 |
| Between Matthew and Luke ..... | 230 |
| Among these three Gospels..... | 330 |

#### The Gospel of John:

Although the author of this Gospel is thought to be John, brother of the disciple Jacob, this is disputed by Christian scholars. The identity of the real author is unknown. This Gospel is very different from the other three Gospels in style and in the kind of information it contains. It is the latest but least authentic of the Gospels.

The Gospel of John consists of 21 chapters and the last chapter is believed to have been added later. Additionally, the verses 8:1-11 are shown in parentheses, because they too are believed to be additions. Some Christian scholars claim that there are signs of some disorder within the gospel; e.g., there are two endings to Jesus' discourse at the Last Supper (14:37; 18:1).

Having looked at this brief information on the four gospels, let's examine several verses about Jesus' preaching:

"And Jesus went about all the cities and villages, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, . . ." (Matthew 9:35)

"Now after John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, . . ." (Mark 1:14)

"And it came to pass, that on one of those days, as he taught the people in the temple, and preached the gospel, . . ." (Luke 20:1)

Related Questions:

1. Well, which gospel was Jesus preaching? Matthew? Mark? Luke? Or John? Or the gospels that were banned by the Nicene Council?
2. The important portions of the official four gospels are about Jesus' life story. Was Jesus preaching his life story? Was he telling people about his ancestors, his birth, his miracles, his trips, his disciples, etc.?
3. Where is the gospel of the kingdom of God? Where is the gospel according to Jesus?
4. Why not eliminate the interpretations of Gospel writers and stick with the words uttered by Jesus himself?
5. What do you think about Catholic's extra 7 books; are they apocrypha or books of the Bible? What does Rev 22:18-19 say about this issue?

(There was a cartoon here!)

This cartoon is from a free booklet: "This Was Your Life," published by Chick Publications. It is a good summary of distortions in Christianity.

QUESTION 6

A Forsaken God?!

"And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, E'li, E'li, la'ma sa-bach'-tha-ni? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Mt 27:46, Mk 15:34)

Obviously, they use a sensational language to dramatize the scenario of Crucifixion. They are like a plastic surgeon who gouges out the eye while

trying to make an eyebrow! This verse is not only at cross-purposes with fabricated doctrine of Christianity, it also reflects the confusion on the part of the authors of the Gospels.

Evangelists are fond of using the Crucifixion of Jesus by Jews as a proof of his deity. One of their "strongest evidences" about the deity of Jesus is based on "the deep understanding capacity of Jews." Evangelists pontificate: "Look, if Jesus did not claim that he was God or literally Son of God, monotheistic Jews would not have stoned him for blasphemy." To support their evidence they feel the obligation to add that "Jews definitely understood his teaching." But, the Bible says the contrary:

"Why is my language not clear to you? Because you are unable to hear what I say." (Jn 8:43 and Mk 4:13).

Not only disbeliever Jews, even his less than a dozen disciples, sometimes had difficulties in understanding him: Mark 9:32 Luke 18:34; 9:45 & John 8:27; 12:6.

Unfortunately, the evangelists and clergy do not have a better understanding of his teaching than the Jews who stoned him. Josh Mc Dowell, in his "one-million-in-print-book" tries to persuade us by Jews' deep understanding capacity:

"Jesus is threatened with stoning for "blasphemy." The Jews definitely understood his teaching. . ." (More Than a Carpenter, Josh McDowell, Tyndale, Illinois, 1989, p. 17)

E. Calvin Beisner, a professional evangelist, advocates another common logical fallacy related to the fictitious divine sacrifice:

"Think what kind of act gets the highest praise among men: isn't it when someone voluntarily sacrifices his life in order to save the lives or others? Such self-sacrifice is a tremendous good. The greatest such sacrifice was when God sacrificed His life in the Person of Jesus Christ to save the lives of all who believe in Jesus." (Answers for Atheists, p. 10).

Before listing my questions, let me share a brief argument:

I asked an evangelist: "Why should God sacrifice 'His son' in order to show His love and forgive us?" He replied with a counter question, "If you love a girl too much what do you do?" I said, " I'll try to help her." "Wouldn't you die for her?" he suggested. "Why?" I said, "To the contrary, I would try to keep myself healthy and handsome. When we feel desperately helpless and not able to find a solution, then we may sacrifice ourselves. But, God does not run out of solutions, and He is never helpless."

Related Questions:

1. Do fanatic religious people kill others only because they claim that they are God? How many prophets were killed by "monotheistic" Jews before Jesus? Should we infer that all those prophets claimed to be God? Why did the "monotheistic" Church sentence Galileo to death? Did he claim to be God? Why did the "monotheistic" Christians burn Tyndale? Did he also claim to be God?

2. According to that verse (Mt 27:46, Mk 15:34), Jesus was not even a human hero. History (even this author) has witnessed so many brave warriors who did not cry under torture, but they roared their slogans into the ears of their murderers. How can Jesus deserve to be God, while he, according to

your record, demonstrates a weakness which is considered shameful for a human warrior? Who is more courageous according to your own record: the first Christian martyr, Stephen (Acts 7:59-60), or Jesus (Mt 26:38, 39)?

3. What was the main mission of Jesus' birth according to Paul's disciples, that is, the Gospel writers? Wasn't it to sacrifice himself for salvation of the human race? Then, why did Jesus try to escape from that mission? And why did he start to wail and whimper even before his mission was carried out (Matthew 26:38,39)?

4. According to the story of crucifixion, did not Jesus accept his divine mission? Did God promise to save him or to let him 'die for the sin of humankind'? Then, how can he accuse God of forsaking him? Isn't this a slander to God? How can God be a betrayer?

5. If the purpose of Jesus in this life was to die for our sins, as it is claimed in the Paulinist New Testament, would he not have said on the cross: "My God, my God, thank you for fulfilling my mission!"?

6. You believe that Jesus, your god, prayed as "My God, my God, why have you forsaken me." Do you really believe that God prayed to himself and asked help from himself? Does God call himself as "My God, my God"?

7. When Jesus was dead for three days, was God also dead? If "yes," then who controlled the universe during those 3 days? If your answer is No, then Jesus is not equal to God.

8. "E'li, E'li, la'ma sa-bach'tha-ni" is one of the few Hebrew words in the New Testament. Ironically, it is one of the most obvious fabrications in the Bible. Did the authors of the Gospel decide to keep that part in Hebrew especially to make us believe that those words were accurately transmitted?

9. How can killing an innocent person be considered the method for salvation? Do we have to kill somebody unjustly to deserve salvation? Is this divine wisdom?

10. Is it just and wise to punish your son because of the misbehavior of your neighbors' children?

11. What kind of love is it to kill your own innocent son in order to be able to forgive your neighbors' children?

12. We can forgive our friends, even our enemies without feeling an obligation to kill our loved ones. Couldn't God forgive us without killing His "own son"?

13. According to your dramatized teaching, a "son" is a greater hero than his "father", since he volunteered to sacrifice his life, and his father behaved selfishly.

14. Your "divine sacrifice" story does not deserve to be entitled as "sacrifice," since according to your own doctrine, God has sacrificed only one-third of his personalities. When a human sacrifices his life, he sacrifices whatever he has. Doesn't your "divine sacrifice" have less importance than "human sacrifice" in terms of "sacrifice"?

15. If "all his disciples forsook him and fled" (Mark 14:50), then, who are the eye-witness narrators of the events following Christ's arrest? How can we trust the hearsay that came through his murderers and bystanders?



16. Some Christian scholars claim that the Greek word "stauros" means a piece of timber, not cross. If this is correct, then why do you transform the stake to a cross?

17. If the salvation of humanity could be accomplished only by the Crucifixion, why did God spend thousands of years preparing a chosen people for this task?

#### QUESTION 7

Can A "Human God" Be A Product of Translation Errors?

"It is a miracle that the King James' translators were able to produce such a remarkable translation from sources available in this dark period of European history. Even fifty years ago, the knowledge of Western scholars relative to the Eastern Scriptures in Aramaic and the Christian Church in the East was conjectural. Moreover, these scholars knew very little of the Eastern customs and manners in which the Biblical literature was nurtured." (The Holy Bible From Ancient Eastern Manuscripts, George Lamsa, A.J. Holman Co, Philadelphia, 1957, Introduction).

Anyone who is familiar with translation knows that sometimes the exact meaning of the text cannot be reflected, because every language has unique terms, idioms and combination of meanings ascribed to words. Sometimes a translation of a multiple meaning word obligates the translators to make personal comments. Sometimes an original word having one obvious meaning can be translated with a multiple meaning word. There are numerous cases which make every translation always subject to revisions and disputes. So, a translation without a loss is impossible. Translations of translations are less reliable, which is the case for the King James. If we add the problems related to the loss of original manuscripts, scribal errors such as homoioteleuton, transposition of letters and bias of the translators, the credibility of translations dramatically goes down. A wrong translation in key words may change the main theme of a book to the opposite.

Lisa Spray, in her thought-provoking study, holds the translators responsible for important distortions:

"A scholarly review of the various biblical translations unveils an extremely interesting phenomenon; one that contributed to the exaltation of Jesus to the status of "God." As pointed out in the previous chapter, such exaltation contradicts the very message of Jesus and runs totally contrary to the Jewish religious tradition he strongly upheld and preached" (Jesus: Myth & Message, Lisa Spray, Universal Unity, Fremont, CA, 1992, p. 17).

Worship or pay homage?

One important example of translational distortion in the King James version is the crucial word "worship." Here is the King James version of Matthew 2:2 and 2:8.

". . . Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him." (Matthew 2:2).

". . . and when ye have found him, bring me word again, that I may come and

worship him also." (Matthew 2:8).

But the New American Bible, which is "translated from the original languages with critical use of all the ancient sources by members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America" has translated it differently:

". . . Where is the newborn king of the Jews? We observed his star at its rising and have come to pay him homage (Matthew 2:2). Then he sent them to Bethlehem, after having instructed them: 'Go and get detailed information about the child. When you have found him, report your findings to me so that I may go and offer him homage.'" (Mat 2:8).

Creating a male Jewish god

Who do we worship? The Bible's answer to this question is God alone (Exodus 34:14; Deuteronomy 8:19) To whom do we give homage? To anyone we acknowledge loyalty.

It is obvious that somebody is trying to create a Jewish god besides our Creator, by imposing his own faith on the translation.

The same distortion can be found in John 9:38:

And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him.

However, this verse is not only a distorted translation, it is entirely a fabrication as it is acknowledged by the New American Bible in the footnote: "This verse, omitted in important MSS, may be an addition from a baptismal liturgy."

There is more. Just three verses earlier (John 9:35), Jesus is described as "Son of Man." Jesus is "Son of Man" in the New American Bible, in The New International Bible and in the footnote of The Living Bible, Paraphrased, etc... Ironically, the King James version has altered this phrase to the "Son of God", to justify the distortion in the key word "worship".

New American:

35 When Jesus heard of his expulsion, he sought him out and asked him, "Do you believe in the SON OF MAN?"

New International:

35 Jesus Heard that they had thrown him out, and when he found him, he said, "Do you believe in the SON OF MAN?"

Living Bible:

35 When Jesus heard what had happened, he found the man and said, "Do you believe in the Messiah?" (c)

(c) Literally, "the SON OF MAN."

King James:

35 Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when he had found him, he said unto him. Dost thou believe on the SON OF GOD?

Jesus was not the only "son of God"

The idiomatic expression "Son of God", or "children of God" is frequently used in both the Old Testament and the New Testament. According to Hebrew language, "children of God" are those who follow God's law and are blessed by God.

"The sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful, . . . (Genesis 6:2). So you shall say to Pharaoh: Thus says the Lord: Israel is my son, my first-born (Exodus 4:22). I will proclaim the decree of the Lord: The Lord said to me, 'You are my son; this day I have begotten you' (Psalms 2:7). Blessed too the peacemakers; they shall be called sons of God (Matthew 5:9). This will prove that you are sons of your heavenly Father . . . (Matthew 5:45). . . . the son of Adam, which was the son of God (Luke 3:38). They become like angels and are no longer liable to death. Sons of the resurrection, they are sons of God." (Luke 20:36).

You can find even more "sons of God" in Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:4-7, Hosea 1:10; Psalms 89:7, Jeremiah 31:9; John 1:12, Romans 8:14-21

Additionally, Matthew 5:48; 6:1-16; 7:11 23:9, Luke 12:29-32, also show that the word "Father" does not have the meaning that the doctrine of Trinity ascribes to it. According to the Bible, God is the Father of every righteous believer. Matthew 23:9 is interesting: "Do not call anyone on earth your father. Only one is your father, the One in heaven." In fact, Jesus never called himself the "only" son of God. On the contrary, he almost invariably calls himself "Son of Man." Further, he calls God "my father and your father":

". . . I go back up to him who is my Father and your Father, my God and your God." (John 20:17).

The Gospel of John: A mishmash

John, by adding one or two words, creates chaos in the Bible:

"For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him may not die but may have eternal life." (King James version, John 3:16).

The original King James version had one more word to make it very special, that is "his only begotten Son". Yet, this crucial word "begotten" was removed by the Bible Revisers furtively. Ahmed Deedat, a Muhammadan scholar, condemns this action furiously:

"They are as silent as church-mice and would not draw the reader's attention to their furtive excision. This blasphemous word "begotten" was another of the many such interpolations in the 'Holy Bible.' " (Is the Bible God's Word?, Ahmed Deedat, I.P.C.I., Durban, 1986, p. 15)

Despite numerous verses--some of which are quoted above--calling all righteous people "sons of God" and messengers "God's first-born sons", now we encounter John 3:16, which claims just the opposite. Which one shall we believe? Even John himself informed us that all the believers are "children of God" (John 1:12) and they all should be "begotten from above" (3:1-7). In other words, according to him, he was himself a "begotten son of God," as well as his hero Paul.

It is significant that John is the only Gospel that calls Jesus the "only" son of God! Matthew, Mark, and Luke, altogether have omitted or forgotten this very crucial word that made John 3:16 the most popular verse in Paulinist Christendom.

The attraction of "only"

"Only" is a single word; it is short too. So, literally it is not significant. However, it can change the meaning of a text entirely. By omitting or adding this word the whole theology and practice of a religion can be changed. For instance, according to the Quran, it is the "only" source of religion (17:46), However, those who idolize Muhammad and follow volumes of fabrications (Hadith and Sunna) are disturbed by this fact. So, they omit or displace that crucial word in their translations. Thus, they distorted the original religion preached by Muhammad, beyond recognition.

The same is true with addition. The difference between the following statements is plain: "I am a believer" or "I am the only believer"; "This is a reason" or "This is the only reason." Let us see an example of an inserted "only," as a result of bias:

According to the Old Testament Hagar bore Ishmael to Abraham when he was eighty-six years old (Genesis 16:15-16), and fourteen years later when Abraham was a hundred years old, Sara bore Isaac to him (Genesis 21:2-5). The Old Testament mentions Isaac and Ishmael as Abrahams sons (Genesis 25:7-9). It is obvious from these verses that when Isaac was born he was not Abraham's "only" son; Abraham, then, had a fourteen year-old son, that is, Ishmael. However, the author of Genesis, because of racial bias, inserts the magic word "only" into the verse:

"Then God said, 'Take your son Isaac, your only son, whom you love, . . .'" (Genesis 22:2).

If we remember that Ishmael is the ancestor of the Arabs and the author of Genesis is a Jew, then we can easily understand the motivation behind this inserted "only." Obviously, the author of that particular verse wanted to bestow honor upon Isaac by disconnecting Ishmael from Abraham.

So, our John does the same. He inserts "only" for Jesus to exclude other "sons of God." He wants to make him an incarnated God. However, this "only" does not work. Not only does it exclude other "sons of God;" it totally denies and dismisses them.

Four kinds of translational errors:

We see four main sources of error in existing scripture:

I. Translation errors resulting from lack of understanding of linguistic rules such as grammar and idioms.

II. Errors resulting from the translator's own bias in favor of their personal convictions, i.e., human bias.

III. Innovations and additions to the scripture for prejudicial of political reasons.

IV. Errors resulting from lack of original written manuscripts, since oral narrations are highly subject to distortion, delitions, addition, and human forgetfulness.

Thus, we cannot rely on the Bible verbatim. The Bible should be studied in a critical way. We know that they are the translations of translations bearing deficiencies mentioned above.

Questions:

1. How can we totally trust the translations which distort the most important words, the central concepts in the doctrine of any religion?
2. Which translation of Matthew 2:2,8 is correct: the one with "worship" or the one with "pay homage"? Why?
3. Is there any difference between "Son of Man" and "Son of God"? If there is, why does the King James version change "Son of Man" in John 9:35 to "Son of God"?
4. What is your evidence that John 9:38 is not an addition, as claimed by some Christian scholars?
5. Was Jesus the "only" son of God? What about other "sons of God" or "begotten" sons of God? Were they adopted?

QUESTION 8

Genealogy or Mythology?

"The genealogies of Jesus as they appear in the Gospels may perhaps be the subject that has led Christian commentators to perform their most characteristic feats of dialectic acrobatics, on par indeed with Luke's and Matthew's imagination." (The Bible, The Quran, and Science, Dr. Maurice Bucaille, American Trust, Indianapolis, 1979, p. 93).

In his book, *Is the Bible God's Word?*, A. Deedat tries to separate the wheat from the chaff. The following three paragraphs are from Deedat.

Only two commissioned

"Of the four Gospel writers, God 'inspired' only two of them to record the genealogy of His 'son.' To make it easy for you to compare the 'fathers and grandfathers' of Jesus Christ in both the 'inspired' lists, I have culled the names only, minus the verbiage. See page (37). Between David and Jesus, God 'inspired' Matthew to record only 26 ancestors for His 'son.' But Luke, also 'inspired,' gathered up 41 forefathers for Jesus. The only name common to these two lists between David and Jesus is JOSEPH and that, too, a 'supposed' father according to Luke 3:23 (AV). This one name is glaring. You need no fine-tooth comb to catch him. It is Joseph the carpenter. You will also easily observe that the lists are grossly contradictory. Could both the lists have emanated from the same source, i.e. God?"

Fulfilling prophecy?

"Matthew and Luke are over-zealous in making DAVID the King, the prime ancestor of Jesus, because of the false notion that Jesus was to sit on the 'Throne of his father David' (Acts 2:30). The Gospels believe this prophecy, for they tell us that instead of Jesus sitting on his father's (David's) throne, it was Pontius Pilate, a Roman Governor, a pagan who sat on that very throne and condemned its rightful (?) heir (Jesus) to death. 'Never mind,' says the evangelist, 'if not in his first coming then in his second coming he will fulfill this prophecy and three hundred others beside.' But with their extravagant enthusiasm to trace the ancestry of

Jesus physically to David, (for this is actually what the Bible says 'THAT OF THE FRUIT OF HIS (David's) LOINS, ACCORDING TO THE FLESH' (literally, not metaphorically Acts 2:30), both the 'inspired' authors trip and fall on the very first step."

"Matthew 1:6 says that Jesus was the son of DAVID through SOLOMON, but Luke 3:31 says that he (Jesus) was the son of David through NATHAN. One need not be a gynecologist to tell that by no stretch of the imagination could the seed of David reach the mother of Jesus both through Solomon and Nathan at the same time! We know that both the authors are confounded liars, because Jesus was conceived miraculously, without any male intervention. Even if we concede a physical ancestry through David, both authors would still be proved liars for the obvious reason (p. 52-54)."

"It is an artificial list"

Matthew, lists 27 names for the "genealogy of Jesus." But, this is one short than what he claims right after the list:

"Thus there were fourteen generations in all from Abraham to David, fourteen from David to the exile to Babylon, and fourteen from the exile to the Christ." (Matthew 1:17).

Obviously, Matthew pays a special attention to the number fourteen. The New American Bible, published by the Catholic Biblical Association of America in 1970 has a shocking footnote for Matthew 1:17.

(The diagram comparing the two different lists from Matthew 1:1-16 and Luke 3:23-31 is omitted)

"The genealogy is artificially constructed out of three groups of fourteen names each, taken principally from Genesis, Ruth, 1 Chronicles and 2 Kings. The list of names beginning with Abiud in 1:13 is unknown to the Old Testament. The number 14 is undoubtedly a mnemonic device, perhaps chosen because the numerical value of the three letters of David's name (DVD) yields in Hebrew the sum of 14."

After this acknowledgement can anyone accept the genealogy? If so, there is more...

Who are Perez, Zerah and Tamar?

Perez, Zerah and Tamar can be seen in Matthew's artificial genealogy fabricated for Jesus Christ. Before looking for their former misdeed in the Old Testament, let's see the position of adulterous generation:

"A wicked and adulterous generation asks for a miraculous sign. . ." (Matthew 12:39; 16:4)

"If anyone is ashamed of me and my words in this adulterous generation. . ." (Mark 8:38)

"But you come here, you sons of a sorceress, you offspring of adulterers and prostitutes!" (Isaiah 57:3)

No doubt, both the Old and the New Testament condemn adultery, prostitution and incest. It is not considered a good credit to be the offspring of adulterers and prostitutes.

However, Matthew 1:3 claims that Jesus was the offspring of a prostitute,

namely Tamar. According to Genesis 38, Tamar has relation with her father-in-law and gives birth to twin boys: Perez and Zerah. The Bible labels the result of this kind of relation as "bastard" or in some polite translations as "one of illegitimate birth".

"A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord; even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of the Lord."  
(Deuteronomy 23:2)

Bastards with their prostitute mother enter...

Not only a bastard, twin bastards with their prostitute mother sneak into the genealogy of the "Lord"! They cannot enter the congregation of the Lord, but they obtain an honorable place in the blood-line of the "Lord"! According to Matthew 1:3, David is the ninth generation of Perez, the Biblical bastard.

"All these characters are honored in the "Book of God" for their bastardy. They became the great grandfathers and great grandmothers of the "only begotten son of God" (?) . . . No decent reader can read the seduction of Lot to his mother, sister or daughter, not even to his fiancée if she is a chaste and moral woman. Yet you will come across perverted people who will gorge this filth. Tastes can be cultivated! Read again and mark Ezekiel 23. . . The "whoredoms" of the two sisters. Aholah and Aholibah. The sexual details here puts to shame even the unexpurgated edition of many banned books." (Is The Bible God's Word?, A. Deedat, Durban, South Africa, 1986, p. 48-51).

Questions:

1. Which genealogy is correct: the one in Matthew or the one in Luke?
2. Why is Joseph one of the very few common names between the two lists from David to Jesus?
3. Jesus cannot be related to David, if he was conceived miraculously by a virgin. How can Gospel writers make a "genealogical" connection between Jesus and David, though Jesus refused it? Mt 22:42-45; Mk 12:35; Lk:20:41
4. Jesus was born from Mary without a father (Matthew 1:23). The only genealogy he had should be from Mary, not from a "supposed" father (Luke 3:23), i.e. Joseph. Why do you refer to Jesus as "son of Joseph", instead of "son of Mary"? Where is the genealogy of Mary?
5. Why do the ancestors of Jesus mentioned in Luke's list have a life span much shorter than the one in Matthew?
6. Matthew who tries hard to fabricate 14+14+14 artificial ancestors between Abraham and Jesus falls one short; he mentions 41 names, instead 42 names (14 from Abraham to David, and 27 from David to Jesus). Which one of the ancestors of Jesus did Matthew dismiss in his "inspired" Gospel? Why?
7. Considering the modern estimate that Abraham lived around 1850 B.C., according to the Old Testament, man's appearance on earth is less than 6 thousand years ago. Is this historical data correct?
8. Why does Matthew honor Perez, Zerah and Tamar by presenting them as the ancestors of Jesus? Does it mean incest and adultery is justified?
9. What does "wicked, adulterous generation" mean?

10. Considering Deuteronomy 23:2, how could David enter into the congregation of the Lord, since Matthew makes him the ninth generation of the Biblical bastard, Perez?

#### QUESTION 9

Quadrinity?

"This Melchizedek was king of Salem and priest of God Most High. He met Abraham returning from the defeat of the kings and blessed him, and Abraham gave him a tenth of everything. First, his name means "king of righteousness"; then also, "king of Salem" means "king of peace." Without father or mother, without genealogy, without beginning of days or end of life, like the Son of God he remains a priest forever." (Hebrews 7:1-3).

Who is claiming all these? Paul, in the 19th book of the New Testament! In our earlier discussion, we know that he was the one who created a god out of Jesus. He was the one who bragged to be a Pharisee and acted like a hypocrite. Here he is creating another god: Melchizedek. According to Paul he has higher rank than Jesus. He is not only without a father, he is also without a mother. He was not born and he did not die. However, he, like the Son of God, remains a priest forever.

Paul, the proven hypocrite (1. Corinthians 9:20-22), the acknowledged Pharisee (The Acts 23:6), fool and blind (Matthew 16:11-12; 23:13-33, Luke 12:1-2) had dedicated himself to create gods besides the Lord of the universe. He is not satisfied with his other two gods (Jesus and Holy Spirit), and he adds one more, even a bigger one. Thus, he, in fact, is the father of Quadrinity. However, this fourth god is a hidden god. Clergy do not preach about him, and do not pray to him. They probably consider him to be a rival to Jesus, since according to Paul, he has higher rank over Jesus.

Some evangelists try to avoid the problem by interpreting Paul's claim about Melchizedek. They want us to believe that he had genealogy, but it was lost. However, a person needs to be extremely gullible to swallow this bait with its hook and thread. Why then were the entire three chapters of Hebrews dedicated to praise Melchizedek? Because his genealogy was lost by absent-minded narrators?

Questions:

1. According to Hebrew 7:1-3, Melchizedek had no beginning and end of life, he had neither a father nor a mother, and he has higher rank over Jesus. Who is Melchizedek?
2. Why don't you accept Melchizedek as the fourth "godhead"? Why do you preach Trinity, instead of Quadrinity?
3. Psalm 110:4 has been translated in several different ways. Do you see any difference among the following translations? "... You are a priest forever, in the order of Melchizedek." or "... You are a priest forever after the rank of Melchizedek." or "... You are a priest forever with the



rank of Melchizedek"? Which one is correct: "in the order", or "after the rank", or "with the rank"?

4. How many priests are entitled to be "priest forever" like Jesus? Who are they?

Contradictions...

"There are claimed contradictions that theologians have not resolved to every atheist's satisfaction. There are textual difficulties with which scholars are still wrestling. Only a Bible illiterate would deny these and other problems." (The Plain Truth, July 1975).

Here is a sample of some Biblical contradictions with which scholars are still wrestling.

\*\* While Genesis, in chapter 5 & 11, mentions 19 generations between Adam and Abraham, Luke adds one more. According to Genesis Shela is the son of Arphaxad, but to Luke Shela is the son of Cainan. Obviously, either one has added, or the other has dismissed Cainan.

\*\* Chapters 6, 7 and 8 of Genesis describe a worldwide flood which destroys all living creatures on the face of the Earth. This contradicts the findings of modern archeology. John Allen Paulos, the professor of mathematics at Temple University in Philadelphia has an entirely different reason to reject this exaggerated story:

The book of Genesis says of the Flood that ". . . all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered. . ." Taken literally, this seems to indicate that there were 10,000 to 20,000 feet of water on the surface of the earth, equivalent to more than half a billion cubic miles of liquid! Since, according to biblical accounts, it retained for forty days and forty nights, or for only 960 hours, the rain must have fallen at a rate of at least fifteen feet per hour, certainly enough to sink any aircraft carrier, much less an ark with thousands of animals on board (Innumeracy, John Allen Paulos, Vintage Books, Newyork, 1990, p. 16).

\*\* According to 2 Samuel 24:1 God incited David to take a census of Israel. However, according to 1 Chronicles 21:1 the one who incited David was Satan, not God.

\*\* According to 2 Samuel 24:13 one of the options was "seven years of famine," but according to 1 Chronicles 21:12 it was "three years of famine."

\*\* According to 1 Kings 4:26 Solomon had "forty thousand stalls of horses," but according to 2 Chronicles 9:25 he had "four thousand stalls of horses."

\*\* According to 2 Kings 24:8 "Jehoiachin was eighteen years old when he became king," but according to 2 Chronicles 36:9 he was "eight years old."

\*\* According to 1 Chronicles 8:36 "Ahaz was the father of Jehoaddah," but in the following chapter, 9:42 "Ahaz was the father of Jarah."

\*\* According to 2 Samuel 24:9 Joab reported the number of fighting men: "eight hundred thousand in Israel," and "five hundred thousand in Juda," but the same report according to 1 Chronicles 21:5 is "one million one hundred thousand in Israel," and "four hundred and seventy thousand in

Judah."

\*\* According to 2 Kings 8:26 "Ahaziah was twenty-two years old when he became king," but according to 2 Chronicles 22:2 he was "forty-two years old when he became king." Obviously the later one is wrong since Ahaziah's father was in his 40's when he died (2 Chronicles 21:5). According to the Chronicles 22:2 he was two years older than his father when he became king just after his father's death!

\*\* There are nineteen contradictions between Ezra chapter 2 and Nehemiah chapter 7 in the list of the exiles who returned. When we count the grand total of exiles who returned according to Ezra, we come up with 29818, but according to Nehemiah we find 31089. Ironically, despite their differences in numbers of exiled tribes, both of them give us the same grand total as 42 360. Nehemiah is 11271 short, Ezra is 12542 short.

\*\* According to 2 Samuel 6:23 "Michal daughter of Saul had no children to the day of her death." However, in 2 Samuel 21:8 we see Michal had borne five sons. Some revised versions tried to get rid of this contradiction by changing the name of Michal to Merab, unceremoniously! You may find the trace of this change in a footnote.

\*\* According to Genesis 6:3, man can have a maximum of "a hundred and twenty years" life span. However in Genesis 9:29 we learn that Noah lived 950 years, and in 11:13 Arpaxad lived 403 years.

\*\* According to Numbers 23:19 "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent;" but according to Genesis 6:6,7 God repented (in some translations: he was sorry, or was grieved) that he made man on the earth.

\*\* According to Exodus 24:10 the elders of Israel "saw the God of Israel;" however, John 1:18 claims that "no man has seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he has declared him." John's enthusiasm to make Jesus an incarnated God makes him contradict the Old Testament. It is interesting that the "New Revised" versions of the Bible try to save John by inserting the magic word "actually" into the verse as reads: "No one has actually seen God. . ."

\*\* According to Matthew 1:1 and Luke 3:31 "Jesus was son of David;" but Matthew 22: 41-45 denies this claim from Jesus' own mouth.

\*\* The genealogy of Jesus listed in Matthew and Luke has numerous contradictions. In Question 8 we mentioned those problems.

\*\* According to the three Synoptic Gospels, Judas betrays Jesus with a kiss; but according to John 18:3-5 Jesus himself went forth and told the soldiers that he was Jesus. Obviously, the narration of the three Synoptic Gospels do not make sense, since an exposed betrayer (Matthew 26:25) will not try to hide himself by using a sign. In fact, nobody needed to identify Jesus. He was well known by everyone in the region.

\*\* While Matthew 27:44 sends both criminals to hell, Luke 23:43 saves one of them.

Still verbatim?

Whether these are important or not, we must realize that we cannot rely on the Bible verbatim. We must read them with a critical analytic consciousness. Some of the above have been "corrected" such as in the "New

International Version" and "New Revised Standard Version." But, the contradictions between the ancient manuscripts are admitted in the footnotes of their revised versions. Sometimes those footnotes are removed in the following editions in order to erase the trace of contradictions.

Related questions:

1. How can we rely on the Bible to the letter, after witnessing many contradictions and mistranslations?
2. How many times did you "revise" the Bible? Why? When will we have the Final Revised Bible?

#### QUESTION 11

Revised, re-revised, re-re-revised King James Versions; what's next?

"The Revised Standard Version of the Bible is an authorized revision of the American Standard Version, published in 1901, which was a revision of the King James Version, published in 1611. The first English version of the Scriptures made by direct translation from the original Hebrew and Greek, and the first to be printed, was the work of William Tyndale. He met bitter opposition. He was accused of willfully perverting the meaning of the Scriptures, and his New Testaments were ordered to be burned as "untrue translations." He was finally betrayed into the hands of his enemies, and in October 1536, was publicly executed and burned at the stake. Yet Tyndale's work became the foundation of subsequent English versions." (Revised Standard Version, preface).

Since W. Tyndale translated King James version it has been revised four times. The preface of the Re-revised Standard Version (RSV) 1952, and Re-re-revised Standard Version (still RSV) 1971, contains very important acknowledgements. Here we will quote some paragraphs to give you an idea about the reality of the Bible from the horses' mouth.

The authors of RSV, that is, "thirty-two scholars, assisted by an Advisory Board of fifty representatives of the cooperating denominations," after praising the King James Version as "the noblest monument of English prose" acknowledge the following facts:

"Yet the King James Version has grave defects. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the development of Biblical studies and the discovery of many manuscripts more ancient than those upon which the King James Version was based, made it manifest that these defects are so many and so serious as to call for revision of the English translation. . .

"Sometimes it is evident that the text has suffered in transmission, but none of the versions provides a satisfactory restoration. Here we can only follow the best judgment of competent scholars as to the most probable reconstruction of the original text.

"The King James Version of the New Testament was based upon a Greek text that was marred by mistakes, containing the accumulated errors of fourteen centuries of manuscript copying. . ."

These words have been published in both Revised Standard Versions of 1951 and 1971. However there are important differences between them. For instance:

In the 1951 version, the word "begotten" of John 3:16,18 was considered as an addition and was taken out. But, in the following revision, in 1971, this correction is considered as a distortion, the surgery was reversed and the word "begotten" replanted again.

Similarly, 1 John 5:7 was corrected in RSV 1951 as "And the Spirit is the witness, because the Spirit is the truth." However, in the following version, RSV 1971, the correction was deleted and the addition was inserted again as: "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these are one."

Furthermore, it varies in different translations. According to The New International Version, for instance, the verse: "For there are three that testify: the Spirit, the water and the blood; and the three are in agreement." The three may be in agreement, but it is obvious that our Bible versions are not in agreement.

You can find in footnotes (sometimes)!

The differences and contradictions, additions and omissions in the Gospels, leave no doubt that they are historical notes narrated by humans who can forget, can misunderstand and can add. Below are some of the acknowledged distortions in the Bible; you can find them in the footnotes of many revised editions of the Bible.

Matthew 17:21; 18:11; 23:14  
Mark 7:16; 9:44-46; 11:26; 15:28; 16:9-20  
Luke 17:36; 23:17  
John 5:4; 8:11; 9:35  
Acts 8:37; 15:34; 24:7; 28:29  
Romans 8:1; 16:24  
Who denies this fact?

Before directing our questions let's read a brave acknowledgement made by Dr. W. Graham Scroggie of the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, one of the most renowned Christian Evangelical Mission in the world. The heading of the following quotation is IT IS HUMAN, YET DIVINE:

"Yes, the Bible is human, though some, out of a zeal which is not according to knowledge, have denied this. Those books have passed through the minds of men, and bear in their style the characteristics of men." (Is The Bible the Word of God?, Dr. W. Graham Scroggie, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, p. 17).

Related questions:

1. How many times did you revise the "inspired" King James version?
2. Why was the word "begotten" of John 3:16 and 18 taken from 1951 RSV?
3. Why was the same word replanted in 1971 RSV?
4. Why was 1 John 5:7 tampered with?
5. Is it coincidence that the two major references of your teachings, John

3:16 and 1 John 5:7 are questionable by your own scholars?

## QUESTION 12

Transubstantiation or consubstantiation or pretentious cannibalism?

"Jesus said to them, "I tell you the truth, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you. Whoever eats my flesh and drinks my blood has eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is real food and my blood is real drink." (John 6:53-55).

Encyclopedia Americana (1959) under the title Eucharist gives an enigmatic information about the Holy Communion. Here is the first paragraph:

"The Roman Catholic Church teaches and maintains that it has always taught that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrament, that after the consecration of the bread and wine in the Mass, Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is really, truly, and substantially present under the appearances of bread and wine. It teaches that He is not present there, as most Protestantism maintains, merely symbolically, or figuratively, or virtually; it teaches that there is contained in the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, together with His body and blood, really, truly, and substantially present, also the soul and divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ, that is, the whole Christ; it teaches further that by the consecration of the bread and wine at Mass, the whole substance of bread is converted into the substance of the body of Christ, and the whole substance of the body of Christ, and the whole substance of wine is converted into His blood, and that only the appearances of bread and wine remain. The conversion that takes place in the Eucharist is called Transubstantiation. The presence of Christ in the Eucharist is known as the Real Presence." (Henry R. Burke, S.S., Catholic University of America).

The translation of the above mumbo jumbo is this: Bread and wine are the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ. This is not a metaphorical or an allegorical statement. When consecrated in Eucharist, bread and wine convert to the substance of Christ's body. This is called Transubstantiation.

This odd theological doctrine and liturgy, however, is not shared exactly by all the sects and denominations of Christianity. The founder of Protestantism, while accepting the chemical reaction of bread and wine changing into the flesh and blood of "God," yet uses another term:

"Luther alone retained the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but replaced the doctrine of Transubstantiation with that of consubstantiation or impenation." (Encyclopedia Americana, Eucharist).

The fact remains that regardless of what it is called bread and wine converting to flesh and blood is beyond my chemical knowledge and beyond the knowledge any modern chemist. This appears to be a type of symbolism. But, what type of deranged mentality wishes to allude to cannibalism in their religious rights.

Pretentious cannibalism

As we questioned the reliability and authenticity of the Bible in previous questions, we have no doubt that Jesus' words have been distorted by Paul and his disciples. His allegory on bread and water must have been refracted and distorted through oral narrations and some deliberate interventions. If we read Luke 12:1-2 we will see that "leaven" is used by Jesus Christ for "doctrine". Jesus may have told his disciples: "Eat my bread, drink my water; not others." Why should these allegorical words be transformed to what we have today, "bread and wine is God's flesh and blood. When we eat them in Sacrament we will gain eternal life"? The answer lays under the title of "Cannibalism":

"A common and widely occurring custom, it is an expression of blood-thirstiness or exultation over an enemy's downfall, and in many cases is motivated by a belief in the possibility of acquiring the enemy's strength, prowess, or certain magical qualities by swallowing flesh. Where, as among the tribes of East Africa, the flesh of a deceased relative was eaten, the purpose was to conserve his spirit and virtues for the family." (Encyclopedia Americana).

Defining the Holy Communion as "pretentious cannibalism" is not a euphemistic manner. However, the practice, the theory and the victim do not yield to a milder definition. Attribution of this absurdity to one of the wisest figures in history is the most wicked lie and defamation. Calamitously, the faith and the practice of hundreds of millions of people once again confirms Goebbels, Hitler's Minister of Propaganda:

THE BIGGER THE LIE THE MORE LIKELY IT IS TO BE BELIEVED.

Related questions:

1. How does bread convert into Jesus's flesh, and wine into his blood? Which transformation is correct, transubstantiation or consubstantiation?
2. After witnessing so many intentional, unintentional errors and distortions in the Bible how can you assure us that Jesus used to drink wine, instead of water or fruit juice?
3. Why do you consecrate wine, an intoxicating drink? What is the contribution of the Holy Communion to the widespread alcoholism in the Western world?
4. Was Jesus drinking his own blood, and eating his own flesh?
5. Why do you accept the "leaven" in Luke 12:1-2 as an allegory for "doctrine", but on the other hand take the "bread" and "wine" literally?

QUESTION 13

Priests or peddlers?

"When missionaries came to South Africa, we had the land, they had the Bible. Then they told us, "Let's close our eyes and pray." When we opened our eyes we saw that we have the Bible, they have the land." (Desmond Tutu,

the Nobel Prize winning South African priest).

There are undoubtedly many individuals with high moral and ethical standards among the clergy members of every religion. Even among confirmed atheists you can find many such laudable individuals. However, the overall record of organized religion and proselytizing atheism is far from exemplary.

Politics, money and religion... History is full of examples of this trinity, as well as the trinity of idols. Religion is an attractive and profitable business for many. You can preach to others to close their eyes on faith and pay money to your church, mosque or temple in order to enter heaven. When the market is good, you can sell indulgence and holy handkerchiefs. You can learn about people's secrets and crimes through confession and enjoy the power to forgive them. You can exploit their guilt-complex as much as you can. You become their gods with blackmail in your left hand, and forgiveness in the other. If there are some trouble makers you can call them heathen and even excommunicate them in the name of the conventional god, or gods. You can even manipulate kings and queens to declare Holy Wars, or Crusades.

Indeed, church authorities are highly successful in abusing the faith of gullible masses. They inherit thousands of years of experience. They craftily mix gullibility with faith, ignorance with divine mystery.

They never asked for money

All the pioneers of monotheistic religions invariably fought against their contemporary professional religionists. Moses against the Magicians, Buddha against the Brahmins and their caste system, Socrates against the Athenian polytheist clergymen, Jesus against the Pharisees, Muhammad against the Arab's theocratic oligarchy.

These pioneers never asked for money for their mission. They taught that the exploitation of faith is one of the biggest crimes. They tried to open people's minds. They exhorted them not to follow the religion merely on faith, but after reasoning. They defied the idols which were the means for every kind of exploitation. Their message shook the corrupt establishment. Worried about their business, religion brokers fought against them. Here is an example of this encounter:

"Then he (Jesus) entered the temple area and began driving out those who were selling. "It is written," he said to them, "My house will be a house of prayer, but you have made it 'a den of robbers.'" Every day he was teaching at the temple. But the chief priests, the teachers of the law and the leaders among the people were trying to kill him." (Luke 19:45-47).

Paul, "the Pharisee, son of the Pharisee," was the first Christian to start making money and freeloading for his preaching. He was harshly criticized for that behavior. However, he made excuses for himself in 1 Corinthians 9:3-14 . Today's church is following Paul, not Jesus.

When weeds replace flowers

Ironically, soon after those brave revolutionary masters, their teachings were distorted by their ignorant "followers" and the hypocrites. Superstitions and lies replaced truth and wisdom. Weeds replaced flowers. After a long process of degeneration and mutilation, they became the norm and convention. That is the best time for religion brokers. The distorted religions with their many idols provide the best culture for them to breed

and grow. Human history is stained by numerous disasters caused by the powerful church authorities.

The holy form of colonialism

The clergy do not need absolute power to stain the human history with wars and disasters. When they have relatively less power, they become tools in the hand of corrupt kings and rulers. Amawy, Abbasy and Ottoman tyrants used Muslim clergy for their corruption and aggression for centuries. The British Empire used Christian missionaries as spiritual conquerors, as angelic reserve forces behind their troops in Africa, Asia and the New World. This insidious form of colonialism was carried out by Catholics, Protestants, Mormons, with full governmental support. Massacres, assimilations, genocide, slavery were justified and consecrated by the corrupt clergy. The ones that did not want to participate in this action did no more than to say to the oppressed party, "Turn your right cheek also."

The characteristics of nefarious clergy

Today's clergy is no different than before. They adapt very well to every condition. In the United States, churches are very competitive businesses and they are evolving to super-churches. Evangelists now use radio and TV to raise even more money. Modern technology and psychology is employed for this oldest of businesses. The volume of money and assets involved annually accounts in billions. Emotionally exploited widows and elders, rich and poor reward them generously for their only product: delusion; but of the "holy" kind.

Related questions

1. Why do you make profit for your religious service? Did Jesus or any of his disciples make money for their mission?
2. Why did you turn your church to "a den of robbers"?
3. What did Jesus mean when he told to his disciples, "You received free, give free. . . ." (Matthew 10:8)?
4. Jesus was a carpenter and was working to earn his living. Why do you not follow him as a role model?
5. You are obviously following Paul, "the Pharisee, son of the Pharisee". He was not shy of telling people that he had the right to nourish himself with the milk of his flock, that is, his followers (1 Co 9:7). However, you have gone even far ahead of Paul. He was not charging when he was preaching the gospel. He was not making full use of it (1 Co 9:18). But you charge all the time. Why do you not have some mercy to your flock?

Images, icons, idols, saints, priests --or God?

"You shall have no other gods before me. You shall not make for yourself an idol in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below." (Deut. 5:7-8).

The Bible is full of verses prohibiting use of images and statues in worship. Asking mediation from any image is considered a reproach to God. The first commandment is very clear in condemning any kind of respect for images.



By asking a rhetorical question, the Bible teaches us that we cannot represent God with any image, since God is beyond our imagination.

"To whom, then, will you compare God? What image will you compare him to?" (Isaiah 40:18)

Psalms 115:4-8 describes idols as deaf, dumb and blind. Then, it warns those who make them and those who trust them of becoming like them. Here are some verses:

"Break down their altars, smash their sacred stones and jut down their Asherah poles. Do not worship any other god . . ." (Exodus 34:13-14)

"Do not make idols or set up an image or a sacred stone for yourselves, and do not place a carved stone in your land to bow down before it. I am the Lord your God." (Leviticus 26:1).

". . . Destroy all their carved images and their cast idols, and demolish all their high places." (Numbers 33:52).

"They worshiped their idols, which became a snare to them." (Psalm 106:36).

"The arrogance of man will be brought low and the pride of men humbled; the Lord alone will be exalted in that day, and the idols will totally disappear." (Isaiah 2:17-18).

Also see: Deut 4:16-28, 35; 5:8; 7:5, 25; 27:15; Isaiah 27:9; Jeremiah 8:19; Micah 1:7; 5:13...

>From monotheism to idolatry

However, today's churches are full of images and icons of Jesus, Mary and countless so-called saints. If Jesus were back today he would consider churches as the center of idolatry. A book published by the Jehovah's Witnesses raises a sound question against the idolization of the cross as a symbol:

"Even if Jesus had died on a cross, would the way Christendom uses it be reasonable? If someone you loved very much was stabbed to death, would you worship the knife that killed him? Of course not. It would be an object of abhorrence to you. Further, according to the Bible, it is wrong to worship anything or anyone apart from God himself. The apostle John stated: "Little children, guard yourself from idols." (1 John 5:21) Yet, Christendom has made an idol of the cross." (The Time For True Submission to God, Watch Tower Bible and Tract Society of Pennsylvania, 1982, p 30).

Paul is carving idols by innovating mediators

In the Old Testament we cannot find intercession as the method for salvation. The doctrine of intercession is fabricated by Paul and his disciples. None of the biblical messengers and prophets used the names or images of other prophets or messengers in their prayers. Paul is the first one who created the institution of intercession or mediators after Jesus.

"For there is one God and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all men." (1 Timothy 2:5).

But, the word "one" in Paul's dictionary does not mean the "one" that we know. When he says "one God," he means the "one made of three and equal to

three", when he says "one mediator," he means "the Spirit and numerous saints" besides Jesus:

". . . because the Spirit intercedes for the saints in accordance with God's will." (Romans 8:27).

Prayer brokers

Christendom followed Paul and added numerous idols under the title of intercessors or mediators. Many so-called apostles and saints have been appointed as mediators, it appears that the Christian churches have turned to Hindu temples.

Previous mediators and intercessors, (i.e., dead prayer brokers) paved the way for the living brokers. This provided a very important tool for the clergy to exploit their followers.

("We just care about the icon." A newspaper clip quoting the assistant secretary of a Greek Orthodox Church regarding the stolen "weeping icon" is omitted.)

There are many gullible people who believe in fabricated stories. Fictitious miracles are not unique to the Christendom; they can be witnessed in every religious community. Whenever clergy needs some advertising, hearsay miracles are published. Excited zealots echo those tales with uncontrollable exaggerations and distortions.

Nevertheless, here, I want to pull your attention to the attitude of the clergy. The clip below quotes a very interesting confession of idolatry by a clergyman: "We just care about the icon." How much did Abraham, Moses and Jesus care about icons? (The Arizona Daily Star, December 29, 1991)

Related questions:

1. Why do you display images, icons and pictures in your churches? Why do you disobey numerous verses of the Bible regarding idolatry?
2. The Bible sets many examples for us. None of those Biblical figures advocate intercession, except Paul and his followers. What is the reason for this major shift?
3. Why do you "worship man-made gods of wood and stone, which cannot see or hear or eat or smell"?
4. As Catholic ministers, how can you claim that you possess the power of absolving the penitent? Who give you power to require people to confess their sins before you? Are you "God" or His sinful creature? How can you forgive the crimes or sins committed against somebody else?

QUESTION 15

Why do you abuse and ignore Biblical verses?

In this chapter we will examine some verses which have been abused by the

clergy in order to support their corrupted teachings. Even though we assume the following verses to be the original words of Jesus, the traditional meanings ascribed to them and conclusions derived from them are merely biased interpretations and personal imaginations.

John 8:57,58

"Then said the Jews unto him, You are not yet fifty years old, and you have seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am."

The clergy asserts that this verse provides the evidence that Jesus claimed his deity. However, this is far away from the truth. This verse cannot provide any status of deity for Jesus. According to the Bible, all the human race was created before the creation of earth. Solomon, Jeremiah, also share pre-existence with Jesus (Proverbs 8:22-27; Jer 1:4,5). The speculation on "I am" is not worthy to discuss here. It is an ordinary "I am," as "you are."

John 1:1

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God."

"So, Jesus is God" concludes clergymen after quoting the above verse.

We cannot agree for two reasons, at least:

1. These are not the words of Jesus himself. They are not the words of John either. Objective Christian scholars acknowledge that they are the words of Philo of Alexandria, who lived before Jesus was born. Thus, it is a quotation without reference.

2. The capital letters in the translation are misleading. The word "God" which occurs twice are not the same in the Greek manuscripts. The first one is "Hotheos" which can be translated as "The god" or "God," the second one is "Tontheos" which can be translated as "a god" or "god".

The abuse of capital letters, commas, and full stops are widespread in translations. For instance, the Greek word "Hotheos" (God) occurs twice in 2 Corinthians. However, the English translations distinguish them by the manipulation of capital letters.

John 20:28

"Thomas said in response, 'My Lord and my God!'"

Although we know that John is the latest and the least authentic Gospel (see Question 3), we assume that Thomas told Jesus, "My Lord and my God!"

Before evaluating this verse, let's summarize the common clergy approach by quoting from Josh Mc Dowel & Bart Larson:

"There is no mistaking that Thomas's words were addressed to Jesus. Thomas used both titles to express his understanding of Christ's deity and lordship. Jesus did not rebuke Thomas for blasphemy. Instead, He accepted those titles of deity." (Jesus: A Biblical Defence of His Deity, p 27).

However, if we read the context (from the verse 24 to 30) the case is very different. After burial of Jesus, his body disappears. Then Jesus appears to Mary Magdalene and other disciples except Thomas, one of the Twelve

(John 20:24). He hears the resurrection story and says, "I will not believe it." (20:24). Please note that the topic is not Jesus' deity, it is his resurrection. So, he says that he does not believe "it", that is, the story. A week later Jesus appears to him physically and Thomas is in a great excitement: "My God, my Lord!" are the words he could utter. He does not say, "You are my God and my Lord." His words are ordinary words that all of us use frequently in our life when we witness an incredible event.

The identity of the utterer of these words also refutes clergy's interpretation. A stranger, or a disbeliever is not saying these words. He is Thomas, one of the few who followed Christ to death: "Then Thomas said to the rest of the disciples, 'Let us also go, that we may die with him.'" (John 11: 16). If this very Thomas did not believe Jesus and "his deity," until after his death, then why was he following him? What kind of disciple was he that he could not understand the most important message, which caused Christ's crucifixion? Was he a retarded disciple?

There is another option: he understood Jesus, but did not believe him. Apparently, the clergy opt this alternative by claiming that Thomas finally believed Jesus' deity after his resurrection. According to this theory, Thomas was another hypocrite among the disciples besides Judas Iscariot. Judas made money. But, why did Thomas act as a believer until the crucifixion of Jesus? Why was he saying, 'Let us also go, that we may die with him'?

There are many other problems related to the story of resurrection. The obvious contradictions between the Gospels and "their disjointed, blurred and disordered character" (Father Roguet, *Initiation a l'Evangile*, p182) need our attention which is beyond the scope of this book.

John 10:30

"I and my Father are one."

This verse is one of the most abused verses in the Bible. We assume that Jesus Christ uttered this statement. To understand the intention and purpose of this statement we have to look at its context. If we read verses 24 to 39 carefully, we will find out that this unity is not in Nature, neither in Omniscience, nor in Omnipotence; it is in purpose. Sure, Jesus and God were one in purpose as stated:

"The one who sent me is with me; he has not left me alone, for I always do what pleases him." (John 8:29).

The simple-minded Pharisees and their followers were looking for excuses to accuse Jesus of blasphemy. They were not the people who were willing to understand Jesus:

"This is why I speak to them in parables: Though seeing, they do not see; though hearing, they do not hear or understand." (Matthew 13:13).

Ironically, clergymen present the Pharisee's mind as criteria for interpretation of Jesus' words. But, Jesus sarcastically rejects this logic (John 10:33), by reminding them of the usage of word "gods" in the Old Testament (John 10:34-36). Jesus refers to Psalm 82:6 which reads: "I have said you are gods; and all of you are children of the most High." Jesus, after reminding them of the usage of "gods" for good men in their own scripture, now asks them:

"Why then do you accuse me of blasphemy because I said, 'I am God's son'?"

(John10:36).

The Bible teaches us that Jesus is not unique to be "one in the Father."  
The verses below explain John 10:30 clearly:

"My prayer is not for them alone. I pray also for those who will believe in me through their message, that all of them may be one, Father, just as you are in me and I am in you. May they also be in us so that the world may believe that you have sent me.

"I have given them the glory that you gave me, that they may be one as we are one: I in them and you in me. May they be brought to complete unity to let the world know that you sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me." (John 17:20-23).

As an answer to one of my articles published in a newsletter questioning the doctrine of Trinity, I received a letter from the American Bible Society, New York. The back of the letter was filled with references to the verses of the Old Testament in order to support the traditional misinterpretations on John 10:30.

So, let's see what those abused verses by Trinitarians are? We will evaluate two of them.

Isaiah 7:14

"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."

Immanuel means "God with us". Obviously, it doesn't mean "This is God," or "God". In Jewish tradition it was common to name a child or a place with a phrase reminding or praising God. For instance, the place where David defeated Philistines was called Baal Perazim, which means The Lord Who Breaks Out (1 Chronicles 14:11). David's wife named her son Samuel, which means Heard of God (1 Samuel 1:20). Solomon's other name Jedidah means Loved by the Lord (2 Samuel 12:25)...

Isaiah 9:6

"For to us a child is born, to us a son is given, and the government will be on his shoulders. And he will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace."

The long name is deliberately mistranslated in order to justify the deity of Jesus. The Hebrew words are: Pele-joez-el-gibbor-Abi-ad-sar-shalom. The correct translation of this long name: Wonderful in counsel is God the Mighty, the Everlasting Father, the Ruler of Peace.

Evidently, the correct translation does not leave room for an incarnated god. It is another praising phrase commonly used in those days. Furthermore, this verse has nothing to do with Jesus. It is about a contemporary person, most likely, Hezekiah.

The ignored verses

>From the New Testament and the Final Testament as well, we learn that Jesus was a human messenger of God whose sole mission was to deliver God's message. The following verses are only a sample of many Biblical verses which are deliberately ignored by the clergy:

"I cannot do anything of myself. I judge as I hear, and my judgment is honest because I am not seeking my own will but the will of Him who sent me." (John 5:30).

"Jesus said: 'My doctrine is not my own; it comes from Him who sent me.'" (John 7:16).

". . . If you loved me, you would be glad that I am going to the Father, for the Father is greater than I." (John 14:28).

"As Jesus started on his way, a man ran up to him and fell on his knees before him. 'Good teacher,' he asked, 'what must I do to inherit eternal life?' Jesus answered, 'Why do you call me good? No one is good--except God alone.'" (Mark 10:17-18; Matthew 19:16-17; Luke 18:18-19).

"Whoever welcomes me welcomes, not me, but Him who sent me." (Matthew 10:40; Mark 9:37; Luke 9:48 & John 13:20).

". . . I have not come of myself. I was sent by One who has the right to send, and Him you do not know. I know Him because it is from Him I come; he sent me." (John 7:28-29).

"The most important one,' answered Jesus, 'is this: Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one.'" (Mark 12:29).

"None of those who call me 'Lord' will enter the kingdom of God, but only the one who does the will of my Father in heaven." (Matthew 7:21).

". . . Go to my brothers and tell them, 'I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.'" (John 20:17).

The real source of the Trinity

Then, why do the clergy preach the Trinity? Why do Christendom not pay attention to the whole Old Testament, and the majority of the New Testament? Here are the so-called defense of two self-appointed lawyers. They exhibit such a clumsy defense that they blunder in the following statements:

"This discussion can get complicated, depending on what a person has been taught. Arguments can be made both for and against the deity of Christ. For example, if one has been taught that God is one person and that Jesus is a created being, then on first reading, Bible verses can be found to support that view. On the other hand, if one has been taught that God is one supreme being comprised Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that the Son gave up His position of equality within the godhead to become a man in the person of Jesus, then Scripture passages can be found to support that view." (Jesus A Biblical Defence of His Deity, Josh McDowell & Bart Larson, Campus Crusade for Christ, California, p. 15)

Here are two Trinitarian Christian slipping up the source of the three equal godhead. If we cannot get the Trinity from the Bible, then which authority will teach it to us? Besides, The Old Testament does not preach God being comprised of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Here are the questions:

1. What can be the sources for the teachings of monotheism, and trinitarianism?
2. Why do you use John 8:57-58 as a Biblical evidence for the deity of

Jesus? Do Jeremiah, Solomon, Job also not share pre-existence with Jesus (Jer 1:4,5; Proverbs 8:22-26; Job 38:21)?

3. According to Greek manuscripts, "the Word was God" (John 1:1) should be translated as "the word was god." Why do you abuse the capital letters?

4. Why do you use a small "g" for "God" when referring to Moses (Exodus 7:1) instead of a capital "G" as you do for a mere word -'WORD'- (John 1:1)? Why do you play fast and loose with the Word of God?

5. Why do you claim that Thomas did not believe Jesus until he saw him resurrected? Did he not witness many of his miracles? Did he not follow him despite all the risks? Wasn't he the bravest of all disciples who suggested 'Let us also go, that we may die with him.' " (John 11: 16)? What was the topic in John 20:28 that made him say "My Lord and my God! "? Was the topic the deity of Jesus, or his resurrection? Why didn't he say "You are my Lord and my God"? Do we not say "My God!" with excitement when we encounter an incredible event?

6. The word "God" can be an insertion by the translators into John 20:28. Assuming this probability we can ask the following question: The title "lord" is used for humans throughout the Bible as well as for God. For instance, "Do not be angry, my lord," says Aaron to Moses in Exodus 32:22. Since we know that Hebrew and Greek do not have capital letters, what made you write the "lord" in John 20:28 as "Lord"?

7. Why do you take John 10:30 out of context? When Jesus told Jews that "I and my Father are one." he was obviously telling them that they are one in purpose. Why do you ignore the verses which clarify its meaning such as ". . . that they may be one as we are one: I in them and you in me" (John 17: 23 & 8:29)?

8. You speculate on the name "Immanuel" in Isaiah 7:14 in order to create an incarnated god. Then, why do you ignore similar names, such as Baal Perazim (1 Chronicles 14:11) and Samuel (1 Samuel 1:20).

9. Why do you mistranslate the long name in Isaiah 9:6? What is your reason of not accepting it for a contemporary person?

10. Why do you ignore numerous verses which leave no room for Trinity, and the deity of Jesus?

#### QUESTION 16

A human god?

"The Scriptures teach that Jesus was fully God while also being fully human. Paul declared of Jesus, "For in Him all the fullness of deity dwells in bodily form" (Colossians 2:9). Because Jesus is both fully God and fully man, He stands in a unique relationship in the Trinity to the Father and the Holy Spirit." (Jesus: A Biblical Defense of his Deity, Josh McDowell & Bart Larson, Campus Crusade For Christ, 1983, pg 65).

"The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God, and yet there are not three Gods but one God." This Pauline fabrication is so well

embedded in today's teachings of Christianity, "Jesus is God", or "Jesus is Lord" is the number one motto. It is claimed that "Jesus shares the nature of God, and he is in every way like God. "

In the next few pages we will replace the word "Jesus" with "God". This will illustrate the inherent contradiction in the Athanasian Creed quoted above. Our intention is not to insult anyone; but rather to invite Christians to reflect on the Bible and follow Jesus Christ, Son of Mary, so that Jesus will not denounce them (Matthew 7:23). As you see, the doctrine of Trinity, which was fabricated by Paul, and influenced the authors of the Gospels is an insult to God Almighty and to the intelligence of men.

The Birth of "God"

"God" was created from the seed of David: "Concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh." (Romans 1:3)

The ancestors of "God": "The generations of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." (Matthew 1:1)

The sex of "God": "And when eight days were accomplished for the circumcising of the child, his name was called Jesus." (Luke 2:21)

How Mary conceived and delivered "God": "The days were accomplished that she should be delivered," (Luke 2:6). "And she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered." (Revelation 12:2)

"God" sucked the paps of a woman: "And it came to pass, as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked." (Luke 11:27)

The country of "God": Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king." (Matthew 2:1)

The occupation of "God": "Jesus was a carpenter by trade (Mark 6:3), and the son of a carpenter." (Matthew 13:55)

The transport of "God": "Behold, the King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass." (Matthew 21:5). "And Jesus, when he had found a young ass, sat thereon." (John 12:14)

The wining and dining "God": " The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." (Matthew 11:19; Luke 7:34)

The poverty of "God": "And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." (Matthew 8:20).

"God" was a devout Jew: "And in the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out, and departed into a solitary place, and there prayed." (Mark 1:35)

The Family of "God"

"God" was the son of Joseph: "... Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." (John 1:45)



Brother of "God": "But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother." (Galatians 1:19 and Matthew 13:54-56)

Mother of "God": "Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, ..." (John 19:25)

The Development of "God"

Spiritual development of "God": "And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom." (Luke 2:40)

Mental and moral development of "God": "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, . . ." (Luke 2:52)

The confession and repentance of "God": Before the beginning of his public ministry, "Jesus was baptized by John the Baptist (Matthew 3:13), which signified the confession of sins (Matthew 3:6), and repentance from sins (Matthew 3:11).

"God" was twelve years old when his parents took him to Jerusalem: "Now his parents went to Jerusalem every year at the feast of the passover. and when he was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem after the custom of the feast." (Lk. 2:41-42)

The powerless "God": Jesus said, "I can of mine own self do nothing." (John 5:30)

"God" was ignorant of the hour: Jesus said, "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." (Mark 13:32)

"God" was ignorant of the season: "And on the morrow, when they were come from Bethany, he (Jesus) was hungry: And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, he came, if haply he might find anything thereon: and when he came to it, he found nothing but leaves; for the time of figs was not yet." (Mark 11:12-13)

"God" was unlettered: "Now about the midst of the feast Jesus went up into the temple, and taught. And the Jews marvelled, saying, How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" (John 7:14-15)

"God" learned through experience: "Learned he obedience by the things which he suffered." (Hebrews 5:8)

The Tempting Of "God"

The devil tempted "God" for 40 days: "And immediately the spirit driveth him into the wilderness. And he was there in the wilderness forty days, tempted of Satan." (Mark 1:12-13)

The devil tempted "God" continuously: "And when the devil had ended all the temptation, he departed from him for a season." (Luke 4:13)

Like the sinners, "God" was tempted in all things: " But (he) was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." (Hebrews 4:15)

True God cannot be tempted with evil: "God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man." (James 1:13)

Only the ungodly are tempted with evil: "But every man is tempted, when he

is drawn away of his own last, and enticed." (James 1:14)

The Racial "God"

"God" was a tribal Jew: "The Lion of the tribe of Juda." (Revelation 5:5)

"God" came for the Jews only: "But he answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matthew 15:24)

Racial discrimination of "God": "These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them, saying, Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matthew 10:5-6)

The kingdom of "God": "And he (Jesus) shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end." (Luke 1:33)

The titles of "God": "The King of the Jews". (Matthew 2:2); "The King of Israel". (John 1:49; 12:13)

A "God" Unlike the God

A hungry "God": "Now in the morning as he returned into the city, he hungered." (Matthew 21:18). "And on the morrow, when they were come from Bethany, he was hungry." (Mark 11:12)

A thirsty "God": "(He) saith, I thirst." (John 19:28)

A sleepy "God": "He was asleep." (Matthew 8:24). "He fell asleep." (Luke 8:23). "And he was in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow." (Mark 4:38)

A weary "God": "Jesus therefore, being wearied with his journey, sat thus on the well." (John 4:6)

A groaning "God": " He groaned in the spirit, and was troubled." (John 11:33). "Jesus therefore again groaning in himself cometh to the grave." (John 11:38)

A weeping "God": "Jesus wept." (John 11:35)

A sorrowing "God": "And (he) began to be sorrowful and very heavy. Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death." (Matthew 26:37-38)

A hysterical "God": "And (he) began to be sore amazed and to be very heavy." (Mark 14:33)

A weak "God": "And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him." (Luke 22:43)

The "God" of war: Jesus said: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword." (Matthew 10:34)

A "God" cursing a tree: "And when he saw a fig tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward forever. And presently the fig tree withered away." (Matthew 21:19)

A "God" who did not want to be called "good": "And Jesus said unto him, Why

callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God." (Matthew 10:18)

A "God" who was servant of God: "Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgment to the Gentiles." (Matthew 12:18)

A "God" who was prophet of God: "And he said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people:" (Luke 24:19)

#### The "God" On the Run

"God" was panic-stricken: "After these things Jesus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in Jewry, because the Jews sought to kill him." (John 7:1)

"God" walked in fear of the Jews: "Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put him to death. Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews." (John 11:53-54)

"God" has shown a clean pair of heels: "Therefore they sought again to take him: but he escaped out of their hand." (John 10:39)

"God" fled in disguise: "At this, they picked up stones to stone him, but Jesus hid himself, slipping away from the temple grounds." (John 8:59)

#### The Capture of "God"

A friend betrayed the hiding place of "God": "And Judas also, which betrayed him, knew the place: for Jesus oft-times resorted thither with his disciples. Judas then, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons." (John 18:2-3)

"God" was arrested, bound and led away: "Then the band and the captain and officers of the Jews took Jesus, and bound him, and led him away." (John 18:12-13)

"God" was humiliated: "And the men that hold Jesus mocked him, and smote him. And when they had blindfolded him, they struck him on the face." (Luke 22:63-64). "Then did they spit in his face, and buffeted him; and others smote him with the palms of their hands." (Matthew 26:67)

"God" was defenseless: "One of the officers which stood by struck Jesus with the palm of his hand", he said, "Why smitest thou me?" (John 18:22-23)

"God" was condemned to death: "And they all condemned him to be guilty of death." (Mark 14:64). "They answered and said, He is guilty of death" (Matthew 26:66).

The dumb and docile "God": "He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth" (Acts 8:32).

The cursed "God" by God: "Christ had redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hanged on a tree" (Galatians 3:13).

#### The End of "God"

The dying "God": "And Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost" (Mark 15:37).

The dead "God" : "Christ died" (Romans 5:6). "He was dead" (John 19:33).

The corpse of "God": "He (Joseph) went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered." (Matthew 27:58)

The shroud of "God": "And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth." (Matthew 27:59)

What is your problem?

The verses that we have quoted from the New Testament leaves no doubt that Jesus was a human being like us, he neither shared the nature of God nor was he in every way like God. But, he was selected by God Almighty as a messenger to confirm the message of previous messengers which can be summarized in a single statement: "Worship God Alone."

But the zealot followers of the "Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee" (The Acts 23:6) will still try to make Jesus an incarnated God. To prove their claim, they show several distorted or mistranslated verses. They sometimes shock you with bizarre interpretations. They mention miracles of Jesus without thinking about miracles of previous messengers (Exodus 7:10; 2 Kings 13:21 etc.). They try to create the doctrine of Trinity from the birth of Jesus, forgetting that Adam was created without father and mother (I Corinthians 15:45; I Timothy 2:13), and that Sarah gave birth to Isaac while she was barren (Genesis 11:30; 17:17-19).

A divine oxymoron?

Many qualities of God and human being are just the opposite, like day and night. While God, by definition, is Omnipresent, human being is not. God is Omnipotent, human being is not. God is Omniscient, the human being is not. God is the Creator, the human being is His creation. God is perfect, but the human being is not. God knows the future, but the human being does not. Thus, one cannot be both God and human. Oxymora are used in art and literature for special effect. However, clergy has based its entire teaching on a divine oxymoron similar to Hermes, Pan, Poseidon and Aphrodete of Greek mythology.

So,

1. Was Jesus a "human God" or a "God human"? Was he acting like humans while he was Lord, or was he acting like God while he was a human?
2. Can you show me a single unequivocal statement in the Bible where Jesus claims to be God, or where he says "worship me?" (Mark 13:32; John 14:28; 1 Corin 15:28)
3. Why are the verses that we quoted above not enough to convince you that Jesus was a human prophet?
4. How do you explain the obvious contradiction between Mark 1:12-13; Luke 4:13; Hebrews 4:15 which claim that Jesus was tempted by Satan and James 1:13 which claims that "God cannot be tempted with evil"? Furthermore, what about "But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed." (James 1:14)? Was Jesus drawn away of his own lust, and enticed?

5. What kind of divine wisdom do you find in cursing a fig tree which could not give fruit before the season? What was the crime of that tree?

6. Did Mary give birth to "God"? Then, according to this information Mary was the mother of God (as the Catholic church still officially say in its liturgy), and at the same time the creation of God! Can you accept this "logic"?

7. Was Jesus created? If your answer is "no," then Jesus was not a human; if your answer is "yes," then he was not God.

8. You claim that Jesus was a perfect man. A man can never be perfect. God is the only perfect one. If he was a perfect man, for instance, he should have demonstrated an exemplary matrimony. Is marriage a satanic institution?

9. Jesus was exercising his so-called divine power anytime he wanted or needed. Was he still fully human?

#### QUESTION 17

Is this how you defend the deity of Christ?

"Suppose I hypothesize that shy fairies live in my rose garden and help tend the roses, but are so clever that they always know if I put a camera or recorder out to document them; thus they avoid leaving any record. This explains why no evidence of fairies exists. This is a fine hypothesis, but it is not a part of rational science, because it has the built-in proviso that no meaningful evidence can be gathered. Once the assumption is made that fairies exist, many books could be published about where they might live, how they might dress, and so on. These books could be fine literature and brilliant exercises in logic, but they would be speculation, not science." (The Cosmic Voyage: Through Time and Space, William K. Hartmann, Wadsworth Publication, Belmont, 1990, p. 457).

In the previous pages we tried to demonstrate how the doctrine of Trinity was fabricated by St. Paul and officially formulated by the council of Nicaea and the council of Chalcedon. Here we want to demonstrate how modern Christians try hard to defend that story through speculations, and interpretations. For this purpose we have selected a book: Jesus: A Biblical Defence of His Deity, Josh McDowell & Bart Larson, Campus Crusade for Christ, California. The titles of following quotations are mine:

Which one do you select: Unity or Trinity?

"This discussion can get complicated, depending on what a person has been taught. Arguments can be made both for and against the deity of Christ. For example, if one has been taught that God is one person and that Jesus is a created being, then on first reading, Bible verses can be found to support that view. On the other hand, if one has been taught that God is one supreme being comprised of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and that the Son gave up His position of equality within the godhead to become a man in the person of Jesus, then Scripture passages can be found to support that view" (p. 15).

Paul declared:

"The Scriptures teach that Jesus was fully God while also being fully human. Paul declared of Jesus 'For in Him all the fullness of deity dwells in bodily form' (Colossians 2:9). Because Jesus is both fully God and fully man, He stands in a unique relationship in the Trinity to the Father and the Holy Spirit" (p. 65).

"God humiliated himself"

"My Father is greater than I." This is the favorite verse with Unitarians, who deny the absolute Deity of Christ and His perfect equality with the Father. . . .

"The contrast which the Savior drew between the Father and Himself was not concerning nature, but official character and position. . . .

"In becoming incarnate and tabernacling among men, He had greatly humiliated Himself, by choosing to descend into shame and suffering in their acutest forms." (quotation from Arthur W. Pink's book Exposition of the Gospel of John, p. 88).

A volunteer!

"The same relationship of greater and lesser is illustrated in 1 Corinthians 11:3. 'But I want you to understand that Christ is the head of every man, and the man is the head of a woman, and God is the head of Christ.' In this passage, three comparisons are made: man to Christ, man to woman, and Christ to God. The third comparison between Jesus and God is the one under discussion here. "God is the head of Christ. Doesn't that sound like superiority?" Note that this comparison has to do with patterns of authority; it does not imply inferiority or superiority. Instead, while on earth, in order to identify with humankind, Jesus voluntarily put Himself under the Father's headship." (p. 89).

Jesus was best understood by his enemies

"First, the Jews to whom He was speaking--who culturally were in a position to interpret His words better than anyone 2,000 years later--understood Jesus to be saying He was "God." They took up stones to stone him." (p. 94).

Self-imposed limitations

"Thus, when Jesus, in the form of a man, said that He did not know the hour of His return [Mark 13:32], it could have been because of His self-imposed limitations as a bondservant. Not that He was not equal to God, but rather in this instance that He had chosen not to exercise all His divine prerogatives." (p. 97).

The trilemma of the Trinity

If you are determined to create an incarnated God, you can stretch your imagination and interpretation as much as possible. You can distort the meaning of every Biblical clear statement that contradicts your assumption by esoteric interpretations. You can also ignore all the historical facts that contradict your story.

A diagram was displayed on page 102 of A Biblical Defence of His Deity. The diagram is supposed to explain all the possible alternatives about the identity of Jesus. "We are faced with a trilemma that is depicted in the

diagram on the following page" say the authors of the book.

The diagram assumes fairies in the author's rose garden: "Jesus claims to be God." He does not let the reader think the other alternative, which is "Jesus never claimed to be God." However, the author is overzealously creating a "trilemma" to defend the Trinity. Here is the trilemma of the Trinity.

(The diagram is omitted).

The plank in the eye

In its appendix, the book *Jesus: A Biblical Defence of His Deity*, gives information on a number of today's religions. The information about Buddhism is ironical:

"Buddhism, which began as philosophy espoused by Sidhartha Gautama (Buddha), became a religion approximately two hundred years after his death when a segment of his followers deified him. Buddha (the name means 'enlightened one') is treated as a savior-god, even though he claimed to be only a teacher." (p 114).

The authors do not see the planks in their eyes. They do not ask questions such as, "Why did Buddhists fabricate a faith which claims that Buddha is a Savior-God?" If our authors, who believe that "Jesus is a Savior-God," could reflect on the reason behind this human tendency, they would have realized the fact that neither Buddha, nor Jesus, neither Hare Krishna nor many other "incarnated gods" claimed their deity. It is ignorant people who idolized them after their departure despite their teachings.

Indeed, "It works"

The same book, under the title "It works" reads:

"I've come to one conclusion. A relationship with Jesus Christ changes lives. You can ignorantly laugh at Christianity; you can mock and ridicule it. But it works. It changes lives. If you trust Christ, start watching your attitudes and actions—because Jesus Christ is in the business of changing lives, forgiving sin and removing guilt." (p. 110).

We do not have doubt that faith in the deity of Jesus has changed the worldly lives of many pastors, priests, ministers and evangelists. They have invested money and gained popularity in his name. We do believe that this faith has also caused the lives of many to change direction. However, all zealous religionists claim the same thing for their religion. Just replace the name of Jesus with Buddha, or Muhammad, or Krishna, or with thousands of cult leaders, and replace Christianity with the name of their religions and sects... All claim that their faith has changed their life, and they call people to accept it. They call you to believe on faith, close your eyes and enter their dark tunnel to find the light. Unfortunately many who enter those tunnels on faith start hallucinating. They become fanatic idol worshipers by claiming that the only salvation is through their "incarnated gods." Indeed, faith works, not only for Christians, but for every religious person, even for a cow worshiper. The questions are,

1. How does it work, why does it work, and how long does it work?
2. Why do Buddhists believe that Buddha is the Savior-God? Why did they fabricate this doctrine despite his original teaching?

3. Why do Hindus believe that God, the highest being Krishna, has manifested himself in millions of gods? What if a Hindu applies the "trilemma" diagram to prove the deity of Krishna?

#### QUESTION 18

Who is "Parakletos"?

"A more striking point is the similarity between the divine mission given to Moses, Jesus and the Spirit of Truth (Muhammad) as bearers of a single thread of Revelation from God. By comparing Deuteronomy 18:15, 17-19; John 12:49; 16:12-13; and Quran 73:15, one observes that despite the thousands of years involved and the disastrous human interference in the Bible, the words describing these three personalities are almost identical. Therefore, the (original) Torah, Gospel and the Quran have One Source and reveal the same Truth, which is Eternal." (Sulayman Shahid Mufassir, former ordained Christian minister, quoted from ).

Bible-thumpers assert that there are more than two thousand prophecies foretelling the coming of the Messiah in the Old Testament. Evidently, this is a preposterous claim. But, an impartial reader will find several clear prophecies. Then, the reader may ask, "What is wrong with Jews? Why don't they see those plain prophecies in their book?"

Obviously, this problem is not peculiar to Jews. Whenever a new messenger comes, the bigoted religious people reject them in the name of previous messengers. For instance, Egyptians rejected Moses by claiming that Joseph was the last messenger. Muhammedans reject the Messenger of Covenant who is prophesied in their holy book (the Quran 3:81), by claiming that Muhammad was the last messenger. Christians are not different.

"That Prophet"

John 1:19-25 clearly shows that Jews were expecting THREE different persons.

1. Christ
2. Elijah
3. That Prophet

Jewish leaders interrogated John the Baptist:

Now this was John's testimony when the Jews of Jerusalem sent priests and Levites to ask him who he was. He did not fail to confess, but confessed freely, "I am not the Christ."

They asked him, "Then who are you? Are you Elijah?"

He said, "I am not."

"Are you the Prophet?"

He answered, "No."

After receiving three consecutive "NO's" Jewish priests wonder:

"Why then do you baptize if you are not the Christ, nor Elijah, neither



that Prophet?" (John 1:25).

These verses provide us with undeniable clues that Jewish people were expecting a "prophet" besides Christ. Indeed, "That Prophet" has been prophecised in Deuteronomy 18:18. It is not a surprise that the Christian scholars are using their famous synthetic formula, in order to hide this obvious Biblical fact: Christ + Elijah + That Prophet = Jesus. Trinity in the Trinity!

Another Parakletos

"And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter (Parakletos, or Periklytos) that he may abide with you forever." (John 14:16).

"But when he, the Spirit of Truth, comes, he will guide you into all truth. He will not speak on his own; he will speak only what he hears, and he will tell you what is yet to come." (John 16:13).

Jesus predicted the coming of another prophet. The one whose coming was foretold by Jesus is mentioned as "Parakletos" or "Periklytos" in Greek manuscripts. Parakletos means advocate, comforter, or counselor. Periklytos means "admirable one" (in Arabic ahmad). The "spirit" here, does not mean other than human. There are cases where the word "spirit" is used for humans (2 Thessalonians 2:2; 1 John 4:1-3).

Related questions:

1. Evidently, Jews were expecting three people according to the Gospel's narration (John 1:19-25). If John was Elijah, Jesus was Christ, then who was "that Prophet"?
2. Is the semantic relation between "Periklytos" and "Muhammad" coincidental?

QUESTION 19

Can you see the mathematical miracle?

"Mathematics is the language with which God has written the universe." (Galileo)

Chapter 74 of the Quran, God's Final Testament, is dedicated to the number 19. The name of that chapter is "Al-Muddassir" (The Hidden Secret). The number 19 is specifically mentioned in that Chapter as a punishment for those who state that the scripture is human-made (74:25), and proclaims that the 19 is "One of the great miracles" (74:35). In 74:31, the purpose of the number 19 is spelled out: to remove all doubt regarding the authenticity of the Quran, increase the faith of the believers, and to be a scientific punishment for hypocrites and disbelievers. However, the implication of this number as a proof for the authenticity of the Quran remained unknown for centuries. For fourteen centuries, the commentators tried in vain to understand the function and fulfilment of the number 19.

In 1974, the Lord of the universe unveiled the secret of number 19 to Dr. Rashad Khalifa, an Egyptian-American biochemist. His four-year long computerized study on the Quran did not have any expected target. Surprisingly, he discovered the mathematically intertwined structure by

"chance." This multifold interlocked mathematical design is a message in universal language. This message, providing a built-in physical evidence of its divine source, leaves no doubt in any sincere person's heart that the Quran is The Final Testament.

Before the secret is decoded

Before the discovery of 19-based system, we knew a symmetrical mathematical system in the Quran. For example:

- \*\* The word "month" (shahr) occurs 12 times.
- \*\* The word "day" (yawm) occurs 365 times.
- \*\* The word "days" (ayyam, yewmeyn) occurs 30 times.
- \*\* The word "sabt" (seventh day-Saturday) occurs 7 times.
- \*\* The words "satan" (shaytan) and "angel" (malak), both occur 88 times.
- \*\* The words "this world" (dunya) and "hereafter" (ahirah), both occur 115 times.

Simple to understand, impossible to imitate

The mathematical structure of the Final Testament is simple to understand and impossible to imitate. You do not need to know Arabic, the original language of the Quran to examine it for yourself. Basically what you need is to be able to count up to 19. It is a challenge for atheists, an invitation for agnostics and a guidance for believers. It is a perpetual miracle for the computer generation. Dr. Khalifa introduces this supernatural message as follows:

The Quran is characterized by a unique phenomenon never found in any human authored book. Every element of the Quran is mathematically composed—the chapters, the verses, the words, the number of certain letters, the number of words from the same root, the number and variety of divine names, the unique spelling of certain words, and many other elements of the Quran besides its content. There are two major facets of the Quran's mathematical system: (1) The mathematical literary composition, and (2) The mathematical structure involving the numbers of chapters and verses. Because of this comprehensive mathematical coding, the slightest distortion of the Quran's text or physical arrangement is immediately exposed (Quran The Final Testament, Translated by Rashad Khalifa, Islamic Productions, Tucson, 1989, p 609).

Physical, examinable divine proof

Here are some examples of this historical discovery:

- \*\* The first verse, i.e., the opening statement "Bismillahirrahmanirrahim", shortly "Basmalah," consists of 19 Arabic letters.
  - \*\* The first word of Basmalah, Ism (name) occurs in the Quran 19 times.
  - \*\* The second word of Basmalah, Allah (God) occurs 2698 times, or  $19 \times 142$ .
  - \*\* The third word of Basmalah, Rahman (Gracious) occurs 57 times, or  $19 \times 3$ .
  - \*\* The fourth word of Basmalah, Rahim (Merciful) occurs 114 times, or  $19 \times 6$ .
- Although this phenomenon (the opening statement consists of 19 letters, and each word occurs in multiple of 19) represents a minute portion of the code, it was described by Martin Gardner in the Scientific American as "ingenious" (September, 1981, p. 22-24)
- \*\* The multiplication factors of the words of the Basmalah ( $1+142+3+6$ ) add up to 152 or  $19 \times 8$ .
  - \*\* The Quran consists of 114 chapters, which is  $19 \times 6$ .
  - \*\* The total number of verses in the Quran including all Basmalahs is 6346, or  $19 \times 334$ . If you add the digits of that number,  $6+3+4+6$  equals 19.

\*\* The Basmalah occurs 114 times, (despite its conspicuous absence from chapter 9, it occurs twice in chapter 27) and 114 is  $19 \times 6$ .

\*\* From the missing Basmalah of chapter 9 to the extra Basmalah of chapter 27, there are precisely 19 chapters.

\*\* It follows that the sum of the chapter numbers from 9 to 27 ( $9+10+11+12+\dots+26+27$ ) is 342. This total (342) also equals the number of words between the two Basmalahs of chapter 27, and 342 equals  $19 \times 18$ .

\*\* The occurrence of the extra Basmalah is in 27:30. The number of the chapter and the verse add up to 57, or  $19 \times 3$ .

\*\* Each letter of the Arabic alphabet corresponds to a number according to their original sequence in the alphabet. The Arabs were using this system for calculations. When the Quran was revealed 14 centuries ago, the numbers known today did not exist. A universal system was used where the letters of the Arabic, Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek alphabets were used as numerals. The number assigned to each letter is its "Gematrical Value." The numerical values of the Arabic alphabet are shown below:

(The table is omitted)

A study on the gematrical values of about 200 attributes of God which are mentioned in the Quran, shows that only four names have gematrical values which are multiples of 19. These are "Wahid" (One), "Zul Fadl al Azim" (Possessor of Infinite Grace), "Majid" (Glorious), "Jaami" (Summoner). Their gematrical value are 19, 2698, 57, and 114 respectively, which are all divisible by 19 and correspond exactly to the frequencies of occurrence of the Basmalah's four words.

\*\* The total numbers of verses where the word Allah (God) occurs add up to 118123, and is  $19 \times 6217$ .

\*\* The total occurrences of the word Allah (God) in all the verses whose numbers are multiples of 19 is 133, or  $19 \times 7$ .

\*\* Chapter 96, first in the chronological sequence, consists of 19 verses.

\*\* This first chronological chapter is placed ahead of the last 19 chapters.

\*\* The last revelation, chapter 110, consists of 19 words.

\*\* The key commandment: "You shall devote your worship to God alone" (in Arabic "Wahdahu") occurs in 7:70; 39:45; 40:12,84; and 60:4. The total of these numbers adds up to 361, or  $19 \times 19$ .

\*\* The Quran is characterized by a unique phenomenon that is not found in any other book: 29 chapters are prefixed with "Quranic Initials" which remained mysterious for 1406 years. With the discovery of the code 19, we realized their major role in the Quran's mathematical structure. The initials occur in their respective chapters in multiples of 19. For example, Chapter 19 has five letters in its beginning, K.H.Y.A'.SS., and the total occurrence of these letters in this chapter is 798, or  $19 \times 42$ .

\*\* To witness the details of the miracle of these initials, a short chapter which begins with one initial, letter "Q" will be a good example. The frequency of "Q" in chapter 50 is 57, or  $19 \times 3$ . The letter "Q" occurs in the other Q-initialed chapter, i.e., chapter 42, exactly the same number of times, 57. The total occurrence of the letter "Q" in the two Q-initialed chapters is 114, which equals the number of chapters in the Quran. "The Quran" is mentioned in the Quran 57 times. The description of the Quran as "Majid" (Glorious) is correlated with the frequency of occurrence of the letter "Q" in each of the Q-initialed chapters. The word "Majid" has a gematrical value of 57. Chapter 42 consists of 53 verses, and  $42+53$  is 95, or  $19 \times 5$ . Chapter 50 consists of 45 verses, and  $50+45$  is 95, or  $19 \times 5$ . The number of Q's in all ver-ses numbered "19" throughout the Quran is 76, or  $19 \times 4$ .

\*\* The Quran mentions 30 different numbers: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 99, 100, 200, 300, 1000, 2000, 3000, 5000, 50000, & 100000. The sum of these numbers is 162146, which

equals 19x8534.

\*\* If we write down the number of each verse in the Quran, one next to the other, preceded by the number of verses in each chapter, the resulting long number consists of 12692 digits (19x668). Additionally, the huge number itself is also a multiple of 19.

The details of this study is endless. Keeping up with the new discoveries is a challenging task.

In the original of The Old Testament

Is this mathematical structure unique to the Quran? For a while we thought so. But, we were wrong. The same 19-based mathematical composition was discovered by Rabbi Judah in the 12th century AD in a preserved part of the Old Testament. Evidently, the prime number 19 is the signature of God, the Greatest Mathematician.

Below is an excerpt from Studies In Jewish Mysticism, Joseph Dan, Association for Jewish Studies, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1978, p 88.

"The people (Jews) in France made it a custom to add (in the morning prayer) the words: Ashrei temimei derekh (blessed are those who walk the righteous way), and our Rabbi, the Pious, of blessed memory, wrote that they were completely and utterly wrong. It is all gross falsehood, because there are only nineteen times that the Holy Name is mentioned (in that portion of the morning prayer), . . . and similarly you find the word Elohim nineteen times in the peri cope of Ve- elleh shemot . . . .

"Similarly, you find that Israel were called sons nineteen times, and there are many other examples. All these sets of nineteen are intricately intertwined, and they contain many secrets and esoteric meanings, which are contained in more than eight volumes. Therefore, anyone who has the fear of God in him will not listen to the words of the Frenchmen who add the verse Ashrei temimei derekh (blessed are those who walk in the paths of God's Torah, for according to their additions the Holy Name is mentioned twenty times . . . and this is a great mistake. Furthermore, in this section there are 152 words, but if you add Ashrei temimei derekh there are 158 words. This is nonsense, for it is a great and hidden secret why there should be 152 words . . ." (Dan, Joseph. Studies In Jewish Mysticism, Association for Jewish Studies. Cambridge, Massachusetts: 1978, p 88.)

How can we explain this phenomenon?

There are primarily four possible explanations:

- 1) Manipulation: You may be skeptical about this data. However, you can eliminate this option in several hours by random checking of detailed computer print outs published in several books. They can be obtained from the Monotheist Production International.
- 2) Coincidence: This possibility is eliminated by the statistical probability laws. The consistency and frequency of the 19-based pattern is much too overwhelming to occur coincidentally.
- 3) Human fabrication: While fabricating a literary work that meets the criteria of the document summarized here is a stunning challenge for our computer generation, it is certainly improbable for the time of initiation of the document, namely, 610 AD. One more fact augments the improbability of human fabrication. If a certain person or persons had fabricated this

literary work, they would want to reap the fruits of their efforts; they would have bragged about it.

In view of the originality, complexity, and mathematical sophistication of this work, one has to admit that it is ingenious. However, no one has ever claimed credit for this unique literary code; the code was never known prior to the computer decoding accomplished by Dr. Khalifa. Therefore it is reasonable to exclude the possibility of human fabrication.

The timing of the discovery may be considered another evidence for the existence and full control of Supreme Being: The mystery of the number 19 which is mentioned as "one of the greatest events" in Sura 74 (The Hidden Secret) was unveiled exactly 1406 (19x74) lunar years after the revelation of the Quran. Dr. Khalifa discovered the code 19 in 1974. The connection between 19 and 74 (the number of Sura which this code is mentioned) is significant in the timing of the discovery.

4. Super Intelligent Source: The only remaining possibility is that a super intelligent source is responsible for this document; one who designed the work in this extraordinary manner, then managed to keep it a well guarded secret for 14 centuries, for a predetermined time.

The mathematical code ensures that the source is super intelligent and also that the document is perfectly intact.

It is not a dream anymore

The following excerpts are from the famous astronomer and science-fiction writer Carl Sagan's book:

"No, don't you see? This would be different. This isn't just starting the universe out with some precise mathematical laws that determine physics and chemistry. This is a message. Whoever makes the universe hides messages in transcendental numbers so they'll be read fifteen billion years later when intelligent life finally evolves. I criticized you and Rankin the time we first met for not understanding this. 'If God wanted us to know that he existed, why didn't he send us an unambiguous message?' I asked. Remember?"

"I remember very well. You think God is a mathematician."

"Something like that. If what we're told is true. If this isn't a wild-goose chase. If there's a message hiding in pi and not one of the infinity of other transcendental numbers. That's a lot of ifs."

"You're looking for Revelation in arithmetic. I know a better way."

"Palmer, this is the only way. This is the only thing that would convince a skeptic. Imagine we find something. It doesn't have to be tremendously complicated. Just something more orderly than could accumulate by chance that many digits into pi. That's all we need. Then mathematicians all over the world can find exactly the same pattern or message or whatever it proves to be. Then there are no sectarian divisions. Everybody begins reading the same Scripture. No one could then argue that the key miracle in the religion was some conjurer's trick, or that later historians had falsified the record, or that it's just hysteria or delusion or a substitute parent for when we grow up. Everyone could be a believer." (Carl Sagan, Contact, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1985, p 418-419)

Eerily, almost everything exactly has been happening according to Carl Sagan's prediction with an exception that the code of the divine message is

not pi, it is a peculiar prime number. Also the last statement seems to be too optimistic, at least for the time being. Already millions of Muslims have rejected the mathematical code based on the presupposition that the Creator of the universe won't employ mathematics in his book. And born-again Christians are ready to coin it as Anti Christ.

However, this mathematically coded message promises a new era in the world of religions. It does not only provide an examinable evidence for the existence of God, it also expose the widespread corruption plagued all the organized religions. This mathematical code suggests (as it is published in our numerous books) a "Copernican revolution" in theology of religions. Instead of Krishna-centered, or Jesus-centered, or Muhammad-centered religions we must turn to the original center, to the God-centered model. Here is the challenging question:

Can you see the mathematical miracle of The Final Testament?

#### THE ARROW TEST

If you were born in India, most likely you would be a Hindu. In Saudi Arabia, a Muslim. In Israel, a Jew. Since you are in the USA, you're most likely a Christian. The dominant religion of your family and your country is more likely to be adopted by you. Why? What is the relationship between religion and geography?  
Psychological relationship

Years ago I did some psychological experiments to explore certain common human behavior. The most interesting one was on conformity and compliance. I wanted to find out how we, as individuals, behave under strong group pressure. How was a minority of one reacting against a unanimous majority? The results were incredible.

#### The Arrow Test

For the experiment, I gathered five persons in a room and put them in a line. These participants would be my confederates. I told them that we would perform an experiment on the next person who would enter the room. He would be the last in the line. In the beginning, I would ask them two warm-up questions, and they should give me the correct answers. But, when I ask them the third question (the real one), my confederates one by one, should give me the wrong answer, loudly.

When the real participant entered the room, I announced that we would have a test--as if I had never talked about it previously. I started with the two warm-up questions. I drew simple figures on the board and asked them one by one the routine question: which one is similar to this one. After all the five participants gave the correct answer, the real participant also gave the correct answer. They were easy questions.

Then, it came to the real question, the easiest one. I asked the following question: which figure on the right side is similar to the figure on the left side?

(The tabel is omitted)

My confederates, one by one gave the obviously wrong answer. The first

person said "C." The second one also said "C." The third followed with "C." All of them gave the same answer. The real participant was in shock. He was amazed at the discrepancy between what he saw and what he heard. When his turn came, after hearing five straight "C"s, he agreed with the majority. The "C" was his answer. He had gone along with the group.

#### Results of the experiments

Later, I learned that I was not the first one who conducted this experiment. Between 1951-56, S. E. Asch performed a series of studies on compliance and conformity. Let me summarize the results of his experiments:

Asch made his experiments with different length of lines. He asked the participants to match the standard line with the lines on the left. Out of 123 participants, only 29 did not ever conform with the group's decision. 61 participants went along with their groups on occasion. But, 33 conformed to their groups numerous times. They agreed on the obvious wrong answer almost every time.

Some participants claimed to actually have seen the wrong line as a correct match. They privately accepted the belief of the majority opinion. About half of the rest of the conformists claimed that they had seen the lines correctly, but that when they heard the majority choice, they decided that they must have been wrong. They then went along with the group. The remaining conformists said that they knew that the answer was not correct but that they had gone along with the group anyway (See Small Group Discussion: a theoretical approach, Charles Pavitt & Ellen Curtis, Gorsuch Scarisbric, Scottsdale, AZ., p 160-165).

Conformity, whether in the form of compliance or private acceptance, occurs in every group. If a gang member steals a car the first time, most likely he will continue to do so. He will probably justify that stealing in order to maintain his internal harmony.

#### Religion: the best nest for conformists

World religions give hundreds of different answers for a single question. Dogmas attract the highest rate of conformists. Conformity, sooner or later, causes the private acceptance or justification of the dogma. Some people become fanatics, dedicating themselves to the dogma. The old conformists cause the newcomers to conform. This chain attraction goes on.

Why is the percentage of religious conformists and their private acceptance so high? There are many reasons:

1. We are exposed to dogmas from childhood. This early exposure to the religion has a great impact on us. For a Hindu, thousands of human gods and holy cows make more sense than everything else. For a Christian, a God with three personalities sacrificing his innocent son for criminals provides the only answer for the purpose of life. For a Muslim Muhammad's name is the only password to heaven.
2. Religious answers are not simple, they are mostly complex and vague. We can interpret any dogma and make it acceptable to us. The way is wide open for justification through endless speculations.
3. Many answers do not have objective validity. Since we cannot verify them, we can easily accept them.
4. Professionalized priesthoods survive on particular dogmas. So, there

will always be some well-trained holy sales people around. They are the most effective sales people ever seen in this world.

5. The common religious norms such as "Have faith without reason." or "Don't question." can close all the circuits for any possible intellectual light.

6. Religions do not nakedly expose their false dogmas and myths. They exploit the truth and craftily amalgamate it with myths. The truth such as "God's existence," or "good moral values," attracts many. For the sake of some truth we may accept the mixture to be the whole truth.

7. In religious groups, peer pressure is very strong. The social and psychological punishment for not complying with the religion of our family and friends is usually a deterrent factor. So, we may employ an intellectual censorship to avoid a possible confrontation.

8. Our enigmatic brains can reinforce our private acceptance by playing odd games: selective cognition and logical fallacies can create spiritual experiences.

9. The socio-economic benefits of a religion or cult may force us to rationalize and justify their dogma.

#### Children's questions

Here is a bouquet of children's letters to God. They are a selection from *Dear God: What Religion Were the Dinosaurs?*, David Heller, Bantam Books, New York, 1991. They are from relatively free and innocent minds. They contain serious criticism blended with humor and satire. We hope that we can learn something from our children.

Dear God,

What does the word begat mean in the Bible. They certainly used it a heck of alot. Pardon my grammer, Dom (age 9)

Dear God,

I read how you partered the red ocean. That was cool and unbelievable. How come you don't do things spektakquler like that any more. Hard to get up the energy? Dan B. (age 12)

Dear Lord.

Was the bible the first book? Or did the cavesmen made up stories too. Your friend, Kev (age 9)

Dear God,

I think you and Jesus are the best. I heard that Jesus was your only begotten son. I cannot understand for the life of me (like my dad says) why you did not permit him to live longer than age 33. Other than that I believe in you with no questions asked. Alex (age 11)

God,

What do you think of guys like Mohamud, Buuda and the others like them? I do not understand their ideas. But maybe you do. Raymond (age 12)



Dear God,

You should change the rule on priests and nuns. So they can get married and have kids. Otherwise they get off scott free and can get lonely and get into trouble. I know. My uncle is a priest. Hallelujah, Bonnie (age 10)

Dear Saint Augustine,

I am writing to you because I thought it might take too long to reach God. I need some help soon. My teacher Sister Mary has it in for me. I didn't do anything wrong. Honest. Anthony (age 9)

Dear God,

Are preachers like ministers and priests? Are they close to you or do they just talk loud. I say put them in their places and have them stop taking your name in their veings. Francis (age 12)

God,

Like I said in confession. I am sorry. Please forgive me. And make sure Father Ryan keeps quiet about it. Thank you, Patric (age 11)

Attention: God

Please tell Rev. Johnson to stop calling you a him every single time he talks about you. Tell him youre a girl and set him strait. Best wishes, Melissa Sue (age 10)

Dear God,

There should be a book about you. It would be a best seller. They could have a big burning bush and a cross on the cover. If that would not get the people, that would be on the back and they would put a lady all dolled up on the front. That works every time. J.M. (age 10)

Dear Mr. God,

Do you get drunk on wine like the men in the Bible? My dad drinks too much too. So do not feel bad or sad. You are not alone. Your buddy, Andrew My dad's name is Phil (age 9)

God,

I hate the taste of wine. Why didn't you have them dirink fruit punch or papaya juice in Israel. Love, Michael (age 11)

Dear God,

If the last supper was in the morning, would it be called the last breakfast? I love Jesus very much and I wish that he did not have to suffer for our sins. Love, Kenneth (age 12)

God/Jesus.

I have a box where I keep all my valuabled things and stuff. I want to let you know that I have my cross there. You did not die for nothing. Joe (age 10)

## AN INVITATION

If Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad were back today, the Jews would stone the first as Anti-Semite, the Christians would crucify the second as Anti-Christ, and the Muslims would stab the third as Dajjal (The imposter).

Idolization of human beings is the epidemic of all religions, and it is the most common tragedy of human history. According to the original teachings of all God's messengers, idol worship is the biggest offense against God.

Besides, the idolization of prophets, messengers, saints and the faith of human intercession etc., creates religious abuse, oppression, conflict and fighting between believers in God.

When believers start idolizing their previous religious leaders, they develop the tendency to idolize their living religious leaders too. The clergymen, in order to take advantage of that weakness, focus their preaching on praising the departed humans--Buddha, Jesus, Mohammed, etc.,--instead of God.

These clergymen and their fanatic followers killed many in the name of their incarnated gods. They fabricated many prohibitions. They made money and fame in the name of those human gods. And they claimed to have the power of intercession in their names--so much so that they sold the keys to the heavens, and holy handkerchiefs.

So, if we want to follow the Old, the New and the Final Testaments, if we want to stop religious exploitations, if we don't want to be blind idol worshipers, if we want the unity of all the believers of all religions, we must start a "Copernican revolution" in theology. Instead of Krishna-centered, or Jesus-centered, or Mohammed-centered religions we must turn to to the original center, to the God-centered model. To achieve this revolution, each of us must start questioning the formulas and teachings that have created incarnated gods. Christians must start from the Trinity and clergy, Jews from Mishna and Gemarah, Muslims from Hadith and Sunna. I hope the next century will be the century of unity under the banner of "God Alone".

"The Lord your God is One God.  
You shall worship the Lord your God  
with all your heart,  
with all your soul,  
with all your mind,  
with all your strength.  
(Old Testament, Deuteronomy 6:4;  
New Testament, Mark 12:29;  
Quran, the Final Testament 3:18)

"Say, 'O followers of the scripture, let us come to a logical agreement between us and you: that we do not worship except God, that we never set up any idols besides Him, and never set up each other as gods beside God.' If they reject such an agreement, then say, 'Bear witness that we are Submitters.'" (Quran, the Final Testament 3:64)

Please write your comments or for the catalog of International Community of  
Sumbmitters to:

Edip Yuksel  
P.O. Box 43476,  
Tucson, AZ 85733-3476 U.S.A.

Tel/Fax: (520) 323-7636