

DISCREDITING THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

Discrediting the Miracles of Jesus

July 2007

[Revised - 2018]

All rights reserved to the author

ISBN – 978-0-620-38240-3

(Johannesburg, February 23, 2007)

[Written in South African English]

Email address – jlefhanded@telkomsa.net

DISCREDITING THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

[Revised - 2018]

Julio Carrancho

Other books by the author:

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

Dedicated to Intelligent People

PREFACE

Table of Contents

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This book stands against that nasty and unwelcome christ.

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MIRACLES

1 – first imponderable

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2 – second imponderable

Another imponderable is that nowhere in the description does Jesus

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

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

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

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

3 – third imponderable

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4 – next imponderable

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

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

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

5 – Jesus lies to his mother

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

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

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

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

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

6 – how much wine was it?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 – not a canonical miracle

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

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

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

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

8 – wine to fight stress

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

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

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

However the challenge for the staunch fundamentalists is to explain

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And that is the quandary Bible exegetes and commentators are

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

...

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

Verse 6:

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

Verse 7:

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

Thank You for previewing this eBook

You can read the full version of this eBook in different formats:

- HTML (Free /Available to everyone)
- PDF / TXT (Available to V.I.P. members. Free Standard members can access up to 5 PDF/TXT eBooks per month each month)
- Epub & Mobipocket (Exclusive to V.I.P. members)

To download this full book, simply select the format you desire below

