

Introduction

"There is a principle which is a bar against all information, which is proof against all arguments, and which cannot fail to keep a man in everlasting ignorance – that principle is contempt prior to investigation." Herbert Spencer

You are listening to Religion Roundtable, the most controversial show on radio.

Later on in the show we're going to have Brian Flemming, the maker of the documentary The God Who Wasn't There.

1-877-899-5866

rrt@godwithoutreligion.com
www.godwithoutreligion.com

God Without Religion is a multi-award winning book that the institutionalized religious powers hope you never read. Here is why:

12 My Comments/News

In dialectics, if I don't believe in something, like the existence of a particular god, the burden of disproving that god does not rest on my shoulder. The burden of proving the existence of that god rests on the shoulders of those who assert their god's existence.

If I say I never have to press on the gas pedal in my car, because there is always an invisible force that moves my car at the exact acceleration I want it to go, no one has to disprove my assertion. If I can't prove it, everyone is not only entitled to doubt me, but reasonably bound to the conclusion that my assertion is valueless.

This is true for everything, from leprechauns to spirits to forces of nature.

Another principle of dialectics is this: if you make a claim, like there is a god or perhaps you say you're the Son of God, no one can absolutely disprove it. But the inability to absolutely disprove your

claim does not give your claim any value or make it true. In fact, the principle to go by is this: assertions that can never be disproved are always valueless.

Now, that Jesus existed is an assertion, and people who have made that assertion have attempted to prove it. Their proof fails not only for non-Christians, but for Christians who have overcome their initial contempt for the challenge to their beliefs and begin investigating the evidence.

Considering how long this myth has lived, I think everyone needs to look at the evidence. The reason the proof of Jesus fails is because so much is credited to Jesus. Think of it this way: I can provide evidence that a man named Yeshu (which is Jesus's Hebrew name) lived in Palestine at the time Jesus is supposed to have lived simply by saying nothing extraordinary about the guy and just say his name was Yeshu. The evidence would be the commonality of the name in that time period. But, the more I credit to my Yeshu/Jesus, the harder it will be to prove he existed.

So in a matter of speaking, we know Jesus Christ never existed precisely because Dark Age Jesus followers pinned so much on his life, making it impossible for him to have been part of human history. In other words, in trying to prove he existed by writing elaborate biographies, they actually disproved his existence.

This obviously puts defenders of the faith in a very embarrassing position.

Now, no one expects believers to produce Jesus's birth records or photos of him, though you'd expect that if the Son of God came to earth – a supposedly singular event in history (which of course it wasn't) – there would be statues, coins, and engravings of Jesus that can be dated from the time of his life.

But we're already getting ahead of ourselves, because we have to ignore the fact that if he really came, actually there would be no statues or coins or engravings of him. In fact, there'd be no world, and none of us would be here because he said his generation would be the last in the world. What's the point of God coming to earth if it

isn't the end of history? No wonder Christians think the world is going to end. Every day the sun rises is a spit in their face. So, the world existing today is evidence that Jesus Christ never existed.

Let's put it this way: Jesus's biographers put their feet in his mouth!

So first, in disproving Jesus's existence, let's never forget that this is all a game of make believe. I might as well be disproving the existence of Bullwinkle.

And again, I don't even have to do this, because the burden of proving his existence rests on the shoulders of those who profess it.

Anyway, we can't expect the remains of Jesus to be produced, since he supposedly ascended to heaven, but we can expect tons of words to be written about him during his life. Or are we to believe that the Son of God came on earth, and NOT ONE WORD was written about him while he was here? Not ONE WORD that came out of his mouth was jotted down? Well, that's exactly what we are asked to believe.

Proof of Jesus's existence usually begins with the Hebrew Bible. But the prophecies of the Hebrew Bible can be interpreted to herald the coming of anyone, even Jim Jones.

Not only that, when the very people who wrote biographies of Jesus's life are guilty of manufacturing events in his life that parallel the expectations informed by the Hebrew prophecies, all that prophetic evidence becomes null and void.

It's like reading a weather report from two weeks ago that said thunderstorms were predicted a week ago, and then telling everyone at the local bar that you were hit by lightning last week. And your proof – that weather report.

Some prophecies, like the virgin birth predicted by Isaiah, are outright fabrications. Isaiah never predicted a virgin birth, and one only needs to read the Hebrew Bible, in Hebrew, to find that out.

Other prophecies were totally botched. I'll give you an example. Zachariah predicted the Messiah would be riding one animal, not two,

but the New Testament hagiographers were not well versed in Hebrew. They thought Zachariah was referring to two animals, and so fabricated this story of Jesus, a Messiah character, riding two animals at once.

Here's a big problem. The New Testament intrudes on the historical time stream. Here was a man that overturned the tables of the money changers, attracted throngs of people, was called the King of the Jews, and was crucified for being a political upstart.

And yet, he did not attract the notice of any Roman writer? A list of about 45 contemporaries of Jesus, or within a century, was made. Besides a few forgeries, there is no mention of Jesus Christ or his disciples in any of their works.

In fact, like the New Testament biographies themselves, the forgeries are further proof that he never existed, because why would later Christians need to forge historians like Josephus in obvious ways to prove Jesus existed unless there was embarrassingly no evidence that he ever walked the earth?

Let's just fight that feeling of contempt prior to investigation. Are we seeing how deep the rabbit hole goes? How far this consciously perpetrated hoax went? That Jesus ever existed, not whether or not he was married to bloody Mary Magdalene, is **THE GREATEST HOAX IN THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD!**

True Believers love to say: "Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence." But my reply to that is: when the evidence of presence is absent of substance, the absence of presence is self-evident.

We'll be right back with Brian Flemming, the director of the documentary *The God Who Wasn't There*.

12 Minutes Guest/Skit/Callers/E-mails

1-877-899-5866

rrt@godwithoutreligion.com
www.godwithoutreligion.com

323-874-1517

Our guest this morning is Brian Flemming, the writer, director, producer, and narrator of the documentary The God Who Wasn't There. He co-wrote Bat Boy: The Musical. He also wrote and directed a faux documentary about the assassination of Bill Gates called Nothing so Strange. You can find The God Who Wasn't There at thegodmovie.com Brian, welcome!

I loved your documentary and I think everyone should see it.

Before we get into Jesus and The God Who Wasn't There, tell us about Danielle, this new movie you are making. What is Danielle about?

What inspired you to make this documentary?

This is a trick question, but I think you will see through it:

A savior was sent to humanity by a father God, was part of a Trinity, was born in a stable on December 25 to a virgin, his birth was witnessed by shepherds and by gift-carrying Magi, he died for the sins of humanity, offers vicarious atonement, a form of bread and wine as a sacrament, had 12 apostles, a last supper, was called the savior, is depicted with a halo, makes a covenant with humanity, was resurrected on a Sunday, and ascends into heaven on the first day of Spring, performed many miracles, cured many illnesses, and cast out devils. He will judge the dead on judgment day, and expects baptism.

Who am I talking about?

Christians are actually worshippers of Mithra, they just don't know it.

Tell us about these heroes whose lives mirror one another.

What does that make Christianity? A plagiarism? Is there any saving grace to the religion, any redeeming feature? Maybe one is that it's so preposterous it's hard to take seriously?

Here are some fun facts: Few Christians know this, but the authorship of the Gospels was not even known to early Christians. Not until the latter part of the second century was their authorship decided. We don't even know how many authors they had.

And they can't be eye-witness accounts since they were written fifty, sixty, seventy, perhaps eighty years after Jesus is supposed to have lived.

Matthew and Luke plagiarize Mark, so they are obviously not eye-witness accounts. Also, they contradict each other and even contradict themselves. In fact, there are about 200 contradictions in the New Testament.

A perfect example of this is in Jesus's genealogy. Jesus can't be the descendant of David and the Son of God at the same time. Why bother giving all the male ancestry of Jesus, ending with Joseph, only to stop and say Joseph was not Jesus's father? Contradiction!

Here's another Contradiction: in Matthew, there's an angel appearing outside the tomb to give news of the resurrection. But in Luke, the women enter the tomb and are given the news by two angelic men.

And Matthew and Luke are the two gospels that fabricate Jesus's early years, so we know nothing of those years. There goes the King David bloodline bit. There goes the virgin birth. There goes the wise boy in the temple. There goes the slaying of the first born, which is itself not historical.

You'd think that if a religion was truly inspired by a perfect God, it wouldn't require any apologists. None of these facts are taught to the forming minds of Christian children. So what would you say to a student at Village Christians Schools or any fundamentalist school?

12 Minutes Guest/Skit/Callers/E-mails

1-877-899-5866

rrt@godwithoutreligion.com
www.godwithoutreligion.com

The earliest copy of Mark was written at least forty years after Jesus's demise. It says nothing of his early years or his ascension. I think we can all agree that if Mark knew these details, he would have marked them down.

Also, Mark is not a disciple, and not even from Palestine, so his work is entirely hearsay.

But one of your guests in the movie explains that Mark was not even worrying about the historicity of his Gospel. Tell us about that.

Let's talk about blood. I'll start with John. If John was an eye-witness of Jesus's life, then why would John plagiarize miracles from other myths? And why would he wait till he's ripe in senility eighty years later before writing any of it?

Worse, why leave it to future writers to add a chapter and mention that you were a disciple of Jesus?

Why not write down the life you eye-witnessed? And here's the point: there is practically no embodied Jesus in John, except for the guy they like to have for breakfast every Sunday.

And you cover the flesh and blood aspect of Jesus in your movie. Can you talk about that?

Paul admits he never met Jesus. In fact, it sounds like he had a vision during a seizure. I don't know, but with all the other evidence failing, I wouldn't base my whole religious identity on a guy's medical condition from two thousand years ago.

We know that well over half of Paul's letters were written much later, making them useless in finding an historical Jesus.

Also, Paul is ignorant of Jesus's entire life – meaning the fictional one written down in the gospels decades later. If it happened, he would have known about it.

Paul never mentions Jesus's birth or genealogy, Pontius Pilate, Judas, John the Baptist, or any of his miracles. He doesn't even concern himself with Jesus's message. Paul's Jesus is just a mythic being sacrificed for humanity. And that's an old story he plagiarized.

Now after his epileptic attack, this deranged man thought the end of the world was nigh. Everything this deluded man wrote was informed by his belief that at any moment the world would end. His words are not words to live by. They are words by which to prepare for impending death and destruction.

What do you learn about Paul? What do you say to this: Paul, the first Christian fundamentalist, makes him the most influential depraved man in the history of the world? Yes or no?

Victor Hugo wrote: "Jesus said, love; the Church says, pay." I think it's common to consider Jesus a good guy, but Jesus is actually a composite of several characters penned by different writers, either that or he's a schizophrenic sociopath, because one minute he's preaching the Sermon on the Mount and the next he's belligerent.

"Do you think that I have come to bring peace to the earth? No, I tell you, but rather division! From now on five in one household will be divided, three against two and two against three; they will be divided: father against son and son against father, mother against daughter and daughter against mother, mother-in-law against her daughter-in-law and daughter-in-law against mother-in-law." (Luke 12:51-3)

No wonder we're in a never ending cultural war!

"He said to them, "But now, the one who has a purse must take it, and likewise a bag. And the one who has no sword must sell his cloak and buy one. (Luke 22:36)

One minute he says if you live by the sword you die by the sword, and the next, its an arms race.

“Whoever comes to me and does not hate father and mother, wife and children, brother and sisters, yes, and even life itself, cannot be my disciple.” (Luke 14:26)

May I have some self-loathing with that sacrament, please?

“But as for these enemies of mine who did not want me to be king over them – bring them here and slaughter them in my presence.” (Luke 19:27)

Now, in your movie, you did show the dangers of following these crazy words. But some might read this stuff and say, that’s why I am a moderate Christian. But you think that’s crazy too. Why is moderate Christianity absurd?

One thing I would love both moderate and extreme Christians to get is that nothing happened. Martin Buber wrote “The Christian is the incomprehensibly daring man, who affirms in an unredeemed world that its redemption has been accomplished.” His point? Your Son of God came and went and nothing changed. Everything is the same. Death, disease, ignorance and stupidity, greed, envy, hatred, racism, sexism – they’re all still here. The only thing that changed is we created one more religion to lie to ourselves and mystify ourselves with new verbiage and justify all our madness. Though any of the old ones would have done nicely. What’s the point of believing that the most important spiritual event in human history has already happened, when nothing happened? Did you enter the Christian mind enough to figure that out?

12 Minutes Guest/Skit/Callers/E-mails

1-877-899-5866

rrt@godwithoutreligion.com
www.godwithoutreligion.com

Was there ever a time when you felt contempt for people who dared to question your religion? How do you think people can overcome that initial defensiveness?

We can show that Jesus's biography is not the Word of God and cannot be trusted. If there is just one error, then no more Word of God. Once that's settled, Christianity, a revelatory religion, is over.

Here is an Error: Matthew 27:9 says Jesus fulfilled a prophecy spoken by Jeremiah, but it was Zachariah, not Jeremiah, that made the prediction.

Another Error: Matthew says that it was predicted by the Prophets that he would be a Nazarene, but no such prediction exists.

Here are some examples from Mark:

A Blunder: Jesus is arguing with Pharisees, and quotes the Greek version of the Hebrew Bible to make his case. Believing this is like believing Bill O'Reilly could get the massacre at Malmedy backwards in a debate with World War II scholars, and win the argument.

Another Blunder: Mark gets the geography of Palestine wrong. Jesus casts demons out of a man (or two men in Matthew) and sends them into the bodies of a couple thousand pigs which then run into the sea.

Bad luck for the pigs and the pig farmer, but only one small problem. This occurs in Gerasa, 31 miles from the shore of the Galilean Sea. Can anyone imagine possessed pigs running for 31 miles only to drown themselves? Anyone believe this superstitious tripe?

No one does. Here's why: When Matthew read Mark, he realized it was nonsense, so he changed the name of the town to the only one

nearer that started with a “G”, Gadara. Gadara was only five miles from the shore. But one small problem: It was in the wrong country.

King James scholars finally found Gergesa on the shore, and called it the spot for the exorcism.

Another Blunder: Mark originally has Jesus traveling from Tyre to the Sea via Sidon. This basically means that Jesus could tell us the sure path to heaven, but not the shortest route to the sea, because he’s walking about 40 more miles than he needs to.

And even with all these self-defeating attempts to flesh out Jesus’s life, Mark is almost half the length of Luke, which just goes to show how much larger stories become when told and retold.

But let’s say a Christian realizes through exposure to this kind of biblical research that Jesus never existed. After a few years of searching, this Christian adopts Hinduism. He then sees all these people who worship mythic images of gods that they know never walked the earth. And even though there is all this mythic literature, they know it was written just to increase the devotional sentiment. So, this apostate misses that devotional life and wants to worship using an image of God. But try as he might to adopt one of the Hindu gods, his heart keeps going to Jesus. So say he readily admits that Jesus never existed and admits that everyone can choose whatever mythic image that works to focus their mind, but he wants to use Jesus as a focal point of concentration. Anything wrong with that? He’s a mythic image of God, fine, but can’t someone use that image just like a Hindu might worship Shiva or Krishna?

Your documentary reveals how little modern Christians know about Christianity and about the culture in which Christianity formed. We know why ministers won’t teach that history, but if this is the most important thing in the world, you’d think Christians would find out as much as they can. If the Bible is really believed to be the word of God, you’d think that every single Christian would be reading it in Greek. Why do you think Christians aren’t interested in learning about their religion? More than one of the people you interviewed actually said it’s good they didn’t know the history of Christianity and the Roman world.

Closing

Thank you Brian. You can visit Brian online at thegodmovie.com

rrt@godwithoutreligion.com

Write questions and comments, or let us know if you are interested in sponsoring Religion Roundtable.

www.godwithoutreligion.com

You can find there my retreat schedule. I'll be leading a course at the Omega Institute.