

Why, such a nice post! And more baseless claims. Why, you shouldn't have given me such a lovely gift. I do enjoy you claim that I am having a "temper tantrum" when you can't refute what I say. Can you please show us how explaining on how one refutes a point is a "temper tantrum"? I do wonder what you think a temper tantrum actually is.

Let's see, Tater, I said that Christians claim that the chapters in Isaiah mention the crucifixion. I know that they do not, but they are "interpreted" by Christians to retroactively try to make their supposed messiah fit the Jewish prophecies. And I do love your excuse that you "never really said much about that anyway." You mentioned it, you made claims about it and now you can't support them. I have no idea what JC looked like before the crucifixion, being that there is no reason to think he existed as the bible claims. At best, the possible historical Jesus would have looked like a 1st century Jew, complete with temple locks, beard, etc. The verses in Isaiah say that he will be nothing special to look upon. You want a direct citation. Well, Potato, read Isaiah. It's there. But since you have demonstrated yourself to be quite ignorant about what your bible contains, I'll be merciful and tell you where. It's in Isaiah 52. Read the entire chapter, so we don't have problems with claims of "context".

Oh and golly, Suetonius mentioned Christians! Why yes he did and again that does nothing to show that your magical Jesus existed. The existence of worshippers of a certain god/gods does not support the existence of a particular god. Unless of course you wish to admit that other gods exist just like you claim yours does. I know you've claimed that you'll come back to this issue. I am expecting an answer since you have indeed claimed you would address it.

I have said that if I don't know whose interpretation is more valid there is no reason to think any interpretation is the "right" one. Since you misrepresented my words again, your claim of a non sequitur fails. If a document's author, intention etc is unknown, people who claim to magically know the meaning via magical revelation have no more evidence that their interpretation is the "right" one than the next group of people who make the same magical claim. And indeed, there is no reason to believe any of this nonsense since "this nonsense" are baseless claims by all sides.

The bible is not a document that we know quite a bit about. First, it is not one document, it is a gathering of contradicting stories. We know very few of the authors and those we know, we know as commonalities of writing, not personalities. The writer of the gospel of Luke and Acts may be the same person but it cannot be shown that this person was an apostle or who it actually was. We know the history of the eras that it purports to report about and we know that those reports are faulty since we have no evidence of magical floods, fantastical palaces and temples, divinely wise kings, millions of people wandering around in the Sinai for 4 decades, magical destruction of cities, battles between

hundreds of thousands of men, earthquakes, darkening of the sun, walking dead, etc. You simply lie when you claim that we know the viewpoints of the authors. We can guess that they may be focusing on an audience but we have no evidence on why. And I do want you to show me these “viewpoints of contemporary men who want nothing more than to destroy Christianity”. Now, it seems that these “contemporary men” could be Christians that Potato doesn’t agree with and who is sure that their claims of being right are wrong and that only Potato’s claims are right, all of course with no evidence to support that claim. Let me guess, would the Pope be one of those contemporary men? Would Pat Robertson be one of them?

And no, saying that the US Constitution has been written by mortals and that it is not claimed to be an eternal truth that was written/inspired by a magical omnipotent, omniscient being is not “irrelevant to the analogy of exegesis/interpretation”. You claim that the bible is this magical book and its meaning is from magical revelation from this magical being. Christians wish to pretend that they get some magical message, some “sensus plenior”, from their god and that their version of what “God really meant” is the only true one. In the case of the Constitution, we know that men who claimed to be nothing else but men wrote it. They wrote other things that demonstrated their ideas and positions and those facts can inform what they meant in the Constitution. We have nothing else from the authors of the bible except what we see in the bible so we know nothing about them. Now, if you are willing to say that the bible is no more than a set of works by humans and nothing more than that, we can compare the two documents. If not, the analogy does fail.

There is indeed such a thing as contextual study, metaphors and other literary devices. And Christians pick and choose what they want to pretend to be literal and what they want to pretend are metaphors. Christians all claim that they are all using contextual study, exegesis and guess what, you don’t agree on what God really meant. You, Potato, and so many others, want to pretend that your version is so much more “right” than those “fundy bible belt Christians” but you have no more evidence that this is the case than those Christians you disregard.

And nice to see that you have said that the Romans killed Jesus Christ assuming that the story is true. You claimed that the Jews killed this character before. And my point is that the Romans killed one more person, because it was nothing special to do so. The fact, per the story, that the person who killed JC was himself/God is relevant to the discussion since you are the one who wants to assign blame. Of course calling the Jews “Christ-murders” is anti-Semitism. Paul did a lovely screed on that in Hebrews and his nonsense caused humans to hate each other for a very long time. Please do show me that anti-Semitism is not largely based on what the bible says and what Christians have claimed. Show that this is “just the same old baseless claims”. I do really want to see you do this. You might want to start showing that Martin Luther isn’t a major Christian leader in your attempts to support your claims: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Martin_Luther_and_antisemitism Luther is just about as nifty as the guys who wrote the Left Behind stories where the only “good jew” is a convertible Jew. It’s always good to see you write “So?”

when we're discussing the verses that have caused so much harm to people. Well, Potato, we have one gospel that claims that the Jews claimed the guilt of killing Jesus for their entire people and descendants. None of the others say that the Jews did this, but Christians glommed onto this verse to excuse themselves and their hatreds. They didn't take the majority "opinion" and say that only the Jewish leadership and Romans were responsible; no, they decided to take this verse so they could treat Jews badly. And noting this nonsense is not a "red herring" since again you are the one who wants to place blame. Please do show that the Jewish religious leadership "technically represented" the Jewish people. Doesn't your god say that one's own sin is one's own and not one's descendants, nor one's neighbors? Yes, it does, Ezekiel 18. I will also note that it does say that the opposite Exodus 20, another one of those lovely contradictions.

And Potato, if you mention something and make a claim, like Jesus was a Jew, then that becomes part of the topic at hand. And you have claimed that I am "mumbling" and now claim that "they're your own words". Hmm, no, tater, I have not said I was mumbling. I'm still waiting for you to show me how I was mumbling. I have commented that the Christian god seems to be mumbling as a possible reason for why Christians can't agree on what their god really means. Now, since I do not believe in a god, that is a bit silly since one can explain the differences by simply citing human nature.

I do not often believe you, Potato, since I *can* show that you are lying. Crucifixion is not hanging a body on display after it is dead. That is the Jewish custom, and we can see it in the Talmud reference to the stoned and then hung body. Crucifixion is torture and death by being affixed to a cross/pole and left to hang *until* dead. It's amusing since you now claim "Irrelevant; they were done by the Romans in this case." Which shows that your claims about JC being in the Talmud to be nonsense since in that story the Jews were the killers. Thank you for disproving one of the common Christian claims about the historical sources for Jesus.

Paul killed Christians? Paul has claimed he persecuted Christians. But I don't see where he killed them. He could have if he existed as the bible claims. We don't have evidence of that except in the bible. He, as Saul, put them in prison in Acts. I do see that in Acts, Saul appears from nowhere during the trial of Stephen and "approves" of his killing.

We have that Suetonius has that punishment was inflicted on Christians, we have Pliny asking the emperor about how to deal with Christians and it shows that the Romans were not doing an inquisition. Trajan does say that if they are guilty they should be punished and that does mean killed. And we have plenty of claims on how the Christians were persecuted by emperors, which are not again supported by evidence and seem to be the usual stories told about people in power by those who are not. And of course I use the word "story", Potato, because these claims are not born out by facts. As soon as you can show facts to show that there was a magical Jesus, there was a Paul who was magically converted, etc, then we can continue on and I may be convinced that the bible stories are something more than fictional claims. Tacitus' writings can be considered stories if there is nothing to support his claims. Just like the legends of Atlantis are stories, accounts of dragons are stories, etc.

Let's take a look at your claims about threats against Paul. Acts 9 does have that there was a conspiracy to kill Paul, Acts 14 has that he was supposed stoned. And I happily admit that this is threat, but there is one problem, it's a story, not supported by evidence. And Acts 16. One of the more curious parts of Acts where the authorship is questionable, since we have the author saying "we" when speaking about the actions happening. Is this the same author who wrote the gospel of Luke? We also have Paul saying that only belief is necessary to be saved, not grace alone. However, I see the largest problem is that they had no problem with the authorities when the authorities found out that they were Roman citizens.

Stories are still "mere stories". Unless of course, you wish to admit that the stories about Vespasian healing the blind, Simon Magus flying, Shri Swami Samarth raising the dead, Apollonius of Tyana are true and just as valid as your claims? Or are they "mere stories"? We have the accounts of the martyrdom of Peter, and one can see how confusing they are here: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saint_Peter#Martyrdom Again, we have competing tombs, early church fathers not mentioning details but details added long after the supposed event, Christians accepting apocrypha as long as it's convenient (but ignoring it when it's not), etc. It's very much the same with Paul: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_the_Apostle#His_final_days_spent_in_Rome We have stories that are repeated but again have no evidence.

And yep, if Stephen and James existed, they probably did die. Humans do that. Again, deaths of believers does nothing to support the claims that the gods of those beliefs are real.

People get death threats. Even the actor of Breaking Bad gets them. This does not mean that they benefit. Paul recommended that pastors be paid. He did not take the money from his "churches" but you wish to say he took money from wealthy patrons. He supposedly worked at a tent maker. He gained esteem and influence over Christians. I can postulate that if Paul remained a Pharisee, he would have been one of many, not in power over a new religion. As a tent maker, he would have been a craftsman and this seems to be a middle-class position. And how does Josephus "note" that Paul would have been extremely influential as a Pharisee? Influential as Josephus? He appears to have been a historian but "influential"?

You have claimed that writing materials were too expensive for early Christians to bother writing down anything about their messiah. And now you wish to claim that Paul had a wealthy patron. Unfortunately, we have nothing showing that Paul got any money at all from this person, and it would also beg the question that there were wealthy people who benefited from JC and who did various things like having a dinner in JC's honor, Mary having extremely expensive perfume to pour on JC's feet, etc. We have a grateful centurion. And again, we have JC summoning money when it is supposedly needed. Now, if one accepts that JC is preaching and is sure that heaven will come so soon that no one needs to remember his words, then one can accept that JC didn't think it worth writing things down. That would also show that JC was quite wrong.

You say ">Let "anyone". "We"- including himself." In reference to where Paul calls a curse upon anyone who disagrees with him. No, it doesn't say that. It says Galatians 1:⁶ I am astonished that you are so quickly

deserting the one who called you to live in the grace of Christ and are turning to a different gospel—⁷ which is really no gospel at all. Evidently some people are throwing you into confusion and are trying to pervert the gospel of Christ. ⁸ But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel other than the one we preached to you, let them be under God's curse! ⁹ As we have already said, so now I say again: If anybody is preaching to you a gospel other than what you accepted, let them be under God's curse!" Here, Paul is saying anyone who is preaching a gospel other than what you accepted e.g. his version, should be damned. Since he preached the version that he approves of, he would not be cursed.

And its' so cute to refuse to look a link that shows that Christians think Jesus and Paul disagree. You wanted evidence, dear and the link was evidence because you would not accept me just giving quotes. I know you love me so much that you can't resist repeating my stellar words, but in this case, claiming that giving a link is easy is false since giving a link is necessary.

CARM says that verses magically don't contradict. And I say "magically" since they make baseless assumptions to have such things not contradict. I need to invent nothing new and only cite the verses to show that they contradict. I do not need to claim that the book "really" means something that it does not say.

And it is no surprise that you still cannot demonstrate that your version of Christianity is any more right than another Christians, or another theist's for that matter. I have given you an bible approved way to show that your claims are true, and of course you have done your best to ignore it. You claim that "contextual study, along with all the other rules in any form of literature/studying documents." Are what prove your version is the only "right" one. Unfortunately, all Christian the exact same things prove their versions are the only right ones. We have no magical being coming down and bestowing its seal of approval on any of you, from non-denominational evangelical Christians, to denominational evangelical Christians, to Roman Catholics, mainstream Protestants, Jehovah's Witnesses, "fundy Bible Belt Christians" , Church of Latter Day Saints, Paulines, non-Paulines, etc. I have given you an actual argument, Potato. I have shown where your claims fail and where your claims are no better than your fellow Christians that you think are wrong.

It's hilarious to watch you so desperately try to redefine the word "near". In your words, "There will be a point, so anywhere is really "near". Alas, no, it isn't. By your claims, a thousand years ago is no different than 1 second ago. Even JC has that near doesn't mean "anywhere" Matthew 24:³³ **Even so, when you see all these things, you know that it is near, right at the door.**". Thank you for yet another excellent example of how a TrueChristian will make his own holy book meaningless with this attempts to redefine words to excuse his god's inaction and evident non-existence. Paul is not saying that the return is "always approaching". Please do show what words say this that you claim. I would like to see the exact phrase that you think says "always approaching". You also claim that JC says not to follow anyone who claims to be the Christ. That is not quite true. He says not to follow anyone who says that they know JC has returned, this is also in Matthew 24. Thus, it being Paul saying that Jesus appeared

to him in the wilderness, and that JC will be back so soon that Paul knows it without seeing the signs that JC predicted (stars falling etc), Paul is a very nice fit for those JC is warning about.

And poor Tater, I do love how your protestations about length increase just in time with my points showing you wrong. I have read JC's words in context and again, you present a false context to support your claims. Paul claims to be everyone's father in Jesus, and JC says call no one father on earth. No exceptions for anyone. The context of the verse is in the chapter that has that Pharisees love to be called teacher, love to show off how much they know, love to claim that they and only they know the right answer. JC goes onto say that no one should be considered better than anyone else, and that there is only one being to be called father, and that is God. That Paul doesn't evidently know this is interesting. The term "father" certainly doesn't seem to only be a phrase to be applied to "eminent teachers and founders of schools". That might apply to "rabbi" but we see that no one is to be called "father", except God. And that's exactly what the CARM article on this said, that rabbi was the phrase, not "father", that your quote from here was concerned about. <http://carm.org/call-father> from The Pulpit Commentary, Vol. 2, page 397 Indeed, the CARM article does say that no one should be called father out of "ecclesiastical superiority." And that is what you argue that Paul is doing, claiming that he was more important than the followers, a father to his children, superior to inferior.

You say that "legalism" is trying to earn salvation through works. Well, JC had no problem with that (see goats/sheep). You add that doing good works for "selfish glory" is anathema. Yep, JC says that howling from the street corners about how great you are is a bad thing. Funny how few Christians keep silent. We have JC saying that those who do mercy get mercy. Paul says that doing something will not get you anything, it is all dependent on God's "grace" aka whim. Paul doesn't only combat "legalism" he says his supposed "savior" is wrong because he says that the merciful won't get mercy because of what they have done. If they get anything it is entirely because of God's whim.

It's always good to know that your supposed magical holy book has "possibilities" in what it might mean. There is no logic in Paul that says that the merciful must get mercy. JC says that. Paul says that it matters nothing what you do here on what this god will do.

John 14 says ¹⁵ "If you love me, keep my commands. ¹⁶ And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another advocate to help you and be with you forever— ¹⁷ the Spirit of truth. The world cannot accept him, because it neither sees him nor knows him. But you know him, for he lives with you and will be¹ in you." We see that one does works and believes and *then* the holy spirit comes after JC asks for it. Paul claims that people were long before chosen and had the holy spirit in them from the beginning (romans 9, etc).

I'm sorry, potato, that you don't want to have to address the topics you have brought up. Those are indeed the topics at hand. If your claims fail and you are again shown to be ignorant and telling falsehoods, then I will take great pleasure in showing that. Whining that we are "off topic" any time you get demonstrated as a failure doesn't work.

If you don't like it, you are more than free to go away. Christians cannot agree on what "really" saves them and that is a problem. We have Christians that believe in grace only, that god has already picked those who will believe, we have Christians who believe that people must come to accept JC/God by free will. Which is it? There is no free will if you are guaranteed to do something by the power of something else. We have Christians who believe that anyone who does good works will be saved. And we have Christians who believe in combinations of all of this nonsense. It's so funny to see you try to claim that there is no contradiction here, that "1) God chose people to believe and 2) the people believe it." Alas, you ignore those Christians who don't agree with poor ol' tater and that shows your dishonesty again.

As for your claims that Matthew says that JC supposedly "makes it clear" that the salvation of the sheep is "not necessarily just based on their works" (always good to see "not necessarily" claimed by a TrueChristian who is sure his version of the bible is the only right one and obvious has no idea). Well, let's look at Matthew 25 again. The verse you *partially* quote says this in its entirety ³⁴ "Then the King will say to those on his right, 'Come, you who are blessed by my Father; take your inheritance, the kingdom prepared for you since the creation of the world.' And it's not hard to see why you again tried to lie about what it says. It says that the kingdom has prepared since the creation of the world, not that they were to inherit from the creation of the world. See those commas, that's what makes the difference. Now, if you want to claim that bible interpreters are wrong in how they interpreted this, that's fine, and again we see that the bible is nothing more than human interpretation and writing and the TrueChristians again don't agree.

James is indeed talking about dead faith in those verses and he is also saying that faith is nothing impressive since even demons believe. Again, we have Paul claiming that belief comes from being chosen to have it even before one is born. And this makes the claims of Christians of free will and how important that is to their god to be contradictory to your claims. Which should I believe? Ready for that altar contest now? The claims of the fruit of the spirit fail since we know that people of any belief and no belief at all do good decent things. To claim that the desire to do good things come only from a magical being makes good acts worthless and that is not what JC says. So, again Paul and JC disagree. It's nice to see you repeat nonsense "God chooses who "believes" and thus they believe. It's awfully simple." And yes, it is awfully simple. It is also not a consistent message from the bible or from Christians. Again, we have no reason to believe such imperfect nonsense claimed to come from a perfect being.

Potato, saying "no you really haven't" and then proceeding to not show this is amusing, but it just you saying "nuh-uh". I've heard better arguments on a playground. We have you using another classic TrueChristian claim, that you can pick and choose what JC really meant by claiming that what inconvenient thing he said was only addressed to a specific audience "Christ was addressing the Apostles for that specific moment". If this is the case, then anyone can decide that anything doesn't mean "them". Christians can decide that homosexuality is fine for them since the only people "really addressed" were the Israelites and the Romans. They can ignore the instructions to treat everyone as an equal since that wasn't addressed directly to *them*.

So, Potato, you claim that you can show I'm lying. Okay, do so. I'm waiting. You have not shown that the Bible claims that only part of the Egyptian army was destroyed. But, go ahead, show where I was lying. I'll be most happy to witness more false witnessing on your part, you wonderful TrueChristian. And aw, you claimed you could show I was a hypocrite and all we have from you is "you yourself is the evidence." Not one instance can you show and again, we see that you are unable to back up your false claims.

You claim that "the evidence" puts Paul's claims on a much higher level. And of course you can't show this evidence at all. Surprise!

You have claimed that "the reality is that everyone is exclusive". I responded that we know that everyone is not exclusive since many people do indeed hold the same beliefs. And you know what we get to see from you now? Not a refutation that what I said is true and shows you to be wrong again, no we get "which is not the point". The topic is indeed how different beliefs exclude each other, aka how Christians don't agree on very important parts of their own religion. However, the fact is that they do agree on some things, and thus everyone is not entirely exclusive. If there is one supposed magical truth, then we should indeed have an entirely agreed upon religion, and we don't.

You are right, many Buddhists reject the idea of a deity. Even some Christians do when they try to claim that their god is some vague idea of "love". They try to remove all attributes that get their religion in trouble when they are cited. And again, there is no difference between how I don't believe a god exists and how they don't believe a god exists. Again, Tater, show me how my belief that god doesn't exist is different than my belief that Santa Claus doesn't exist. Show me how your belief that Tezcatlipoca doesn't exist is different than my belief that Tezcatlipoca doesn't exist. Show me how our disbelief is different.

Tater, you really do need a dictionary. Because in a dictionary you can find various definitions, and as we know definitions can change with context. Atheism is indeed the doctrine or belief that there is no God. It is also the doctrine or belief that there are no gods. Belief is "a state or habit of mind in which trust or confidence is placed in some person or thing" and is also defined as "conviction of the truth of some statement or the reality of some being or phenomenon especially when based on examination of evidence". In my context, the second definition is the more accurate.

A doctrine is a principle or position or the body of principles in a branch of knowledge or system of belief. These principles are built on evidence and/or faith that something unseen is true, yes? Now, faith's definition does include this lack of a need for evidence. We have this "belief and trust in and loyalty to God (2) : belief in the traditional *doctrines* of a religion b (1) : firm belief in something for which there is no proof (2) : complete trust 3: something that is believed especially with strong conviction; *especially* : a system of religious beliefs " We also have this in the bible, remember? "Now faith is confidence in what we hope for and assurance about what we do not see."

Now, I am an atheist because I see no evidence for any gods. I see evidence for the theories that explain the universe without needing a god. Thus my belief is based on evidence and earned trust by

repeatable experiments, etc . I do not have “confidence in what we hope for and assurance about what we do not see”. I don’t even have “complete trust” since I know that we may discover something new.

Theists, especially TrueChristians, dearly want to pretend that atheism and theism are equal. They are not since you cannot provide evidence for your claims, any evidence that is not the same as the evidence for gods that you *don’t* believe in. And dear, theism isn’t a lack of belief in atheism. Theism is a belief in God, not a lack of belief in atheists. Because if that’s all theism is, then it’s even more ridiculous than usual, since you know that atheists exist. Or do you believe I vanish when you cover eyes? Peekaboo!

It’s also so sweet of you to whine about tooth fairies to avoid the point I’m making. So, dear tater, tell me you believe in fairies, reptiloids, without evidence. Tell me you believe in Wicca’s Goddess without evidence. Because if you don’t believe in these beings, then you must have a reason? What reason is that, Potato? That there is no evidence for them? Shucks, that’s why I don’t believe in your god, tooth fairies, reptiloids, etc. I’m not agnostic about such things because the evidence against such nonsense is overwhelming. And no, asking for corporeal evidence is not “dishonest” in the least, unless you want to claim that me asking for corporeal evidence for the tooth fairy, Santa Claus, etc is “dishonest”. You want to pretend it is since you have no evidence at all, much less the corporeal evidence that you should have for the magical events in your bible. Santa Claus isn’t corporeal, because how else does he get down chimneys in apartments? The tooth fairy isn’t corporeal since how does she get into locked homes? Golly, Paste Pot Pete, they only have corporeal manifestations (Christians use this excuse so why not here?) It would be intellectually dishonest to not hold your claims to the same standard that you hold others to.

I’ve already seen Christian views and arguments; TWeb has nothing new. I’ve seen them claim each other is wrong, and thus I have no reason to think that any of you, Christians, Jews, Muslims, Wicca, etc, are right and that you have evidence. As I have said, all of your “evidence” is no more than the same “evidence” claimed by the other religions. I’ve asked you to point out one great and wonderful argument from your master Nick and you have yet to do so. My guess is that you are afraid. Afraid you’ll pick one more that fails so you insist that I go to TWeb and look there for something that might work but you don’t have to take responsibility.

I do love that you think Russell’s Teapot is a “ridiculously childish false analogy”. But of course you can’t actually address my point. God is a physical object if it can interact with physical objects. Can it, Potato or is your bible lying again? One of the funniest claims I’ve seen by TrueChristians is that there is a soul but it somehow interacts with the brain like some kind of receiver set. Now, for it to interact with the brain, then it must have physical properties. I can say I have a god in my basement. You can’t prove me wrong, but I bet you don’t believe me. Read Carl Sagan’s “The Dragon in my garage” to see just how ridiculous you and your fellow TrueChristians seem: <http://www.godlessgeeks.com/LINKS/Dragon.htm>

And Nick's refuting of "googlism"? What is googlism? Ah let me guess, he's whining about how dare anyone find research that shows him wrong on the internet? I am asking for one argument, not every argument used by a Christian since the dawn of time. Try again. An argument is one singular point. For instance, a single argument in my writings is that there is no reason to believe in the Christian god because a book claimed to be perfect is rife with mistakes. If a perfect being wants its commands followed to the letter, what possible process allows error to creep in? But I am glad that you do admit that I've addressed at least some of Nick's nonsense.

Every TrueChristian claims that anything that they don't agree with is "heresy". You are heretic, Potato. So why should I care if you call someone else one? And it's fun to watch you complain when I show your personal "interpretation" aka "exegesis" is wrong or at best no more important or true than anyone else's. Again, I'm still waiting for you to compete with other TrueChristians in showing me that your god loves you best. Who am I to believe when you don't agree? I've asked this many times and you still can't give an answer. We have that Paul claimed that JC became the Lord after the resurrection. **"regarding his Son, who as to his earthly life was a descendant of David,⁴ and who through the Spirit of holiness was appointed the Son of God in power¹ by his resurrection from the dead: Jesus Christ our Lord."** Aka getting his power and position ***after*** his death. We have Paul also saying ("declaring"!) saying that JC was always God and didn't need to be declared the "lord" after all (Philippians 2). We have the author of Luke saying that JC was the "Word", which also seems to be god, but before the resurrection, indeed before time itself. We have "kenosis" where JC is divine, but became fully human, but then became divine again. And Christians disagree about that too: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kenosis> Who should I believe so I am not damned?

And again, claims of "contextual study" show you are "right". But as I have noted, every Christian claims this. Why are their contextual studies not as "right" as yours? And ah, the claim "not really", but no evidence against that my claim that any religion is the same as yours. Just a "not really". What masterful refutation, what wonderous rhetoric. Not really.

Oooh, you made me admit I was wrong. No, dear, I admitted I was wrong since I was wrong. My friends and I may have contradicted each other. Know what? We don't claim we're guided by the divine. We can be wrong and there is no shame in that. I have shown that Christians, though they claim divine guidance and interference, do not agree with what they claim is the magical "truth".

You went "into this yet", this being evidence for the magical Jesus, when you tried your hardest to claim that Tacitus, Suetonius, etc were evidence of a magical Jesus. One of the first posts under the relevant topic. I guess you are "no one", a old joke when Odysseus used it. Nope, not coming to TWeb and I have no request from Nick to do so at all. I've had lots of demands from you though. So maybe you indeed are Nick. Nick wrote a supposed refutation of a post of mine and never told me about it. I had to be told by others. Then Nick was on TWeb and again never told me, I only had the demands of others to tell me that he was so hot to trot. I went there to say he was welcome on my blog. And again, poor Nick didn't show again. Just his minion, Paste Pot Pete.

I do enjoy when a Christian lies that there is no evidence that I exist. If you had any investigative ability at all, you'd know who I am, much more than a blog full of writings. Your ignorance doesn't mean I don't exist. But the argument is amusing since you must claim that evidence doesn't show I exist since you cannot provide evidence that your magical Jesus did. Suddenly evidence becomes unimportant when you can't produce it. As I said, I know you exist, and I have evidence of it. I have an IP address that can tell me much about you, Potato. I have your writings. I know that you are likely on TWeb. Unfortunately, you aren't simply a figment of my imagination. Now, with these protestations that you have no evidence that I exist, we see the beginning of the end of the Christian apologist when we start heading into solipsism. The TrueChristian must declare that no thing can have evidence for its existence, so why that means that their god must exist since they have no evidence for it either! Paul was claimed to be magical (healing hankerchiefs and what not). Paul as described by the bible did not exist. As I have said, someone who thought he was an official apostle, he just met an invisible Jesus! Could have easily existed. A man who really did meet invisible Jesus? No.

My being open to the possible of a Jesus Christ has nothing to do with one poor little theist whose arguments I have already addressed. He's failed. You've failed. There could be someone else who does have evidence, something that I do very much deserve. I'm waiting.

Finally, geez, finally! We have one little whimper from you. "No, you see the assertions themselves are the evidence." I have asked you to show me where I have made "pointless assertions" and of course you have failed in being able to do that too. One more vague claim and nothing to back it up. Not one assertion I have made that has been shown to be "pointless". How sad. And how expected.

"So, we are still stuck with you lying that I am not open to the possibility of Jesus Christ even if I were presented with evidence. And now we have you claiming that the "only response you (I) deserve" is claims of evidence while presenting none by you, Nick and SS."