

Area/Question  (from the Objections index)		Where did the idea come from?				
		Never thought or heard of this at all.	Just Bubbled up in my own head	Personally <u>heard</u> someone state this position, but <u>without giving any real evidence</u> to support it (e.g. anecdotes, memes, slurs, or slogans only)	Personally <u>heard</u> someone argue for this position, and advancing <u>some</u> actual evidence or logic to support it (e.g. recorded presentation, teacher lecture).	Read something taking this position, but <u>without</u> giving any/much credible evidence for it (e.g. social media, 'light blogs', Internet 'lists', normal emails)
	<b>The God of the Bible is not worthy of my respect:</b>					
1	The God who created 'red in tooth and claw' nature is cruel.					
2	God commanded and supported genocide against the Amorites/Canaanites, and even endorsed the anti-Semitic writings in the New Testament--especially of the apostle John, and the apostle Paul in 1st Thess 2					
3	God is hypocritical in His orders (e.g. child-sacrifice), and in His ethics about honesty.					
4	The God who created all things must therefore have created evil, and He actually states that explicitly. This means that He must be evil itself.					
5	God is apparently insensitive to all the suffering in the world, even all the natural evil we experience -- some of which is horrific, like hot viruses.					
6	God is either malevolent, impotent, or just hypocritical--He expects us to intervene in crime situations but He doesn't!					
7	God must be cruel or insane to set us up for failure from the beginning.					
8	God forces people to disobey Him, so He can punish them--both His friends, like King David, and His enemies like Pharaoh.					
9	God unfairly condemns people who haven't even heard of Him.					
10	And He even unfairly places people in specific cultures which will determine that they have a low chance of becoming a Christian.					
11	God condones slavery, and devalues women.					
12	God must not be all that loving, because He executes justice when He could just as easily forgive sins.					
13	Plus, He punishes people eternally for non-eternal sins.					
14	And then His 'solution' to it (punishing an innocent Jesus instead of us guilty parties) is both immoral and illegal!					
15	God is even called "jealous", "vengeful", and "wrathful" by Himself (and by others) in the bible!					

Area/Question  (from the Objections index)		Where did the idea come from?					
		Never thought or heard of this at all.	Just Bubbled up in my own head	Personally <u>heard</u> someone state this position, but <u>without giving any real evidence</u> to support it (e.g. anecdotes, memes, slurs, or slogans only)	Personally <u>heard</u> someone argue for this position, and advancing <u>some actual evidence or logic to support it</u> (e.g. recorded presentation, teacher lecture).	Read something taking this position, but <u>without</u> giving any/much credible evidence for it (e.g. social media, 'light blogs', Internet 'lists', normal emails)	Read something taking this position, attempting to support the position with <u>some credible/adequate evidence</u> for it (e.g. academic papers/publications, 'heavier' editorials, Subject-Matter-Experts websites)
16	His servants (like Elisha) are cruel and easily provoked to violence even against children. His servants do His bidding, even to Saul's butchering innocent Amalekite women and children, Moses' butchering of Midianite women and boys, and -- of course -- the nationwide execution of firstborn offspring at the Exodus.						
17	God is obviously a self-centered and insecure glory-hog, since He created an entire universe just to sit around and worship Him.						
18	God knew -- with perfect knowledge -- that all this suffering and hell would befall us, but He was heartless/sadistic enough to go ahead with creation and history ANYWAY.						
19	And He then offers me the "free choice" of "love me, or be tortured in hell for ever ..						
20	Or so I THOUGHT it was a choice--but instead He predestined me to choose hell ANYWAY... according to St. Paul in Romans 9?!						
21	And, this predestination was totally arbitrary, as if decided by a random set of dice or a lottery BEFORE I WAS EVEN BORN or CONCEIVED... and with nothing about my character or actions having ANY bearing on it...						
22	Besides, God just created us just to meet His own, personal EGO needs--He obviously is not 'healthy' enough without us!						
23	Actually, it might even be that He needs us to feed him in some way(?), since He gets hungry!						
24	And, if the biblical story is true, and if that 'god' exists, then the Old Testament god YHWH is probably SATAN himself!						
	<b>Actually, the very concepts of "god" and "souls" are useless:</b>						
25	Humanity probably invented the concept.						
26	Science has shown us that humans don't have "souls" anyway.						
27	The concept of God is riddled with incoherence anyway.						
28	Even if He/she/it/they DID exist, our finite language is inadequate to talk about God.						

Area/Question  (from the Objections index)		Where did the idea come from?					
		Never thought or heard of this at all.	Just Bubbled up in my own head	Personally <u>heard</u> someone state this position, but <u>without giving any real evidence</u> to support it (e.g. anecdotes, memes, slurs, or slogans only)	Personally <u>heard</u> someone argue for this position, and advancing <u>some actual evidence or logic to support it</u> (e.g. recorded presentation, teacher lecture).	Read something taking this position, but <u>without</u> giving any/much credible evidence for it (e.g. social media, 'light blogs', Internet 'lists', normal emails)	Read something taking this position, attempting to support the position with <u>some credible/adequate evidence</u> for it (e.g. academic papers/publications, 'heavier' editorials, Subject-Matter-Experts websites)
29	And God (if he/she/it/they did exist) is so far beyond our knowledge, we could never know God in a personal way.						
	<b>The OT/Tanach that tells us about the God is not trustworthy</b>						
30	It makes false claims: it claims to be written by Moses, but it wasn't, and Daniel 'pretends' that its telling the future!						
31	It is filled with historical errors, like human longevity before the Flood of Noah, or Abraham having camels before they were domesticated.						
32	Archaeology has disproved the biblical story, especially about Joshua's Conquest narratives.						
33	It is filled with contradictions, like God's approval-disapproval of Jehu's actions, or Terah being 70 or 130 years old when Abraham was born.						
34	There is no extra-biblical data to support its wild claims--like the parting of the sea by Moses, the stopping of the sun by Joshua, the reversal of the sun's course by Isaiah, the miraculous feeding of the 5,000-plus people by Jesus, or the post-crucifixion resurrections in Jerusalem.						
35	And the extra-biblical data that does exist shows that it is merely a rip-off of earlier ANE literature!						
36	It was corrupted in transmission to us.						
37	And, what is even WORSE, the god "YHWH" in it, claiming to be the source of the OT was actually SATAN, presenting himself as Israel's God YHWH!						
	<b>I have no affirmative reason to believe such a God exists</b>						
38	God should give us concrete proof--but He doesn't, and the Christian interpretation of the "evidence" has no compelling support for it.						
39	We don't have any evidence of God's existence.						
40	We don't have any reasons to believe in spirits or a 'supernatural dimension' anyway. [Rewrite planned]						
41	Christianity cannot be true, since it needs so much defending? And God doesn't make it very clear or obvious to everyone?						

Area/Question  (from the Objections index)		Where did the idea come from?					
		Never thought or heard of this at all.	Just Bubbled up in my own head	Personally <u>heard</u> someone state this position, but <u>without giving any real evidence</u> to support it (e.g. anecdotes, memes, slurs, or slogans only)	Personally <u>heard</u> someone argue for this position, and advancing <u>some actual evidence or logic to support it</u> (e.g. recorded presentation, teacher lecture).	Read something taking this position, but <u>without</u> giving any/much credible evidence for it (e.g. social media, 'light blogs', Internet 'lists', normal emails)	Read something taking this position, attempting to support the position with <u>some credible/adequate evidence</u> for it (e.g. academic papers/publications, 'heavier' editorials, Subject-Matter-Experts websites)
42	The complexity in the universe doesn't need a 'God' to explain it--complexity arises from simplicity all the time...						
43	The supernatural elements in the gospels are not 'evidence' (LOL), since the ancient world was teeming with fraudulent claims, aimed for the credulous masses.						
	<b>Jesus didn't actually exist himself:</b>						
44	There are no extra-biblical records of Jesus.						
45	He was probably just an amalgam of other savior myths.						
46	He (and the bible itself) was probably concocted for power reasons, to control the populace.						
	<b>The Jesus of the New Testament is not worthy of my respect (much less, worship or trust):</b>						
47	He was a hate-monger, and even anti-family.						
48	He was dishonest--telling lies and deceiving people often -- and was even sacrilegious in using the flesh-eating and blood-drinking imagery.						
49	He used mean and insulting language to his opponents, his audiences, and even his students -- but why even to humble supplicants like the Canaanite woman?						
50	He prayed to the pagan god EL on the Cross (and not YHWH?)						
51	He was mistaken about His return., and the Church had to re-spin Him into something else!						
52	Even His death contradicted the Law of God about human sacrifice.						
53	And He even tried to do away with (annul) the eternal, unchangeable Mosaic law!						
	<b>The New Testament that tells us about this Jesus is not trustworthy:</b>						
54	The whole story about "Jesus the Messiah" cannot be true, because the Jews were not expecting a Messiah at all.						
55	Instead, the early Christians twisted the OT into saying something it didn't, (even the Psalm 22 thing!) and they 'read Jesus back into' the OT.						

Area/Question  (from the Objections index)		Where did the idea come from?					
		Never thought or heard of this at all.	Just Bubbled up in my own head	Personally <u>heard</u> someone state this position, but <u>without giving any real evidence</u> to support it (e.g. anecdotes, memes, slurs, or slogans only)	Personally <u>heard</u> someone argue for this position, and advancing <u>some actual evidence or logic to support it</u> (e.g. recorded presentation, teacher lecture).	Read something taking this position, but <u>without</u> giving any/much credible evidence for it (e.g. social media, 'light blogs', Internet 'lists', normal emails)	Read something taking this position, attempting to support the position with <u>some credible/adequate evidence</u> for it (e.g. academic papers/publications, 'heavier' editorials, Subject-Matter-Experts websites)
56	But even then, Jesus didn't fulfill those messianic prophecies, he was a failure as a messiah to His people, and he didn't even fulfill the prophecies he was supposed to (so we would KNOW he was the messiah).						
57	The NT itself was probably a hoax, written by people biased to the point of untruthfulness, perhaps victims of a group hallucination						
58	These NT authors somehow felt it was okay to invent places like Nazareth, and invent events like the raising of Lazarus from the dead, inflate numbers like Matthew did, make up speeches/settings for Jesus to make Jesus look like 'Moses on the Mountain', or plagiarizing ancient Essene prayers						
59	They probably just ripped-off stories from the Hebrew bible and ascribed them to Jesus, and even borrowed freely from pagan religions!						
60	With all the problems associated with memory and memory recall, it is no wonder that, after the long, slow, hodge-podge collection, by warring factions within the early church, of oral traditions about Jesus, we find the NT accounts filled with contradictions about major events, including: The Resurrection; Infancy events; and the Ascension.						
61	And not just contradictions on the MAJOR events, but countless other small details as well: Two people or One?; On the third day or AFTER 3 days?; Take a staff or not?						
62	Even the best historian in the NT (Luke) makes major, glaring historical errors -- like the stories of Theudas, and of Quirinius' census. So, why should I trust the other writers, like the peasant John [qjohngkr.html] who was anti-Semitic, or Paul who completely mutates Jesus' religion into something totally different!						
63	The evangelists/disciples even invented the miracles stories of Jesus, to "sell Him" to others, didn't they?						

Area/Question  (from the Objections index)		Where did the idea come from?					
		Never thought or heard of this at all.	Just Bubbled up in my own head	Personally <u>heard</u> someone state this position, but <u>without giving any real evidence</u> to support it (e.g. anecdotes, memes, slurs, or slogans only)	Personally <u>heard</u> someone argue for this position, and advancing <u>some actual evidence or logic to support it</u> (e.g. recorded presentation, teacher lecture).	Read something taking this position, but <u>without</u> giving any/much credible evidence for it (e.g. social media, 'light blogs', Internet 'lists', normal emails)	Read something taking this position, attempting to support the position with <u>some credible/adequate evidence</u> for it (e.g. academic papers/publications, 'heavier' editorials, Subject-Matter-Experts websites)
64	This whole myth construction was done so rapidly, and gained power so quickly, that those that knew the truth did not have time to speak up in time (1)(2), and the Christians somehow simply outlived those that knew the truth.						
65	Thanks to the old Jesus Seminar and the earliest gospel (the Gospel of Thomas), we know that the message of Jesus was 'embellished' by the early Christian communities, and the 'official version' of the NT we have today (and the doctrines of the Church) were not the original ones of the true original Christians--the Nazarenes and Ebionites.						
66	The early church was so fragmented that they could not tell between 'authentic' books and 'inauthentic' books, and the process they used for deciding on what were 'official books' was corrupt and politically motivated (1), (2), (3).						
67	And, by the time we get to Rome making Christianity the "state religion", it totally distorted the NT documents for political purposes, increasing the number of textual errors (further undermining our confidence in the NT).						
68	And we even have reason to believe that the earliest church suppressed the truth and deceived people for reasons of power.						
	<b>And even if it were all true:</b>						
69	How could I decide between all the competing world religions, all claiming to be true?						
70	How would I know whether I had the right kind of faith or not?						
71	How would I know how to deal with "faith vs. knowledge" issues?						















