

On The Christian Hope.

Question #1:

My fear for the Universe and our existence.

Everybody has that thing which makes him afraid of the consequences of his religion or philosophy being wrong.

The Christian dreads the possibility that there will be no heaven and hell, after all the piety he strives to attain on earth, and after all the wickedness he has seen evil people display.

The Muslim dreads the possibility that there will be no virgins in heaven after all the supplications he has made in preparation for an afterlife of bliss. He is also afraid that his destiny may be no better than the other person he so derided as an “infidel”, and for which he made great sacrifices in the name of numerous fasts during the Ramadan season.

The Hindus and Sikhs dread the possibility that their main god protagonist Brahma, May turn out non-existent, and several religious practices carried out over several millennia were just a waste of time.

I have since reconciled myself to the possibility that if I die, that may be the very end, as in total lights out.

I have since reconciled myself to the possibility that I might never see departed loved ones again, at least not as they were constituted in this life.

I have since reconciled myself to the possibility that evil people may not get punishment in the life after, that men like Adolf Hitler and King Leopold may not be made to suffer for causing the deaths of millions.

But we all have our versions of what we suspect the universe may bring, and even though some (agnostics more than most) entertain many other alternative possibilities, we all have philosophies which we tend to lean to, philosophies and thought processes which men in the past would simply have written a book and forced it down the throat of others for generations.

My own fears;

1. Our universe may actually be an amoral one. Amoral being, that it is only we humans who can conceive the concept of good or bad.

There is the temptation to believe the higher the sentience, the greater the degree of moral code e.g animals eat each other, but humans do not.

But the fact that these “moral” humans are still subject to superior forces of the universe does not yet put us on top of the chain of existence.

Even that is going too far.

Within the human race, morals collapse under certain circumstances, even when relative advancement of civilisations should have suggested otherwise.

Our colonial masters had superior technologies and ways of life that suggested superior moral code.

I mean they came when some of us were still burying our chiefs with human heads, killing twins and offering human sacrifice.

Yet their “humane” intervention still came at its own price.

They still butchered Africans to further their own interests, which only looked more “humane” than our methods because they carried out theirs using more sophistication.

Before the colonialism was slavery.

Before slavery was the dark ages.

Each era ended not because of overwhelming guilty conscience, but because the era had either been supplanted by superior technology, or the relative enlightenment of the oppressed.

Even with advancement in technology today, we still see aggravated self interest of individuals, societies and nations when push comes to shove.

We only demonstrate as much morals as our access to resources allows us to.

Which begs the question;

In the absence of resources, perhaps we are just as amoral as the next person, only with a higher elastic limit.

Perhaps we are as amoral as animals.

Perhaps it’s always been survival of the fittest all along.

If that is the case, perhaps creating a concept of “good and bad” is just to allow predictable advancement of our race, the way we created and divided time into years, days, hours, minutes and seconds to compartmentalise ourselves into well intentioned and calibrated living.

If that is the case, perhaps all our lives here will not make much meaning in the larger picture, even if we still play a part after we have departed this world, the same way you struggled and killed yourselves over those maths equations in secondary school, and wonder what its use is today to you.

One thing is certain, considering the vastness of our universe, our experience as a human race is extremely limited, and I would not discountenance any possibility.

It's just that some possibilities are frightening.

Response #1a:

With regard to your fears, first...

1. If the universe was truly amoral, you would not even be able to appreciate that it is. You don't see any animals calling a conference to discuss animal rights and laws, do you? Why do we do it as humans? What makes us special? Why are we able to ponder morality and the nature of the universe? Because these things are already there and we are wired to be able to appreciate them.
2. If what has happened is that technology dictates the shape of morality, what dictates the shape of technology? Why did we make tools and why then do the tools we make shape our attitude to other people and to ourselves?
3. If we only demonstrate morality only as far as our resources can stretch, then how do you explain any morality that exists among those who have no wealth? For example, in the first century AD, Christians were largely poor (not completely unlike today either). Why were these poor people more disposed to being kind, generous even up to sacrificial levels? They should have been amoral, shouldn't they?
4. If we explain life by "survival of the fittest," why do humans tend to make laws to protect the weak and punish the strong?
5. How on Earth did any human being divide time? When did we start causing the sun to rise and set or the moon to run a full circuit over a fixed number of days or do the same to the sun? We never divided time. We just appreciated it, and like putting out buckets to catch the rain, we found a way to use or "harness" the passage of time. We never divided it.
6. As for meaning, have you ever read Ecclesiastes, a book in the Bible? It will blow you away. Suffice to say that you will never find meaning in life without God, try as you might. Feel free to argue how you might and let me see what you can come up with.
7. The experience of life in this unresurrected human body is truly limited, but it is also profound. Its profundity will never be appreciated by someone who refuses to face the truth about life, namely that God is and He is going to reward everyone according to all that they do.
8. As for possibilities, judging by the madness in the world, where it seems even possible for a man to become a woman and vice versa, the very notion of impossibility is lost on people, but if one thing is possible, its opposite is bound to be impossible. So, I am happy to tell you that you would be insane to not discountenance at least some "possibilities."

Question #2a:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) on point 5, over ten trillion suns and moons rise and fall and have perfect circles in the observable universe. Why all the waste for just one special humans on a tiny insignificance part of the universe

Response #2a:

I don't know about the exact numbers and perfect circles, but however many the stars and satellites out there and whatever the shapes of their orbits, each thing is intrinsically connected in order to make the planet Earth both habitable and enjoyable for the human race.

Why is this so? That's just how God is. He is pretty lavish in love, like a man smitten with a woman, or like a father with his children. He doesn't spare expense in showing His Love for the ones He loves.

If it seems weird to you, consider that much that goes into, say, a car is just for the purpose of having fuel burn to provide energy to move the tires and get you where you need to go. A novice might think that much that forms part of the vehicle is unnecessary, but the manufacturer knows that even if it doesn't appear to have anything to do with the occupants of the vehicle, it is still critical to getting them anywhere that they need to go. So, although there are so many planets, suns, moons, asteroids etc orbiting in all manner of patterns, and all of them forbidding to human "trespass," it would be hard to have the life we have on earth without them being as they exactly are.

Response #1b:

Interesting. Maybe some Christians have this dread, and it would be interesting to see why they do, but I don't, and none of my close Christian friends does either. And no one who actually reads the Bible and understands what it says actually fears anything like that there might be no heaven and no hell. This universe only began to make sense to me when I finally understood what the Bible was talking about, after all. So I think that you are reaching when you say that Christians dread that what they believe might not be true after all.

Question #2b:

There have been over 10,000 religions and sects since the existence of the modern human.

Christianity is one, and that is if we put all the denominations as one.

The probability of christianity checking out with the rest of the universe as being correct (assuming one religion is correct) is 1/10,000.

Already there are holes that have been pointed out, two of which are

1. As regards slavery
2. As regards subjugation of women.

I won't bring in the issue of the inquisition during the dark ages as you might argue that was human interpretation of the bible.

Even the said bible, was assembled by humans in furtherance of political interests.

Read up the council of Nicea and Hippo.

Response #2b:

...anyone can tell you that probability does not work like that. Probability is the language of imperfect knowledge, but even as such it is not the language of madness. That is to say that not everything is equally probable. I could say that the probability of your having been born male is exactly 0.5, because I don't have complete information about your birth, but common sense would make that completely stupid to think. The reason is that I have no reason at all to think that you have ever been anything other than a man your whole life. So, in fact, although I have imperfect knowledge about the issue, I can still say that there is no doubt about your maleness.

Of course, you could argue that I could be wrong if you were someone else who was born female and transitioned, but the point would be that I am not wrong about you, even though I don't have perfect knowledge about you. Likewise, the probability of Christianity checking out with the rest of the universe is not 1/10000, it is actually exactly 1. But you do have a free will, so that does not have to mean anything.

As for the Inquisition, there is no thinking human being who does not know that it is possible entirely for the untaught to pretend to be experts at any given thing in order to gain power and money. Charlatans and frauds are a dime a dozen in this world. Why is it that Christianity should be different? Does the Bible, which in itself is the definition of Christianity, teach any of the practices of the Inquisition? Have you read it? As far as I have seen, it is immediately glaring to anyone who reads the Bible that all the madness of the Middle Ages had far less to do with the Bible and far more to do with power-hungry, money-loving human beings who could take advantage of the ignorant and poor. It's happening again today in many churches around the world, isn't it? The only difference is that they haven't started burning people at stakes again yet or lopping off heads. I'm sure they'll get around to it in time. Hopefully, you'll know the Bible a lot better by the time that they do.

Question #3:

I think there are so many Christians who actually 'fear' there might be no heaven and hell more than you can ever imagine.

The fact is that many wouldn't share the thought among Christians, as that in itself defeats the key essence of the faith.

Response #3:

as I said, "maybe some Christians have this dread." In the Bible, after all, this generation is called the Laodicean generation. Its character is one of a near-total lack of interest in what the Bible teaches. The result of that is that far more Christians than not know almost nothing about the faith that they claim to have.

But, as I also said, no one who actually reads the Bible and understands it actually fears that what they believe may not be true. I am in my 30s, been reading the Bible all my life. Didn't understand much of what it said until after I had turned 30 and found an excellent Bible teacher. But when I started learning, for the first time, it seemed like life finally made sense. I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that the Bible is true. A dear friend has told me that that makes me sound fanatical, and it's alright if it seems that way to you or anyone else, but I'm not beating you over the head with a Bible, am I? So, if I'm fanatical, that's wholly my business, but it certainly means that I have no fears whether being a Christian is worth it. I know without a doubt that the Bible is completely true. It checks out with everything I've ever experienced, questioned, or wondered about. And it predicts accurately everything that I've kept running into in my life including Obinna's post here.

Question #4:

it's pure arrogance to think that some religions are not equally probable, and your own religion is not among them.

Response #4:

not my problem, if you think so. But if you want to persuade me that it is arrogant, I'll listen to why you think it is.

Question #5:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) If there are 10 thousand eggs in a bag with only one having the black colour, what is the probability of picking black if you were to chose randomly with your eyes closed? Assume that black represents Christianity and the others representing 9999 other religions. Would that not be 1/10000?

I may not know maths but I think you got your probability wrong.

Response #5:

allow me to encourage you to do a small study on probability. To get you started...

Math is a system that was developed to discuss observable truths of the physical universe. As such, the right use of it has always been to make reasonable assumptions and perform reasonable operations on those assumptions.

Probability is a technique used to communicate the imperfections of human knowledge. That is, probability does not address itself to truth. It addresses itself to our knowledge of truth. What we don't know, we make a guess about. What we do know, we don't.

If then, some things are known, then there is no use applying probability to them. For example, the probability that America has a president today is exactly 1, not 1/2, since we could say that America either has a president or does not have a president. She certainly has one, so the probability is 1.

Out of 10,000 religions and philosophies and ideologies, some are completely bunk, that is, they are obviously untrue, and others are mistaken on some known critical points. So, the probability of any of them being right is exactly 0, not 1/10000.

Christianity, on the other hand, is right all the time. So, the probability of its being right is exactly 1.

You could do a small search and see if I am right in how probability is used.

Question #6:

I need only 1,000 to be true to throw Christianity away.

In fact, I need only 50 to be true to throw Christianity away. The Null hypothesis will be rejected nonetheless

Response #6:

find 1000 then and get back to me.

Question #7:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) don't make a joke out of it. 😊😊😊 the joke is actually on the religionists.... I'm not the one making a claim of some gods. 😊

Response #7:

I wasn't. In fact, I'll make it easy for you: find 1 and get back to me.

Question #8:

[Odi](#)....I think you have mis-represented probability as a concept used in quantifying uncertainty.

you asserted “...not everything is equally probable...” This much I agree with you. You moved on to establish a parallel between obinna’s “maleness” (which is actually a probability of “1” as you accurately calculated) and the probability he assigned to Christianity checking out. The two things are different. While the former (Obinna’s maleness) is a certainty, the latter - in this case the Bible/Christianity - are not (e.g. the idea about the existence of God, the age of the universe and all whatnot).

Since my interest in this discourse is mainly on your use of probability, I assert that Obinna’s use of probability is correct and logically consistent. I say this because, if one lacks “complete information”, one way to start the analysis is to assign equal probabilities to all events in consideration. As time goes on, and as more information becomes available, the uncertainty around the predicted variable/event gets refined and minimized, at least in principle.

I will leave the analysis at this level before it gets too academic 😊.

PS: All I have said above is commonly referred to as Bayes theorem in probability theory and on a philosophical level lends itself as a way of reasoning.

Response #8:

since I was not there when Obinna was born and I have never met him and I don't know all the medical procedures he has been through or even much about his personal history, your argument compels me to assign a probability of less than 1 to his having been born male, and that is patently ridiculous. Not having complete information is not the issue. Not having ENOUGH information is. I know enough to be certain that Obinna was born male.

Likewise, I know enough to be certain that Christianity is perfectly true. So the probability there is 1 too.

Finally, as I have just explained, probability does not affect truth. Its concern is with the observer's knowledge of truth. If I ask what the probability is that a car is behind any one of three doors, my question is really, "how sure are you that a car is behind any one of three doors?"

As such, if I know precisely if the car is behind any of the doors and which door it is behind, then I can say that the probability that it is behind that door is exactly 1, and the probability that it is behind any of the other doors is 0.

Now, your claim is that the Bible is not certainly true, but that is the same to me as someone claiming that Obinna was certainly not born male. I would ask you why you imagine that to be the case. It is patently ridiculous to make that claim if you know what the Bible teaches. But you clearly don't believe that. My answer then is that you are free to believe whatever you want, just as anyone who wishes to argue that Obinna was born female when they cannot show that this is the case is free to believe whatever they want too.

In short, I know enough to be confident that the Bible is true, regardless how many competing claims there are. There is no issue of probability apparent here except to those unwilling to actually engage the question of "what is truth?" To such people, anything could be true and anything could be false. But, for example, it is wholly false that the universe is self-existing, so that is not an equally probable philosophy.

Question #9:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) but even the bible has accusations of being forged, pseudoepigraphy, anonymous writers etc

<https://www.goodreads.com> > show

Web results

On the Historicity of Jesus: Why We Might Have Reason for Doubt by ...

Response #9:

do accusations translate to convictions in your court? Does an accusation not need to be proved true in order for the accused to be guilty?

And, please, I have been engaging in apologetics for going on a decade, so if you want me to engage any argument against Christianity, you will need to make an original argument, not send me links to look at. Many of the things that are out there are things I have dealt with too many times to be bothered with anymore. It's boring. But your own reason for rejecting the Bible might interest me, since it should be unique to you as an individual.

Question #10:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) I have found one, and it's Islam 😊

Response #10:

Islam is true? What part of it is?

Question #11:

[Odi](#)...like many people have pointed out above, you are using the concept of probability in ways that ranges from amusing to mis-information.

It is actually okay for you or anyone to assign the probability of less than 1 to Obinna's maleness. I think this is called being skeptical. Nevertheless you should be open to more information (when they are available) as that will shape and refine your uncertainty. More information can be provided in the form of evidence that Obinna had no surgery, he has all the physical/genetic make-up of a male child, a photo of him naked as a child might be presented etc. What is expected is that all this information should adjust your probability to 1. That is the basis of my argument. It is not patently ridiculous as you said, but rather logically consistent.

Also, not having complete information is the issue because if we did have complete info, there won't be any need to quantify uncertainties. And yes, not having enough info is the issue, and that is why we have uncertainties, in part; however, incomplete information should not limit one from making educated guesses/predictions.

And yes I also know for certain that Obinna is male.

Now, you assert that you know for certain that Christianity is "perfectly true" and went ahead to assign a probability of 1. You know the weight of evidence required to settle this assertion. Everyone who reads your arguments know it is about your belief and not evidence. And hey, it is okay to hold this belief.

Again, if you have to use the concept of probability as a basis for an argument -especially in a rigorous manner - the odds are not in your favor because the idea of weighing evidence is implicit in the development and use of probability, and I guess you are not willing to weigh up these evidence.

Response #11:

I'm fine with what opinions anyone is pleased to have of me. So, if anyone thinks that I am misrepresenting what mathematical probability is about, they are free to feel however they want about it. I will only concern myself with the person when they show what is wrong with my discussion of it.

I assure you that it isn't skepticism, it is madness rather. More information can confirm things for us, yes, but more information really is to make us better able to use and deploy something that we already know. It does not make something more true, just more accessible to us.

What weight of evidence do you mean? Only one thing has to be false in the Bible as it was written in order for Christianity to be false. Can you find one thing? I'm fine with engaging any argument you have.

I'm sure that I would be repeating myself if I discussed the mathematical concept of probability again.

Question #12:

every part of it.

The reason why all religions are equally probable is because no one has witnessed the heaven and hell of these religions and all the supernatural claims of things that will happen when we die.

So we have to give all of them equal chances of truism or falsehood.

And that is why I binned all of them.

Response #12:

this is a contradiction. You just claimed that Islam is true, yet you binned it along with everything else. That only means to me that you couldn't care less if any religion or philosophy is true. If you couldn't care less, then you probably are not competent to judge truth claims at all.

Question #13:

it seems you will never get the point. I'm out of here 😊

Response #13:

So, let me see just how willing you are to go along with this.

Islam has Surah 9 (Surah At-Tawbah) opposed to Surah 16:125 and Surah 41:34. Why does this contradiction exist?

you're probably right. But as you and your cohorts have put it, there is an equal probability that you have not made a point yet that I should get.

Question #14:

[Odi](#)...it is your discussion of the concept of probability, and how you used it as a basis for an argument that interests me. It is why I have engaged you, and I guess it is why some people have done the same. We have taken the time to show you where your argumentation is logically inconsistent.

On the philosophical level, you are actually right, that is to say, probability is a quantification of belief or represents the degree of belief.

About finding one thing in the Bible that is false...keep in mind that what you request involves showing predictions made in the Bible that has been shown to be false, for example. Like we will go the full gamut, that is to say, even where evidence is not available, demonstrating logical inconsistencies will be sufficient. You know why I am not motivated to do this latter part with you? Because when I exercise that effort you will tell me I am analysing the Bible with carnal mind. Then what's the point.

You see why I focused on your use of probability?

Response #14:

regarding the issue of probability, I know the language math textbooks have lined it with, but math is also the language of philosophy (and I am just now pivoting into a career in physics, so I'm not a complete novice in the world of math). So, maybe reevaluate what I have said so far in that light. If what I have said is philosophically right, check again and see how it is logically inconsistent in math, if mathematics is the language of philosophy.

As for the challenge that I offered you, the difficulty that you will have is any lack of understanding in the fact that although generally speaking, most mainstream translations of the Bible are good enough for non-Bible-teachers, they are not 100% accurate. Their accuracy is 99%, but sometimes the inaccuracy can throw a reader off the scent of an important appreciation of Truth in the Bible. The other difficulty is that, as you put it, you are carnal, that is, you don't have the Spirit of God in you, since you are not a believer. But what that does to you is that you won't be able to see the sense in things that believers have no trouble understanding.

These difficulties don't bother me at all. If you pick anything, anything at all, in the Bible to prove that the Bible is not 100% reliable, I have no problem taking on the challenge to show you in words that you can read and understand and with appeals to common sense knowledge that you should be able to appreciate that you are wrong about it. And you only have to pick one thing.

Please believe me, I am no longer as active in apologetics as I once was. I find it a repetitive waste of time, so I'm not angling for a debate. I'm fine not having to prove anything to you. In fact, I take for granted that I cannot persuade you to believe if you don't want to, and while every believer is commanded to be compassionate and pray and work that everyone may be saved, we also have our own salvation to work out with fear and trembling and you have a free will, so I can't make it my direct responsibility to save you. So, if you want, we can have a decent, reasonable conversation and you can decide what you want to do with my arguments. That is fine by me. Or we may not too. And that too is fine by me.

Question #15:

[Odi Ariwodo](#). I absolutely share your thoughts and experience. At my age and career as a medical doctor and theologian, I am convinced that the Bible is true. One can ignore it at his or her peril

Response #15:

Agreed.

Question #16:

[Odi](#)...I have actually enjoyed our discussion. Really I have. I am not a novice either (here I am pivoting my training/career as a water engineer who earned a PhD in Statistical Hydrology). And I have looked into the philosophical underpinnings of probability (just like you since I sensed that from your argumentation).

Like you, I've also lost my interest in apologetics too which is why my central argument was focused on how you used probability.

Response #16:

I have too. It is rare enough to have courteous disagreement. Excellent qualifications there. I figured that you were comfortable with math from your arguments.

I think we just lost an amazing opportunity for a reasonable discourse around the Bible, but I am happy to have had the discussion that we did. If you ever wish to examine the Bible's claim to be Truth, I would be more than happy to serve you however I can.

Question #17:

Odi Ariwodo What do you mean when you say the Bible is true? The concept of Truth is very complex that one cannot comfortably ascribe it to the Bible.

Also, which part of Christianity is true: her practices or the original intentions of those who institutionalized it?

Response #17:

I'm not sure what is complex about the concept of Truth. Could you explain what you mean? As for what I meant, the Bible is reality. It doesn't matter what you experience, you will find a perfectly reasonable and logically consistent explanation for it in the Bible. Everything around you is comprehended to a degree beyond human ken by the Bible.

As to which part of Christianity is true, all of it is. I could start listing examples, but it would be a practically inexhaustible list, so it would be easier if you just pointed out anything that you think is false and see if I can't show you that it is in fact true (although I don't guarantee that you will accept my arguments).

As for anyone institutionalizing it, who would those be and how did they institutionalize Christianity?

Question #18:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) If you do not see the complexities that hover around the truth, then you don't have a thorough appreciation of the concept. The innate nature of Truth is epicentered on absolutism and universalism. Little wonder why the gospel writer highlighted on the question of Jesus to pilate; "What do you know to be the Truth? When you see Truth, can you be able to identify it?"

Truth is meant to be the same for a Muslim, Christian, Judaist, traditionalist etc....hence it's universality. But unfortunately, what we see to be the Truth today, varies along religious and ethnic lines....an aberration to the truth.

Coming to the Christianity being the truth as relates to her practices or institutioning, I'll employ one example. Christianity believes Jesus to be the God of creation. This notion is believed and was institutioned in Nicean council. Do you think it is the Truth?

Response #18:

I'm afraid I still don't see the complexity you speak of. That something is absolute and universal is not complex. That something is true no matter the subject observing it is not complex. That is just what it means that something is true. That is why I said that the Bible is reality. That is, what the Bible says is absolute and universal, that is, no matter who is listening or observing,

regardless what they believe or don't believe, what the Bible says is true in every frame of reference. That is what my claim that the Bible is truth means.

I'm not sure how the deity of Jesus Christ was instituted by Nicea. Believers believed for centuries before Nicea that Jesus was Himself God. In fact, that was the whole point of John's Gospel and his first epistle too. The very same teaching that the Messiah that would come was God Himself is also sprinkled all over the Old Testament. The Nicene Creed may have essentially made it an "official" doctrine, but this was something that Christians had believed for centuries before the First Council of Nicea in the 4th century.

Question #19:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) You are wrong. The pre-Nicea Christians never unianimously saw Jesus as God. The 'Homoieusus' clause was inserted in Nicea to give an official credence to the divinity of Jesus. But that is by the way.

Now, you made reference to the Bible and all it's accounts to be the Truth. You also asserted that there are endorsements in the Old testament on the divinity of the coming Messiah. Please can you be kind enough to point a part of the Old testament that said that the Messiah (who you think is Jesus) would be God?

I await your reply Sir.

It was in Nicea that the creed people recite today in churches was formulated and adopted. It was and is still called today, 'The Nicean creed'....i mean "I believe in God, the father almighty...."

[Odi Ariwodo](#) am still waiting for a pointer to where the Old testament suggested the coming Messiah would be God himself? I just want to establish an understanding that many parts of the bible contradicts and blackmail each other....hence debunking your assertion that the Bible is an embodiment of an absolute and universal Truth.

Response #19:

that is a big claim. Can you back it up? Nicea was certainly meant to create an official definition of Christian beliefs, but it was never needed, because the Canon of the Bible was completed by 70AD with the writing of Revelation. Wherever Christians gathered, there were copies of different books and letters both of the Old and New Testaments, so that it was clear what the Bible taught.

True enough, there were interlopers who pretended to be apostles or super-apostles who wrote their own letters and books and pretended to rival the authority of people like Paul and John (see, e.g., 2 Thessalonians 2:2; 2 John 1:10; and 3 John 1:9-10). So, the early believers after the Cross were certainly harassed with lies about Jesus's Deity right up to the fourth century. Arius,

for example, was one of those who made a huge deal out of it, eventually occasioning that united proclamation against the doctrine of Arianism in the First Council of Nicea. As I said before, there have always been charlatans and frauds in everything. Christianity is not excluded. In fact, the Old Testament prophets, Jesus Christ Himself, and the Apostles warned that there would be false prophets and false teachers who would try to deceive true believers about what the Truth really is (see, e.g. Deuteronomy 13:1-3; Matthew 24:4-5,11,23-24; Acts 20:29-30; 2 Peter 2; Jude 1). So, it is no surprise that people have always tried to deceive true believers about the Truth. But the Bible has been a safeguard right from the beginning, even when God only spoke through patriarchs like Enoch, Noah, and Abraham, before any of the Bible was even written down. These men were themselves the oracles that anyone who cared to know God could use to be sure that anything was true (e.g. Genesis 20:7). But, from Moses onward, God's oracles were written down, so that if anyone had any doubt what was true, they could go to them to make sure (e.g. Acts 17:11). These oracles that were written are how the true believers knew that Jesus was God Himself. Not only did they hear the apostles and the evangelists and teachers who taught them say so, but they could see from what had been written and preserved over millennia that they were indeed so. So, Nicea was not necessary for them to know it. And the Council of Nicea did not prevent people from continuing to believe and propound the lies that were apparently instituted against.

As for the parts of the Old Testament, the trouble is choosing what to point out and what to leave out. There are so many. One certain one that the Lord Jesus Himself used is Psalm 110:1 (cf. Matthew 22:42-46).

Question #20:

[Odi](#) and _____...while you are at it (really this engagement is illuminating) do you mind sharing the title of books that you think will give me a good picture of christian history. Thanks.

Response #20:

to be honest, I don't think there is one that would. If you want a passable description of church history, that is, a description of some of the major events as adjudged by this world in the Church visible, rather than a description of the true experiences of true believers of the Church Age, whose true stories are known only by God, you could try Williston Walker's A History of the Christian Church and Philip Schaff's volumes, The History of the Christian Church. You should be able to read the latter at ccel.org.

Question #21:

Odi Ariwodo If you research on the council of Nicea, you will see the undeniable necessity and imminence of convoking the council. Arius was not the only one, many bishops had divergent

or should i say contradictory beliefs from the 'Homoieusus'....the information is there in public domain.

Coming to the Psalm of David you employed as part of the OT which endorses your claim, we will discuss it here.

Psalms 110:1

"The LORD saith unto my lord: 'Sit thou at My right hand, until I make thine enemies" thy footstool.'

What exactly is in this extract of Psalm 110 that suggests that The Messiah would be/is God?

Response #21:

you did see "Arius, for example, was ONE OF THOSE..." in my comment, correct? And I made it clear that there have been interlopers among believers since Adam and Eve. It's nothing new at all.

You did see the passage from Matthew 22 that I recommended that you compare to that passage in Psalm 110, didn't you?

Question #22:

[Odi](#)...Thank you!

Response #22:

glad to help.

Question #23:

[Odi Ariwodo](#)

Mtt. 22:42-46

42 "What do you think about the Messiah? Whose son is he?"

"The son of David," they replied.

43 He said to them, "How is it then that David, speaking by the Spirit, calls him 'Lord'? For he says,

44 “The Lord said to my Lord:

“Sit at my right hand

until I put your enemies

under your feet.”

45 If then David calls him ‘Lord,’ how can he be his son?” 46 No one could say a word in reply, and from that day on no one dared to ask him any more questions.

Response #23:

Well?

Question #24:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) I pasted the Psalm here so it will be easy for us to analyze and process. Remember we are seeking for the Truth.

If you have a thorough examination of the texts i posted from Psalm 110:1 and the one i posted from Mtt. 22....you will observe a remarkable difference.

Remember the OT was written originally in Hebrew letters, while NT was originally written in Greek letters. What this means is that, any citation that NT made to OT supposed to be translated into Greek from Hebrew language.

Here, Mathew posited that Jesus while trying to ridicule the knowledge of the Pharisees on the OT, referred to the song of David. Pee adventure, the word 'Lord' supposed to be translated bearing in mind what the word, 'Lord' means in Hebrew worldview.

Having said that, Although the two English words in the KJV translation were deliberately made to appear virtually identical, in the original Hebrew text they are entirely different. Whereas the first word “LORD” in the Hebrew is a correct translation of יהוה, which is the Tetragrammaton (YHWH), the ineffable name of God....the second word “Lord” is a complete and deliberate mistranslation of the text. The second word “Lord” in the verse is an appalling translation of the Hebrew word לַאֲדֹנָי; (pronounced ladonee).

The correct and only translation of ladonee is “to my master” or “to my lord. (take cognizance that the L is written in small letter words)” The Hebrew word adonee never refers to God anywhere in the Bible. It is used only to address a person, never God. That is to say, God, the Creator of the universe, is never called adonee in the Hebrew Bible. There are many words reserved for God in the Bible; adonee, however, is not one of them.

Now let's explore deep into this context. Why would King David be writing these songs? For whom was he writing them? Who did King David intend to sing these songs? With these questions in mind, we can begin to understand the meaning of Psalm 110.

The central purpose of the composition of this sacred work for the Levites to sing them in the Temple. The Levites would stand on a platform and joyfully chant these spiritually exhilarating Psalms to an inspired audience. Accordingly, the Levites would sing thus:

"The LORD [God] said to my lord/master [King David] "Sit thou at my right hand..." (Psalm 110:1).

The reason why Mathew misrepresented the word 'lord' which is same as master, as 'Lord' is to insinuate that David was actually referring to Jesus (ascribing divinity to him or equality with God), but that is not true. David was actually referring to himself (as King) in the third person.

Like i said, Psalm 110 is a song of David, AND NOT a prophecy of any Jesus. It was a song composed for the Levites to sing in the temple. It is actually the enemies of David (enemies of Zion) that David meant would be brought under his footstool. It is a song of triumphance and not prophecy.

To illustrate this further, let's take a look at the other verses of the Psalm to make more understanding of the message intended to pass.

Verse 2 of the same Psalm says:

"The rod of Thy strength the LORD will send out of Zion: 'Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.'"

"The rod of thy strength the LORD will send out of Zion."....here, the LORD will send someone's rod out of Zion....whose rod? Not Jesus (he is not the King of Israel as of the moment) but King David.

This narrative of lie has been peddled by Christians for many years, but like i said, the Truth remains one and absolute.

Another place in OT that the Christian bible also claims it endorse the divinity of the Messiah is in the book of Isaiah chapter 7.....where Mathew claimed the prophet was referring to Jesus when he gave the prophecy of ' the birth of Immanuel'....but unfortunately, Mathew again lied in that claim, because Isaiah never had Jesus in mind or was ever referring to his birth.

These are outstanding facts to buttress the point that the Bible is not a paradigm of Truth.

Response #24:

that's a pretty convoluted explanation of Psalm 110.

Let's grant that the second "Lord" was referring to David. If it was, who was speaking in the Psalm? As you yourself have admitted, it was David himself who wrote the song, so either the person speaking was himself or else, as you have gone on to posit, the person was someone else. You claim that it was the Levites who were supposed to sing it and that it was David himself of whom they would be singing, but let us see the whole Psalm then:

1 The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. 2 The LORD shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. 3 Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning: thou hast the dew of thy youth. 4 The LORD hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. 5 The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. 6 He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill the places with the dead bodies; he shall wound the heads over many countries. 7 He shall drink of the brook in the way: therefore shall he lift up the head.

Psalms 110 (KJV)

Explain exactly how David is a priest of any sort. He was of the tribe of Judah, not of the Levites. He was never a priest throughout his life. He showed great respect for the priesthood and never overstepped his authority with them. He diligently consulted with the priests and prophets in his decisions as king. So, what exactly was this bit about being a priest forever in the order of Melchizedek doing in his Psalm, if it was about him?

In Zechariah 6:12-13, on the other hand, this is what we read,

12 And speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh the LORD of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is The BRANCH; and he shall grow up out of his place, and he shall build the temple of the LORD: 13 Even he shall build the temple of the LORD; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne: and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.

Zechariah 6:12-13 (KJV)

I can't imagine how the above is not glaring in its argument. Clearly, this is a prophecy about someone who would be both King and Priest, just like Psalm 110 was saying. In fact, it says "branch" here, an eerily similar term to "rod" (cf. Numbers 17:1-8) in Psalm 110:2, which you yourself quoted as well.

Regardless what language gymnastics you could make here, it couldn't be more obvious that David was not speaking of himself. In fact, he most certainly was speaking not only of his Greater Son the Messiah Who was yet to come, but also of His Death on the Cross (Ps 110:4,7) and of His Second Advent and all the Victories associated with it, including the Resurrection of His Bride the Church at the end of the Tribulation and His Millennial Rule over the Earth (vv.1-3,5-6).

Call it a lie, if you wish, but your error here is glaring.

Isaiah 7 was indeed speaking of a baby that was to be born at the same time that he was making the prophecy (that is, within several months of his prophecy), but it is a biblical phenomenon that prophecies applied to more than one thing sometimes. So, while, yes, he was prophesying about a baby that would soon be born in order to assure Judah of the perfect reliability of God's promise of deliverance from the enemies that were threatening them then, his prophecy also applied to the Lord Jesus. This is a common thing in the Bible.

About the language issue, my facility in the original languages is still quite poor, but I can tell you with certainty that you are right that the word "Lord," whether in Hebrew or in Greek means "master". In Hebrew, it translates to "adonai". In Greek, it is "kyrios". Both mean "master." The trouble is that in the Old Testament, the Lord's title given to Moses, that is, the so-called tetragrammaton, YHVH or YHWH, is translated Lord God or just capitalized as LORD and vocalized as "Adonai" wherever it appears. So, what David said was, "YHWH said to my master,..." This is fine. It is not a problem.

When Matthew wrote in Greek and when the Lord Jesus Himself told the story, they simply used the same word that ancient Greek used for "Lord" because they expected the hearers to understand who was meant by what.

The Messiah, after all, was both David's Superior and the Father's Servant. There was no confusion in the report. Even in the words that followed, it was clear that the Father spoke as to His Faithful Servant, not just as to Someone equal to Him. The Lord Jesus did become truly Human, after all, in addition to His Deity, so He was in the position of a Servant before His Father, even though in His Deity, He was equal to Him (see Philippians 2:5-11).

So, your arguments are all wrong.

Besides, those two parts of the Bible are far from the only places that made it clear that the Messiah that was coming was God Himself:

8 For thus says the LORD of hosts: "He sent Me after glory, to the nations which plunder you; for he who touches you touches the apple of His eye. 9 For surely I will shake My hand against them, and they shall become spoil for their servants. Then you will know that the LORD of hosts has sent Me. 10 "Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion! For behold, I am coming and I will dwell in your midst," says the LORD. 11 "Many nations shall be joined to the LORD in that day, and they shall become My people. And I will dwell in your midst. Then you will know that the LORD of hosts has sent Me to you.

Zechariah 2:8-11 (NKJV)

6 For unto us a Child is born, Unto us a Son is given; And the government will be upon His shoulder. And His name will be called Wonderful, Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. 7 Of the increase of His government and peace There will be no end, Upon the throne of David and over His kingdom, To order it and establish it with judgment and justice From that time forward, even forever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this.

Isaiah 9:6-7 (NKJV)

1 My heart is overflowing with a good theme; I recite my composition concerning the King; My tongue is the pen of a ready writer. 2 You are fairer than the sons of men; Grace is poured upon Your lips; Therefore God has blessed You forever. 3 Gird Your sword upon Your thigh, O Mighty One, With Your glory and Your majesty. 4 And in Your majesty ride prosperously because of truth, humility, and righteousness; And Your right hand shall teach You awesome things. 5 Your arrows are sharp in the heart of the King's enemies; The peoples fall under You. 6 Your throne, O God, is forever and ever; A scepter of righteousness is the scepter of Your kingdom. 7 You love righteousness and hate wickedness; Therefore God, Your God, has anointed You With the oil of gladness more than Your companions. 8 All Your garments are scented with myrrh and aloes and cassia, Out of the ivory palaces, by which they have made You glad. 9 Kings' daughters are among Your honorable women; At Your right hand stands the queen in gold from Ophir. 10 Listen, O daughter, Consider and incline your ear; Forget your own people also, and your father's house; 11 So the King will greatly desire your beauty; Because He is your Lord, worship Him. 12 And the daughter of Tyre will come with a gift; The rich among the people will seek your favor. 13 The royal daughter is all glorious within the palace; Her clothing is woven with gold. 14 She shall be brought to the King in robes of many colors; The virgins, her companions who follow her, shall be brought to You. 15 With gladness and rejoicing they shall be brought; They shall enter the King's palace. 16 Instead of Your fathers shall be Your sons, Whom You shall make princes in all the earth. 17 I will make Your name to be remembered in all generations; Therefore the people shall praise You forever and ever.

Psalms 45 (NKJV)

These are an infinitesimal sampling of all the evidence in the Old Testament.

Question #25:

Odi Ariwodo I do not want to say you have an erroneous understanding of the Hebrew bible, but stating it correctly, you do.

If Jesus is from the tribe of Judah, lineage of David as the NT posited, why then do you refer him as the 'Priest' in the order of Melchizedek? Is Jesus just as David from the tribe of Levi? That tells you all you need to know.

The Hebrew bible recorded in Psalm 110:

Psalms 110:1

"A Psalm of David. The LORD saith unto my lord: 'Sit thou at My right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.'"

This above 👉 verse, is culled from the Tanakh bible, a version that succinctly translated the original Hebrew bible into English, devoid of mistranslations and misrepresentations. Here the former and later lords were written thus; 'LORD and lord'where the former speaks of "THE ALMIGHTY the later speaks of a Man (David)."

But when Jesus was citing the same verse in Mathew, Greek authors wrote them as; "Lord and Lord".....which was a malicious attempt to misrepresent the words and intentions of the psalmist.

Kyrios = Lord. Why then did Mathew use the word, instead of the one that translates as lord? That's the critical question amidst. If the psalmist was referring to a divine person, he wouldn't have used the word 'ladonee'....rather would have used 'Adonai'

Coming to your claims of Isaiah 7 speaking about a child to be born within the time of the prophecy, AND also applied to the Lord Jesus....and your claim this is common thing in the Bible, i find it rather disturbing, how you saw two pronged prophecy in Isaiah 7.

The birth of Immanuel was a sign pointing to the actual prophecy. The prophecy was that King Ahaz of Judah will not be defeated in the imminent battle that was coming.

According to the prophet in Isaiah 7:14:

"Therefore the Lord Himself shall give you a sign: behold, the young woman shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel."

Take cognizance of the words used in the prophecy:

1. The young woman....'The' is a definite article suggesting that the particular woman being talked about is already known and existing as of the time of the prophecy....else, the word that supposed to be used should have been 'That young woman'

This fact above automatically puts Mary out of the equation.

Also, the word young woman in Hebrew translation is 'Almah' (a woman of child bearing age). There is no link between Almah and Betulah....Betulah is actually the Hebrew word for virgin.

But fortunately, what Isaiah said was, 'Ha'almah' which translates to, 'The young woman (Ha is translation of the definite article 'The')

So my question is why did same Mathew in citing the prophet, used the word 'Virgin' instead of young woman. Do that not bother you?

Finally, If you have a thorough knowledge of Isaiah 7, you will understand that the two warring kingdoms against Judah were Samaria (Northern israel) and Syria. Like i highlighted earlier, the prophecy was that King Ahaz of Judah will be victorious in this impending war to come. When Ahaz doubted this prophecy of Isaiah, he was given a SIGN (Immanuel) which was meant to validate the prophecy.

The prophet gave a specific duration for the actualization of his prophecy in Isaiah 7:16:

"Yea, before the child shall know to refuse the evil, and choose the good, the land whose two kings thou hast a horror of shall be forsaken."

This above verse 🙌 here is the stopper of every false narrative. In simpler terms, Isaiah was telling Ahaz that before Immanuel will reach age of maturity, the prophecy must have been fulfilled.

Now, do you know that Jesus was born almost 1000 years after this prophecy, AND before his birth, the two Kingdoms have already been defeated. Samaria and Damascus were defeated in the Assyrian raid. It was during and after this raid that the 10 Northern tribes of Israel (Samaria) were sent into exile TILL TODAY. This you can read up in the book of Kings.

Technically, there was nothing like Samaria nor Syria at Jesus birth. So how on this earth was him (Jesus) the fulfilment of the prophecy???

This literally mean that according to Mathew, the prophecy was fulfilled before the sign. And i ask, was that the prophecy in Isaiah 7...?

Both the use of the word, "Virgin" and the reference on Isaiah's prophecy were all malicious attempts to give Jesus a divine essence, and also make the Jews to actually believe an important prophet like Isaiah prophesied about Jesus.

It's all lies and you bought into it hook, line and sinker....just like every other Christians did.

Response #25:

I think you failed to appreciate my argument about the priesthood.

1. Psalm 110 was most certainly not about David since he was never a priest, neither after the order of Aaron nor after the order of Melchizedek nor after any order at all.
2. Psalm 110 was most certainly about the Messiah since he was going to be a priest AFTER THE ORDER OF MELCHIZEDEK, not after the order of Aaron.
3. Zechariah clarified the prophecy in Psalm 110 with his own prophecy that the Messiah would be both priest and king, perfectly combining both offices into one.
4. I will add to that Hebrews 5:5-11 even though I know your position is against the New Testament.

As for the Tanakh, that term is just what the Jews use to mean the Old Testament. It's not a version of the Hebrew Bible, it is the Hebrew Bible. As for the Masoretic Text (that I suppose you were referring to) being devoid of mistranslations and misrepresentations, that is yet another big claim you are making. Can you defend it? Some readings, although very few indeed, from the MT are inferior to some other Old Testament traditions.

As for your continued agitation about the two uses of Lord in Psalm 110, I have already explained that in the Greek, there was no way to accommodate the Hebrew any better than the writer did under inspiration. It is a translation convention to capitalize the words used for YHWH in the Old Testament, but even the vocalization when reading was "Adonai" which is still

Lord. So, there was clear understanding that Matthew and the Lord Jesus were saying exactly what Psalm 110 was saying, namely, that YHWH spoke the statement that followed to David's Lord or master. That was the Lord Jesus's point, after all: that the Messiah was greater than David. How could He be if He was David's descendant? The only way that that could be explained is that the Messiah was more than just another man. That was precisely why the Pharisees shut up and stopped testing Jesus Christ.

Regarding Isaiah 7, Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 are two examples of other prophecies that had more than one fulfillment. In Isaiah 14, the immediate application of the prophecy was to the king of Babylon who ruled at the time of the prophecy, another application is to the Antichrist who will be the ruler of Eschatological Babylon, and the last application is to Satan himself. This is commonly known in theological circles. Likewise, in Ezekiel 28, the application was immediately to the rulers of Tyre (the king and his underling) and later to the Antichrist and to Satan again. There are many such uses in prophecy.

As for your arguments about "virgin," the Masoretic Text is the best preservation of the Original Text of the Old Testament, but it isn't perfect. While I wouldn't claim that they used the wrong word for virgin there, it certainly was the sort of thing that Jews who were still opposing the Messiahship of Jesus Christ in the 6th century would do. In fact, however, it makes no difference that they used the word that they used in Isaiah 7. The word there was just "young woman." The idea was that she was not yet married and certainly was in no position to be having a child at the time of Isaiah's prophecy. So the connotation accommodates itself to the idea of "virgin." That is exactly why Matthew used "virgin" under inspiration.

Again, just like in English where we have both "maiden" and "virgin," as you said, Hebrew had a word for virgin and yet another one that denoted a state that was supposed to be the same. A maiden is supposed to be a virgin since she is unmarried. That is why the word was often used as a synonym of virgin. But technically, it only refers to a young, unmarried woman. Likewise, *almah* pointed to the unmarried status of the woman in question and therefore to an assumed state of virginity. This is just common sense. In other words, using *almah* there does nothing to Matthew's later use of virgin in its place.

Question #26:

"..most religions are pure bunkum, while Christianity is right all the time..".

That alone settles it for me.. The bias for one bunkum over another..

Response #26:

everyone prefers one "bunk" to other "bunk" or did you think that "atheism" is not a philosophy too?

Question #27:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) now you're towing the regular disingenuous line..only you substituted "philosophy" for "religion"... Not so smart, but continue..

Response #27:

LOL. I personally hold that atheism is a religion. The difference is that instead of a personal God, atheists worship the material universe and its prophet, pseudoscience, but I don't care really. Whether you call it a religion or not, everything that claims to explain life in some absolute way is a philosophy.

You can also claim that atheism does not offer any explanations as all the atheists I ever debated like to disingenuously do, but once you do, I'll pull out a page and start writing down all the truth claims you make as you argue against other religions and philosophies.

That's why I'm no longer interested in debating these things. There is no getting through to anyone whose dishonesty is so complete that they've got even their own selves fooled. But that is how atheists see everyone else and how each proponent of each religion or philosophy sees everyone else. So, I can't complain. I'm satisfied that each person is responsible for their own choices. So I do my bit to help anyone willing to appreciate what I believe. If they like, they can believe too. If they don't, they don't have to. But I'm not going to be bamboozled or bullied into admitting lies. Atheism is more of a crackpot philosophy/religion than you will find anywhere else, other religions/philosophies have at least one wrong tenet, and Christianity does not. You can challenge my claim. Or you can sue me.

Question #28:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) I can see you actually had to redefine atheism to your own terms in order to be able to fuel your argument.. it's another attribute of pre-conditioning...

Response #28:

LOL. And you believe that I can't turn that claim right around at you?

Boss, I don't care about what you believe. I just made a point, is all. You enjoy your atheism and accept it with all the risks etc. So be it. I wish you didn't. I wish everyone was a Christian. But neither the first nor the second is my call to make.

So, it should be sufficient for you to know that I'm fine with your opinions about me and my faith and you should not care what I think about you and yours. My thoughts are mine, after all, and they are not costing you anything.

Question #29:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) If they didn't cost me anything...I wouldn't even bother to dissuade you from marinating in your own delusions... but we all know what religious beliefs cost the average Nigeria taxpayer...

Response #29:

go on. What do I cost you for my beliefs? When we're done discussing the cost of my belief, we'll discuss what your own atheism costs me.

Question #30:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) for one thing...the monumental wastage on pilgrimages... But you know this already... However, I'd really love to know how much atheism cost you...

Response #30:

incredible. So I go on pilgrimages? Me? Was I hypnotized or in a coma when I did? Or are you going to make me responsible for somebody else's pilgrimage? Assuming, of course, that any pilgrimage is not paid out of pocket by the pilgrim. And what part of the Bible teaches either that I should pay visits to some holy site or that any government is responsible to pay my way there?

See what I mean? Weird things that keep coming up once this "debate" starts. My faith in Jesus Christ is costing you money because of the pilgrimages, yet I have never been on one and I know of no personal or government responsibility to pay my way to a holy site as a Christian. Just why do you people think like this?

Really? Do I owe you an answer at this point when what you've just tossed up is "pilgrimage"? Do you want an equally ridiculous answer, sir?

Question #31:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) Was it going to be anything BUT ridiculous anyway?? Yes, please give me something equally "ridiculous"... Let's hear it..

Response #31:

okay great. At least we both know that we are trading in absurdities.

Your atheism threatens the lives of believers. Just look at how atheistic governments slaughtered religious peoples in various countries in the world in the 20th century.

I cost you money. You cost me my life. Is that a fair trade to you?

Question #32:

[Odi Ariwodo](#) To think I actually thought you were being serious... How many people actually lost their lives during the Christian inquisition...or due to religious leaders promptings or prosecution...even as recent as this year...compared to your so called "atheistic" governments (which weren't actually atheistic since the state was the religion)?? I believe even you can find a better argument...

Response #32:

I was. It is absurd to do what we are doing, but I was certainly being serious. I'm wondering right now if you are. You are comparing the Inquisition and the totalitarian rule of the popes of the Dark Ages to the pogroms of the 19th and 20th centuries?

Second, what on Earth are you calling the Christian Inquisition? Good heavens! How many Christians were killed in that Inquisition and in other executions throughout the reigns of the popes?! And yet you call it a "Christian Inquisition?" Why do you atheists not actually investigate the things you talk about?

LOL @ "the state was the religion"!!! Did I not say that the God of atheism is the material universe and his prophet is pseudoscience. Are you denying your own religion? Even Obinna has owned on another thread that it is better in his view as an atheist to have homogenous communities where dissidents are unsafe as long as the state prospers. How is this not the natural end of atheism? Atheism is by nature intolerant of any other ideology. So, don't pretend that the bloody crackdown on religious people was not done by atheistic governments. They were. Chest it, oga.

What are you talking about "as recent as this year"?

Question #33:

u made my day Odi Ariwodo

Response #33:

happy to be of help in the Truth to anyone.