

Christianity

What It Is

How to Fight It

How to Destroy It

A Blueprint for Wiping Christianity off the Face of the Earth

by the Antichrist

Introduction

Christianity is an insidious evil that is eating away at our society. All good and reasonable people should stand together to destroy it. Here's how.

Methodology

Before we can decide on the best plan to destroy Christianity, we must be clear on exactly what is wrong with Christianity, what harm it poses to us, how it accomplishes that, and what leads people to believe in Christianity in the first place. Only then will we be able to devise a plan to destroy it.

What is wrong with Christianity?

The danger of Christianity is that it weakens people. It teaches people to love their enemies and to turn the other cheek. Christianity does not help us survive; rather, it soothes people who are unfit for survival.

How does it accomplish that?

In discussing how Christianity accomplishes that, one must make a clear distinction between Catholicism and Protestantism. While the results are the same, they each accomplish those results by quite different methods, and, of the two, Protestantism is much more harmful than Catholicism, as I shall soon demonstrate.

Catholic and Protestant Christianity

When I was a child, and when we were traveling on vacation, if it was Sunday, my father would drive around looking for a church to go to, and my mother would always say, "Make sure that it is a Catholic church." So I learned that there were two types of churches, Catholic and Other, but I had no idea what the difference was between the two of them. Everyone in the elementary school that I went to was Catholic. It wasn't until I was in junior high school that I met my first Other. One day at lunch, he told us that he was Protestant. *Oh, that is what the others are called*, I thought to myself, *they are called Protestants*. He then proceeded to make fun of the Catholics because, during the mass, the altar boy rings the bell to wake up anyone who had fallen asleep. So that was the difference between a Catholic church and a Protestant church. In a Catholic church, the alter boy rings a bell!

By the time I had finished high school I decided that Christianity was all nonsense. I would sometimes debate Christians on their beliefs, and it was then that I discovered the main differences between Catholicism and Protestantism. One argument I would make was that, if two men rob a bank, one is shot dead by the police, and the other is not and subsequently confesses his sin and does penance, then the first one will go to hell, while the second one will go to heaven. That was inherently unfair. If I made that argument to a Protestant, I would be firmly told, "That's not Christianity; that's Catholicism!" I would then be told that, so long as

one believed in Jesus, one would go to heaven. Bank robberies and confessions didn't make any difference, only belief. That opened up my eyes to the fundamental split between Catholics and Protestants.

The fundamental difference between Catholics and Protestants is that Catholics believe that, in order to gain eternal life in heaven, one must not only believe but also do good works, while Protestants believe that it is only necessary to believe. The question then arises as to what, and how much, does one actually have to believe. Is it sufficient simply to believe that Jesus Christ is one's savior, or must one also believe in the teachings of Jesus Christ? If one were to, say, believe that Jesus Christ is his savior but not believe in any of his teachings, would he attain eternal life?

Why do people believe in Christianity?

The most basic reason that people believe in Christianity is they were taught it as a child, were surrounded by other people who believe, and never thought to question it. But there are many people who have examined the issue as adults and still believe in it. I have discussed this with Christians and have gotten various answers, mostly thin rationalizations that cannot withstand any serious scrutiny, but there appears to be one primary underlying reason for people's continuing belief in Christianity after having examined the issue in adulthood.

The Wager Argument

The Wager Argument, first advanced by Blaise Pascal, goes as follows: We don't know whether or not God exists, so we must decide either to believe or not to believe. If we believe, and it turns out that God does not exist, then we have lost little, but if we don't believe, and it turns out that God does exist, then we have lost eternal life, so the rational thing to do is to wager that God exists. There are several problems with this approach, the most obvious being that wagering that God exists is not the same as believing that God exists, and would an insincere belief based on a wager be sufficient to gain eternal life in heaven? There is also the issue of credibility. If I promised you a million dollars tomorrow if you gave me one dollar today, would you give me the dollar? Almost nobody would do so, because the belief in being repaid a millionfold is not credible. But there is a further problem with the Wager Argument.

Assuming that you are a Protestant, if you follow the Wager Argument, you simply have to believe that Jesus Christ is your savior, and you will attain eternal life in heaven. Since all you have to do is believe, the cost appears to be almost zero, while the potential payout is tremendous if you have wagered correctly. But is the cost really that low?

To understand this, we must first ask ourselves, what, exactly do you have to believe to gain eternal life in heaven? Jesus had many teachings. Do you have to believe in all of Jesus' teachings or only believe that Jesus is your savior? Since you are making a wager, the safest bet is to believe in all of his teachings. But that leads to another question and another wager. Do you have to act in accordance with those beliefs, or can you believe in Jesus and all of his teachings but completely disregard them when it comes to guiding your actions? Again, the

safest bet is to act on those teachings. So basically a Protestant is in the same position as a Catholic in that regard.

Catholics believe that salvation is through faith and works, while Protestants believe that is through faith alone. But people tend to act on what they believe in, as that is the whole purpose of belief in the first place, so a Protestant will be led to the same behaviors as a Catholic, even though formally he only has to believe to attain salvation.

So we see that the cost of believing in Jesus Christ is much higher than it initially seems. If one believes, one will tend to lead a Christian life, with all the negatives that entails.

Short term, medium term, and long term

All of our actions have consequences, and the consequences can manifest themselves in the short term, the medium term, and the long term. Actions which may have positive consequences in the short term may have negative consequences in the medium term and long term, and actions that have positive consequences in the short term and medium term may have negative consequences in the long term. Conversely, actions that have negative consequences in the short term may have positive consequences in the medium term and long term, and actions that have negative consequences in the short term and medium term may have positive consequences in the long term. When deciding on our actions, we have to consider the consequences in the medium term and the long term, not just the short term.

There are a couple of things we have to be careful of here. The first is how you measure long-term benefits. You can join a pyramid scheme, believing that you will realize long-term gains on your investments, but those gains may never materialize. The second is how far into the future something has to be to be considered long-term. I would say that, in order to be truly long-term, the benefits must take place after you die. Any benefits that accrue during your lifetime should be considered, at best, medium term and not long term.

Second-hand Christianity

Some people may claim that Christianity is harmless because Christians, in actual practice, do not take the commandment to turn the other cheek too seriously. While this may be true, it fails to take into account the phenomenon of second-hand Christianity. Second-hand Christianity occurs when people who are not Christian live in a society that was created largely by Christians. Second-hand Christians may absorb Christian doctrines without knowing where they came from and may practice them more consistently than actual Christians. An example of this is gun control. People supporting gun rights are overwhelmingly Christian, while those supporting gun control often are not. Yet the principles that the gun-control advocates use to support their views come from Christianity. Often Christians are the least Christian people there are.

The nicest countries that I have visited are those that used to be Christian but recently have become more secular. The reason is simple: They discarded the metaphysics of

Christianity while keeping the ethics. In other words, they were practicing second-hand Christianity. They seemed nice on the surface but at root were weakened, and without a new foundation to replace Christianity, they will not be able to sustain that niceness.

Christianity affects people differently. Those that take it seriously it affects more, and those that understand it better it affects more. There are people who go to church on Sunday but disregard their religion for the rest of the week. For those people, Christianity has little effect. It acts more as a social group than anything else. Christianity also affects the more intelligent more than the less intelligent. Suppose every day you told your child that he was worthless. That would have serious negative consequences for your child's life. But if every day you told your dog that he was worthless, it would have no effect whatsoever, because your dog wouldn't understand what you were saying. Likewise, if you tell a stupid person to turn the other cheek, he'll go and punch in the face the next person who strikes him and won't see any contradiction, but if you tell that to an intelligent person, he will actually do it.

Christianity is not cost-free

Many decisions require a calculation of costs and benefits. Before investing money into something, you have to calculate whether the expected benefits will exceed the costs. In doing so, you must consider both short-term costs and long-term costs.

There are various scams that take advantage of people's desire to maximize their gains. These scams may promise a large payout in exchange for a small investment. One way to recognize such a scam is by a payout that is disproportionately large compared to the investment. If someone tells you that you can expect a payout of \$1,250 in five years if you invest \$1,000 today, that sounds reasonable. If, on the other hand, someone tells you that you can expect a payout of a million dollars in one year if you invest five dollars today, that is obviously a scam.

One of the ways that scammers get away with their crimes is by taking advantage of the time period between the initial investment and the final payout. If the victim is not expecting a payout until a long time into the future, the scammer has plenty of time to enjoy his take before anyone will even start to look for him. He can even send the victims part of his take as dividends, reassuring them that all is well, while still keeping the bulk of the money for himself.

Considering these two factors together, the higher promised the payout relative to the investment, the more obvious the scam, and the longer the delay between the investment and the payout, the more difficult it is to catch the perpetrator, we can see that Christianity is the perfect scam. For if someone promised you \$1,250 after five years for a \$1,000 investment, that would be reasonable. If he promised you \$2,000 after ten years for a \$500 investment, that would be dubious. If he promised you \$500,000 in twenty years for a \$100 investment, that would be an obvious scam. And if he offered you eternal life if you would simply believe, then how stupid do you have to be to believe that? And, to make sure that he is never caught, he promises to give you your payout after you die!

But, you say, the investment is so low that there is no risk to the investor, even if Christianity turns out to be a scam. This is the Wager Argument that we discussed previously, which states that, since you don't know whether Christianity is true or not, you should believe it, since, if it is true, you will gain eternal life if you believe and will lose eternal life if you don't, but if Christianity turns out to be a lie, you will have lost nothing for believing. This sounds, on the surface of it, quite plausible, and I believe it is the most common reason that people believe in Christianity. However, there are serious flaws in that argument, as I have already demonstrated.

The plan

Now that we understand what is wrong with Christianity, how it operates, and why people believe in it, we can begin to devise a plan to destroy it. The plan will be organized in phases. The first phase will be bringing to public attention the harm caused by Christianity. Subsequent phases will make use of that public awareness to crack down on Christians until they are finally wiped out.

The mantra

When arguing against Christianity, antichristians typically make numerous tactical errors. One error is not distinguishing Catholicism from Protestantism. Another is bringing every argument they have to bear against Christianity instead of only bringing out their strongest arguments. It may seem that more arguments are better, but the problem with that is that people have limited attention and will only pay attention to your weakest arguments while ignoring the stronger ones. The situation here is quite similar to military tactics. In fighting a war, you don't want to spread out your forces too thin. You want to concentrate your forces and attack at your enemies weakest point. The same should be true of our efforts to attack Christianity. We must find Christianity's weakest point, then take our strongest argument and hammer it home relentlessly at this weakest point. We must attack relentlessly, repeating this one argument over and over until it becomes *the* argument against Christianity, the one that everyone will reach for whenever dealing with a Christian. The argument can be expressed in a single sentence. This sentence can be used on social media, it can be used in the comment section of news articles, and it can be appended to the end of any article or essay against Christianity. This single sentence expresses the essence of what is wrong with Christianity, and it is something that Christians have no answer for and cannot have an answer for. The single sentence is, "Christians don't care what happens after they die."

What really happens after you die?

When you die, your body ceases to function. Your body may be preserved by embalming, or it may be cremated or simply allowed to decompose, but all bodily functions will cease.

The people you have left behind will live in a world that was formed, at least in part, by

your choices. The type of society they live in will be one that was shaped by the people who came before them. They will prosper or languish, at least in part, by the choices and actions of those who came before them. If those who came before has the foresight to consider the consequences of their actions, not only in their own lifetime but beyond, then those who come after them will be more likely to prosper than if they didn't.

But wait, you say, that's not what we're talking about when we say, "after you die." We mean what happens to you, to your immortal soul. Do you go to heaven to experience eternal bliss, or to hell to experience eternal torment?

The truth is that Christians only care about the fantasy world that they expect to inhabit after they die and not about the real world that those who come after them will have to inhabit. If you don't believe me, try this thought experiment: Imagine that, right before you die, you learn that a loved one of yours may suffer some horrifying fate. Would you still experience eternal bliss in heaven knowing this? If you are a true Christian, that will be all that you care about. Those that you have left behind will be of no further concern to you.

Christians are so obsessed with death and their fantasy world of the afterlife that they will literally let the real world go to hell in the vain hope that they can somehow escape death, but they cannot. Death is the fate that awaits us all, and no amount of pious belief can change that. You're going to die, you idiot! Get over it!

Before you can start, you need a replacement

One must make a clear distinction between Christianity and religion in general. Too many people who oppose Christianity oppose religion in general, but this is a serious error. Religion is the foundation that holds society together. Without religion, society collapses. So one must destroy Christianity without destroying religion. Let me give you an example to illustrate this.

Suppose you entered a building and saw that it was supported by columns formed from pornographic statues. In disgust, you tore down the columns. In the process, you would destroy the building. In order to preserve the building, you would have to remove the pornography without tearing down the columns.

So how could we remove the pornography without tearing down the columns? There are a couple of different approaches we could use. The simplest would be to cover the columns with curtains. A more effective approach would be to construct new columns first before tearing down the old columns.

The first approach can be illustrated by the actions of the Catholic Church. Remember that the Catholic Church was created to convert Pagans to Christianity who weren't otherwise going to convert. In this analogy, the pornographic columns represent the original Christianity, while the curtains represent the additional Catholic elements that were added to cover up the original Christianity. The problem with this approach is that, at some point, people will begin to

wonder what is hiding behind the curtains, and you will get the Protestant Reformation, which pulled back the curtains to reveal the original Christianity. If we don't want that to happen, we must not simply cover up the columns but build new columns before tearing down the old ones.

What should replace Christianity?

Since Christianity cannot be destroyed before a replacement for it can be found, what should be its replacement? Why do we need religion, anyway?

Religion is what gives a society cohesion. When all members of a particular society practice the same religion, they feel more connected to one another and are more likely to consider themselves part of the larger society and not just isolated individuals. They will take action for the benefit of the larger society and not just themselves. When people lack religion, society fragments and is unable to maintain its cohesion.

If we are to replace Christianity with another religion, should it be a newly created religion or one that already exists? Religions rely heavily on tradition, so an older religion would be best. Furthermore, since the purpose of a religion is to make people feel a part of a larger society, the religion should be one that arose in that society rather than one that was imported from somewhere else. In the case of people of European decent, that would be one of the ancient Pagan religions of Europe. However, there is a problem with that. The ancient Pagan religions of Europe have not been practiced for over a thousand years, except for a few small revival groups. A dead religion is difficult to revive, so perhaps a newly constructed religion is best. The newly constructed religion could take some benign elements from Roman Catholicism to make it seem familiar (but not the teachings of Jesus) and combine them with some of the ancient Pagan practices. But whatever practices are adopted must come from the culture itself and not be imported.

To illustrate the importance of keeping with native beliefs and customs, let us suppose the Chinese decided to worship the Greek gods on the grounds that the ancient Greeks were instrumental in developing civilization. Suppose then, after a time, the Chinese government declared the the defense of Greece its highest goal. Wouldn't you think to yourself: *What's going on here?* Yet we have Western governments declaring that the defense of Israel is their highest priority. That's what happens when you worship a foreign god. Although a religion can be constructed that does not require worshiping any god, if worship a god you must, make it a native god and not a foreign god.

Catholicism is better

Antichristians typically focus their attacks on Catholics, with particular emphasis on the church's attack on Galileo. However, this emphasis is misdirected. Catholicism (and Orthodoxy) are the least potent and the least offensive forms of Christianity. Protestantism is much more damaging than Catholicism because Protestantism is closer to Christianity in its original form, whereas Catholicism is Christianity mixed with Paganism.

Catholicism is less harmful than Protestantism because a large component of Catholicism is actually Pagan in origin. This is especially true of ethics. While based partly on the bible, much of Catholic doctrine comes directly from Aristotle. Catholic thought is thus infused with Aristotelian thought, and much of Catholic doctrine is actually useful and beneficial. Since Protestantism lacks an Aristotelian foundation, its doctrines are based on the bible alone. Thus Protestants are much more likely to turn the other cheek than Catholics, as they don't have Aristotle's doctrine of the mean to moderate their beliefs. You may find some Protestants who are not like that, but if you do, they will very likely rely heavily on Old Testament passages to guide them. The problem with that is that the Old Testament was written for Jews, and its doctrines are specifically tailored to Jews. While much of ethics is universal, and a person could find value in the ethical doctrines of any race or culture, it is far better to get your ethical principles from your own people, as they are tailored specifically to the disposition of your own people. For example, much of Aristotle and Confucius are similar, and while it would be possible for a European to follow Confucius and for an Asian to follow Aristotle, it would be far better for a European to follow Aristotle and for an Asian to follow Confucius. Likewise, as the Old Testament was written for Jews, and the New Testament is a poor ethical guide, people of European descent are better served by following an ethical system that is European in origin, such as that of Aristotle.

One of the antichristians' favorite attacks against Christianity is to condemn the Catholic Church for its treatment of Galileo. In fact, this is often their first line of attack, but it is misdirected. The Catholic Church's treatment of Galileo was not particularly loathsome and was largely brought on by Galileo himself. You have to keep in mind that the Catholic Church had temporal authority at that time and had to defend itself against any threats to its authority. When Galileo developed his heliocentric theories, he was not forbidden by the church from publishing them. He was specifically permitted to publish them as a method of calculating the orbits of the planets, so long as he didn't claim that the sun was the center of the universe. However, Galileo went far beyond that and directly attacked the church in his writings. Not only was it unnecessary to state that the sun was the center of the universe to present his theories, the fact is that the sun is not the center of the universe. Moreover, the Catholic Church itself used Galileo's methods in its own astronomical calculations shortly thereafter.

As an example of how the Catholic Church reacted quite differently, consider Dante's *Divine Comedy*. In Aristotle's cosmology, which had been adopted by the Catholic Church, God was located at the center of the earth, which was also the center of the universe. Dante, on the other hand, placed Satan at the center of the earth and the center of the universe. The Catholic Church raised no objection to that, as it was not in any way threatening to church authority.

When Christianity first began, it was slow to attract followers. When the Roman leadership decided that Christianity could be utilized for the benefit of the Roman Empire (a hugely mistaken judgement), they formalized it into what would become the Catholic Church. Some of the things that the early Catholic Church did were to convert Pagan temples into Catholic churches, recharacterize Pagan gods into Catholic saints, and repurpose Pagan festivals into Catholic holidays, the most notable being the repurposing of Saturnalia into Christmas. Another thing the Catholic church did was to adopt the Pagan philosopher Aristotle

as the official philosopher of the Catholic Church. The Protestant Reformation systematically reversed many of the things that the Catholic Church did, removing the Pagan elements and bringing the Protestant church closer to the original Christianity. Most notably, the Protestant Church eliminated the saints, as they considered them Pagan idols. They did keep Christmas and Easter, both Pagan festivals, but some newer churches, such as the Jehovah's Witnesses, have eliminated those holidays as well, bringing them even closer to the original Christianity.

So a replacement religion for Christianity could draw heavily from Roman Catholicism, as Catholicism is actually quite beautiful if you take out all of the Christian elements. I could quite easily read pages and pages of Catholic doctrine and agree with the content, while it is difficult to read more than a few sentences of Protestant doctrine without vomiting. When I was in college, a philosophy professor took a survey of the class, asking us what religion we were brought up with and what our beliefs were now. All of those brought up Protestant were still Protestant, while most of those brought up Catholic were now atheists. One of the Protestants said that that only proves how ridiculous Catholicism is, but I see it another way. What it shows is how good a preparation for life Catholicism is, since it emphasized reason and not just faith, and one can extract the good parts from it, step outside, and then look back in, seeing how beautiful it all was. Protestantism, on the other hand, teaches blind faith, and its practitioners are unable to think outside of it to challenge it.

Christmas

One of the antichristian's favorite targets of attack is Christmas. They will point out, correctly, that Christmas has nothing to do with Christ and is a repackaging of a Pagan festival. Some have sought the removal of Christmas displays from public places. One group even insisted on posting a plaque, in a space for various religions to post displays, containing the message that you are an idiot if you believe in God. These don't help our cause. Nor does it help to insist on plurality, such as having Hanukkah displays together with Christmas display. That may annoy some Christians, but it doesn't help our cause.

Attaching Christmas strikes most Christians as mean spirited. Christmas is simply a repackaging of the old Pagan celebration of Saturnalia. In that spirit, if someone wishes you a Merry Christmas, wish him back a Merry Christmas. They're just celebrating the holiday under the wrong name. That is not the arena that we want to fight them in. And if someone wishes you happy holidays, wish him back a Merry Christmas if he is Christian, or a Happy Yule if not. Holidays have names, and Christmas is the most common name in current use for the winter holiday. Saying happy holidays only obfuscates the issue. We want to use clear terminology, and Christmas is the term currently in use. We can correct that later. In the meantime, celebrate along with the Christians.

Christians are not our enemies. Christians are often decent people who harbor one particular false belief. Our goal should not be to antagonize Christians but to show them the error of their ways. There are many political issues on which Christians are on the right side, while many on the wrong side are Jews or atheists. In these instances we should take the side of the Christians. Our policy should be to hate Christianity but love the Christian.

In any conflict between a Jew and a Christian we should nearly always side with the Christian. For while Jews may at times oppose Christianity, they do so not because of Jesus, who was himself a Jew, but because it is a religion that provides a foundation for society. Our goal should not be to remove the foundation but to replace it with a better foundation.

Subsequent Phases

Once the evils of Christianity have been generally accepted by the vast majority of people, we can move on to the next steps. Please note that these steps must not begin prematurely. They should only begin once there is a general agreement that Christianity must go. This is especially true because they will require the support of the government, which must be in antichristian control before beginning the next phase.

Once we have sufficient support for eliminating Christianity, the next step is to physically attack people who are named Jesus. The government will run public service advertisements which depict someone announcing that his name is Jesus, followed by random passers-by physically attacking him. The immediate objective is to encourage others to do the same. This would have to have the sanction of law. Simultaneously, the government would provide expedited procedures for those unfortunate people to change their names to something else to avoid such attacks.

Charlie Child Molester

Child molesters are the most hated people of all. Even in prisons they are hated and are often the objects of violence. If you were to visit a prison and walk by the cell of Charlie Child Molester, you would immediately feel immense contempt for him. You would want to spit on him and execrate his name. But suppose, as you passed his cell, you heard Charlie Child Molester say, "Those who believe in me shall not die but shall have eternal life." Then, all of a sudden, you would say, "Praised be Charlie Child Molester! Charlie Child Molester is my Lord and Savior!" You may even believe that this child molester "created" you if it allows you to maintain the belief that you will live forever.

It is a fact that Jesus is referred to as "rabbi" in the bible, that rabbis perform circumcisions, and that, at the time of Jesus, and, in some places, still today, they perform oral circumcisions, which involve sucking the baby's penis. It is clear, then, that Jesus Christ either sucked babies' penises or participated in rituals involving sucking babies' penises. He was clearly a child molester.

Any strategy for destroying Christianity must involve labeling Jesus Christ as a child molester and making it stick. Anytime he is mentioned, one must reply, "Oh, you mean that child molester that sucked babies' penises?" This can be featured on billboards and in public service announcements. Jesus must be absolutely vilified.

Denial of death

All of us must die. That is an inescapable fact of life. Yet Christians will do nearly anything to pretend that that is not so, including worshiping a vile child molester. But no amount of fantasy can change the fact of your ultimate annihilation. It is incredible the amount of misery people are willing to perpetuate to maintain the fantasy of their own immortality. You're going to die, you idiot, get over it!

Christianity as the opposite of morality

Some Christians may claim that without Christianity there can be no morality, but the opposite is true. Christians cannot be truly moral, as they only care about their reward in heaven. Christianity undercuts morality. Christians don't actually care about their fellow man. If you offered a Christian the option of sacrificing his reward in heaven to help his fellow man, which choice do you think he would take? Christianity actually prevents someone from developing a genuine love of humanity.

Work ethic

People will often make claims that Christianity is beneficial in this life by citing some alleged benefit, for example, someone might say, "Even if it turns out to be untrue, believing you will be rewarded in heaven for your good deeds is beneficial to society. Your answer to that should be, "That's not Christianity; that's Catholicism." But what about a work ethic? You've never heard of a Catholic work ethic; it's always a Protestant work ethic. So when someone says that Christianity is beneficial because it promotes a work ethic, you should reply, "That's not Christianity; that's Puritanism." None of the benefits attributed to Christianity come from Christianity itself but from religions based on Christianity.

The fact is, much of "Christianity" has nothing to do with Jesus. People simply take whatever they consider good and attribute it to Christianity, whether it be the Catholic ethics, which came largely from Aristotle, or the Protestant work ethic.

The Final Phase

The final phase in the destruction of Christianity must be absolute vilification of Jesus—not Christians, whom we want to convert, but Jesus himself. For example, a child molester should be referred to as a Jesus, and child molestation should be referred to as Jesusing. So the news can report that a Jesus was caught Jesusing some children.

In propaganda cartoons, Jesus must be drawn to look Jewish, with a hooked nose. He must be drawn nailed to a single upright stake, with his hands nailed to the stake above his head, and with a second, horizontal stake, driven through his heart, in the manner of a vampire, completing the form of the cross. This will highlight the facts that (1) Jesus was Jewish, (2) Jesus is a vampire, (3) vampires can be killed by a stake through the heart.

Christian logic

Christians use different logic from other people. In normal logic, we use syllogisms such as

All p are q.
All q are r.
Therefore, all p are r.

or

If p then q.
If q then r.
Therefore, if p then r.

For example,

All men are mortal.
Socrates is a man.
Therefore, Socrates is mortal.

or

If the temperature drops, the lake will freeze.
If the lake freezes, we can go skating.
Therefore, if the temperature drops, we can go skating.

Christian logic follows different rules, such as

p.
q.
Therefore, Jesus is Lord!

For example,

Take a look at those flowers.
They're so beautiful.
Therefore, Jesus is Lord!

In normal logic, the conclusion must contain terms found in the premises. In Christian logic, the conclusion does not contain terms contained in the premises. Regardless of the premises, the conclusion is always the same: Jesus is Lord!

Remember, Christians don't care about you or me or what happens to us after they are gone. They only care about their fantasy of living forever. The fate of the world is of no concern to them. Christians don't care what happens after they die.