

BIBLE CONTRADICTS ITSELF ABOUT GOD

A book that makes huge errors concerning the person it is about and which even says that he wrote it is not much good. Instead of being laid on a pulpit throne as if it were something special it belongs in the fairy-tale section in the local second-hand bookshop which nobody visits. The Bible is unable to make up its mind if God is everywhere and if he is all-powerful and all-good.

Judges 1:19. Here it is said that God could not drive out mountain people for the sake of his people because of their chariots which were made of iron. Elsewhere, God is said to be almighty.

Haley says that God was unable for a moral reason that was clear to him alone for he sees all for leading the people to defeat people with strong chariots would have made them proud (55) but there is no hint of that in the text. The straightforward interpretation must be taken and it blames the chariots.

Exodus 31:17. This says that God rested on the seventh day and was refreshed contrary to Isaiah who said God is too powerful to get tired (40:28). Haley says that Exodus is only saying that God stopped in a poetic and non-literal way. That is only a guess and it is wrong for the passage can be literal therefore it is literal. It was around before the more sophisticated theology came in.

Deuteronomy 8:2. God tries Israel to see if it would obey him. Yet he is supposed to be all-knowing (Hebrews 4:13).

Christians say that there is no collision for God does not know what you are like unless you act. He foresees what you will be like so he knows all things. But it is what you would do that he wants to see not what you do do (Matthew 5:28). That is why deathbed conversions are approved in the Bible. If you would do something he has no need to test you. It would even be wrong for him to try you harder for that would be refusing to count his blessings and start doing what is likely to drive you away if you are biased towards sin (Romans 3). The Bible contradicts itself about God knowing all things.

Genesis 3:8. Genesis 11:5. 1 Kings 19:11,12. These say that God is not everywhere.

Christians do not take them literally. The first says that Adam and Eve hid among the trees from God so it can only be taken literally. They would not hide from a vision of the God who is everywhere for what would be the point? When the hiding place is mentioned it can only be interpreted one way.

The second says that God came down to see the Tower of Babel. Haley says that God descending means that God is starting to do something on earth which looks like he has come down to act. But when it could be literal it must be literal. And it does not say God was doing anything but merely observing.

The third says God was not in Elijah's wind or earthquake or fire. Haley says that this does not deny that God was in them and their saying he was not merely is a way of saying he did not use these to give a message to that prophet but used a still small voice (59). The basis of this is that the quiet voice of God spoke to Elijah after the drama. But stop. God would not have a voice unless he is a god like the pagan gods so the voice is something that he creates to communicate his message. A spirit has no voice. But that would mean that the wind and earthquake and fire did communicate a message by being a kind of sign language. So the Christian sense says that God was in all three so it is a misinterpretation. The true interpretation of the sense is that God was not personally or spiritually in them and so is not everywhere.

Genesis 1:28. This calls God Elohim which is plural. Christians claim that this is a plural of majesty. This is nonsense for even if God is three persons he is one being and is one majesty. The name is a slip made by a confused polytheist or monotheist.

Exodus 31:18. This states that God wrote the Ten Commandments with his finger. This is literal for he could have done that even if he was a spirit by materialising a finger. And there is no hint in these books that he was a spirit, meaning a partless being. Spirit means breath in the Bible so the book never ever teaches that God has no parts. Breath has parts. There is no evidence that it meant immaterial being by spirit. The Bible says that design shows that God the designer exists and refuses to answer the question about who designed God by saying that he always was the way he is which makes it a heresy for Christians to argue that God has no parts and needed no designer. When both the Old and New Testaments glorify the Torah as the heart of the Bible and its foundation and even says that Jesus has no authority if he opposes it, it is clear that the Torah is the guideline for interpreting the rest of the Bible. The Torah describes God as a being with a body and never says it doesn't mean this literally. Therefore any part of the Bible that seems to say he is a spirit should be interpreted in the light of this. Jesus called God a spirit but God could be a spirit and also a body. And yet Christians dishonestly or ignorantly use

that assertion of Jesus to prove that the Mormons and the likes are wrong for holding that God has a body.

Exodus denies the Christian notion that God took flesh only from the Virgin Mary for it is never stated that God has no body.

Christians will say that if we take this literally we must take Habakkuk literally when he says horns stick out of God's hand. But that is obvious symbolism.

Exodus 33. This gives one of the many biblical examples of God changing his mind even though as many places say he can't do that for he is perfect and always does what is best and knows all things.

The Christians reply that God can change promises that are conditional upon what we do. That is fair enough except that it says that God must know the non-existent future. For example, God promised to bless Israel greatly if they obeyed him and to make their lives a misery if they did not. But conditions could change if they obey him forcing him to torment them for a greater good. The idea of God making conditional promises is absurd for even he cannot observe events that will not happen. That is the error in places like Jonah 3:10. For God to promise means that God can act on the basis of what he sees in the future which is absurd. It is the same as having the future cause the present or the past.

The text of Exodus gives no hint of a conditional promise so it can't be conditional.

Exodus 20:5. This says that God visits the sin of the fathers who hate him on the children to the fourth generation.

According to Christians, this means not that God punishes the children for the fathers but that the children pay for the sins because the fathers will have corrupted them and done things which affect them adversely and draw them into sin too. But this is nonsense for God has the power to keep people from sin and vowed to bring good out of evil unless you want to hold that the Law denies this doctrine. Many of the saints had formerly been very evil people. God is saying he will get his own back on them for their father's sins. If I hurt X because of what his father did then I am not really doing it for that reason for I know it was not X's fault. It is an excuse. The Law says elsewhere that children can't be put to death for what their fathers did. God can't mean the world will make X suffer for his father's sin for X can't but God can for he can accept the death of an animal vicariously in place of the sinner who he sentences to death – the Law says all sin deserves death as distinct from capital punishment which it reserves for gays, apostates and many other persecuted minorities.

1 Samuel 6:19. Here we are told that fifty thousand and three score and ten men were slain. This is impossible as even Haley admits (93). Bethshemesh was not a big town. He says it is a copyist's error and admits there is no proof of it being one. Now, this error would mean that a new miracle story was added into the Bible. God miraculously multiplied the men and enabled tiny Israel to kill them all. Yet Haley says the errors do not affect any doctrine. Here they attribute a vicious and absurd miracle to God.

Ezekiel 14:9. God says he will deceive false prophets. Haley says that he means he will make sure their prophecies will not be right not that God will lie through them or to them. So, if one says A will be killed God will avoid this happening. This would not really be God deceiving them for they have deceived themselves. God would have said that he will expose them if he meant what Haley said. The author would not have written that God will deceive unless he meant it literally for misunderstanding was dangerous for him. Fundies like Haley boast of their loyalty to the Bible and then they alter its teaching to give it the appearance of consistency. They are only boasting of their loyalty to their judgment of the Bible which is an entirely different thing and shows their true colours. It's pride.

The Bible makes God a liar by proxy by saying he gets others to do his dirty work and tell the lies for him. Also, the Bible is lies posing as the truth so saying God wrote the Bible is accusing of being a liar!

2 Chronicles 7:12, 16. God said that his name would dwell in the Temple forever. But the Temple has been destroyed. Solomon who gave this revelation was a false prophet. It is no use saying that forever is not literal but means a long time. I said a job will take me forever I would not mean it literally but if God who could mean it literally says it then the opposite is the case.

In 1 Samuel 15:29 we are told that God will not repent of anything he does. But then we are told a little bit later that he was sorry for having made Saul the king of Israel. The solution is that God did not regret having done this for an all-powerful and all-knowing God cannot regret anything he does but that it just looked like he regretted it for he was phasing Saul out as king for he was no longer the man for the job. God acted as if he regretted it. Then why didn't the author just write that God decided that Saul could be king no more? Why say God was sorry? The solution fails.