

## BIBLE ONLY DOCTRINE IS FOOLISHNESS

The cornerstone of the Protestant faith is that the Bible is the only religious authority – the Bible claims that this position is correct. With this cornerstone the reformers, Luther and Calvin sought to crush the claims of the Roman Catholic Church which takes tradition as another authority and has even added some heretical books to the Bible to boot.

The Bible leaves many important questions unanswered. Its omissions prove that it is not the only authority and therefore no authority at all. No sensible God would compose a book full of pointless genealogies and repetition and religious bloodshed instead of writing about more edifying subjects.

Take euthanasia. In scripture, God commands us not to kill though he does allow exceptions for what he calls a just case (I wrote “what he calls” for he has a very twisted idea of justice when he blackmailed his people to kill adulterers and adulteresses in a most cruel fashion). This does not prove that it condemns euthanasia. God tell us what to do what is best for others in it. This neither proves or disproves the morality of euthanasia. All we can do is reason and the problem with that is that the Bible bluntly tells us that since we are stupid due to an inherited mental defect in many things before God as a result of Adam’s sin it is no use either except when God says it is right. Anyone with reasonable life-experience couldn’t swallow the Bible’s statements.

The Bible does not tell us if the human being comes into existence at conception. David said he was conceived but those who believe that a newly conceived egg is not a human person still say they were conceived and we know what they mean. The Bible does not convince us that abortion and the use of the pill that kills the fertilised egg is immoral. It forbids tradition that is not implied by God’s word (Mark 7) so it forbids one to have an opinion one way or the other. This is evil for it is important to take one stance or the other on something as serious as abortion.

The Bible does not say if women can be admitted to communion or baptise or if you can let the infertile get married or if women should be allowed to rule the land.

Nowhere does it tell us that the Epistle to Philemon or the Epistles of Jude are divinely inspired. The list of books in the Bible is largely unbiblical itself and contradicts the Protestant principle of the Bible alone. Faith depends on evidence. The Bible commands faith. This tells us that we should expect true divinely inspired scripture to have been produced by vision and miracles that were verified as historical events. Instead, they were written like a person might write an essay for school. Also, religion has lots of books that claim to be inspired but only a few are taken to be inspired in the sense that they are to be the yardstick against which all revelations are to be tested. So, what is held to be inspired is not necessarily scripture to them. Most of the Bible books do not say what sense they are inspired in. At the end of the day, the Bible books are scripture because some authorities wanted them to be and not because history or Heaven or independent corroboration of miracles made it clear. This does not prove that the Bible teaches we should not look to the Bible alone but it proves that the Bible alone principle is incoherent. The same holds true for any scripture that was produced like a normal book. Any book that claims to be the word of God even if it is just a letter like the letter of Jude has to be should be a miracle. The Mormons had the right idea when they said the Book of Mormon was the word of God because its origin was miraculous. There should be affidavits proving the books of the Bible each have divine authority. The law itself says that serious claims need to have a minimum of two independent witnesses. Even if we had affidavits from the close friends of the apostles that they wrote the documents ascribed to them it would be better. But we don’t. We just have popular gossip.

Protestantism is wrong for belief in scripture alone is a superstition and its Bible should be thrown on the rubbish tip for it claims to be the boss though it is incompetent. There is no way out of this for tradition is a load of junk and would be no use even if it were good for the Bible never appeals to it. Protestantism contains a large portion of unbiblical Catholic tradition and pretends it is in the Bible.

Here is the list.

Infant baptism.

Sunday as the Sabbath.

Though they say that the Jewish Law was abolished they don’t say that the Sabbath rest which they have moved to Sunday from Saturday was abolished though they should to be consistent.

The belief in the real presence in Lutheranism, that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are present in the bread and wine but

do not become them.

That the minister only should facilitate and administer communion. Paul said that the cup is the cup we bless meaning the congregation too.

That ordination should be performed by laying on of hands and that laymen can't create clergymen.

The belief that Mary was an unusually good woman.

The Anglican and Lutheran idea that baptism forgives original sin.

That the whole Jewish law has been abolished (Read my, Jewish Christianity is Real Christianity).

That Jesus Christ is God.

That God is three persons in one.

That God loves all people no matter what they do. The Bible says that God loved us to save us even before we were saved and were sinners but sometimes one who hates you could be said to love you in one or two things. He might want to put you in jail for nothing but he might not let anybody kill you. Love is good will rather than feeling.

That there are no more persons in God who are simply not mentioned in the Bible.

That spirit in the Bible for which the word is breath is an immaterial reality or a spirit in the sense of a being with no parts making it up. This means that the design argument for God (God the designer exists for we see design all around us in nature) is invalid in and alien to Bible theology. We should not assume the Bible means what Christians mean by spirit for it was more likely to believe that God was material when that was all the authors could have known or thought of. If God is immaterial then bringing him in to explain design does not make sense for who designed him? The Bible merely says that God designed but it does not argue that design is a sign that God exists. Romans 1 employs the design argument for it says God is recognised through the creation and his existence is obvious even to those in the grip of sinful depravity.

Some say it could mean that God uses the creation to show you that he exists say through answers to prayer and the feeling that there is something more to nature than what meets the eye. He meant design proved a designer because this explanation is too stretched. Paul is certainly wrong whatever he meant so we have a fatal error in his epistle that proves he was not a prophet of God and was actually a bigot who might have lied to create a new bigoted religion.

That Jesus was not stolen from the tomb.

That Jesus had a magic body after he rose from the dead.

That Jesus Christ's miracles were all supernatural and contravened the law of nature.

Though the Bible certainly claims to be the only reliable word of God and the only authority, this claim is false. The book is man-man revelation pretended to be from God.

The Bible, The Biography, Karen Armstrong, Atlantic Books, London, 2007