

THE HATEFUL GOD OF EXODUS

We are about to launch into an attack on the doctrinal and ethical errors of the Torah, the Law of Moses which is to be found in the first five books of the Bible. The validity of the attack disproves Judaism which is based on the Torah and also Christianity whose founders, the apostles, pronounced the Torah to be infallible and just (Romans 7:12; 1 Timothy 1:8). They said that they got this from Jesus himself (Matthew 5:17-19; 7:12). Many times the New Testament says that the Law of Moses is where it gets its validity from. You can't have the New without the Old.

We will start with the Book of Exodus which is where the real Law begins.

Exodus 7:8-13,22; 8:3 says that God permitted the magicians of Egypt to perform miracles to show that their gods should be worshipped and were as good as the God of Moses. It says they are real miracles, if they were tricks the magicians would have been able to produce gnats (8:14). The God of the Torah asked people to kill and die for him yet he offered no evidence for his teaching when other gods could duplicate his miracles. His miracles don't support his claims when he allowed ones that support false doctrine to be done. The God of the Torah commanded some strange things so it is no use to say that when a miracle supports reasonable teaching that it must be from God. Moreover, the gods of Egypt could have existed.

God did things the other gods failed to do. Perhaps when God was the most powerful God it proved the miracles of the others did not prove their right to be honoured as gods? But a weak God could make people have false visions that he could do mighty things. Besides, the Egyptian Gods were not thought to be all-powerful. The Egyptians would have surmised that the gods were not watching one another when the god of Israel was able to start a contest and occasionally win. Their gods were not always well organised! And when God tried to compete with the gods of Egypt and they were able to do what he did for many of the miracles it shows that God wasn't that powerful. For example, he made the frogs appear, to do something that the other gods couldn't do. But then they were able to do it too. If demons do miracles as Christians believe then demons did the miracles for the gods of Egypt.

In Exodus 19:13-15, we read that God commanded that anybody who touched the bottom of the mountain of Sinai when he was on it had to be stoned to death or shot. A sin that harms would be worse than that and he did not say the sins should all be punished that way. Unfair!

Exodus says that anybody who curses their parents must be put to death (21:17).

If a thief breaks in and is attacked and killed in the night there is no bloodguilt. But if it is daytime then there is (Exodus 22:2). The thief is not armed at all because then there would be no bloodguilt for killing him any time. The rules are said to be based on it being easier to fight him during the day without killing him. Surely it cannot be right to attack a man in the middle of the night to risk your own life or his when he may be unarmed and not a threat to you? This God was evil for he let you fight him to the death in the dark even though it is wrong. The rule should not be worrying about night and day. What it should be worried about is the extent of vision the owner of the house had when the house was burgled. For example, a clear moonlit night with lights in the house would give the owner good vision at night. The utter stupidity and fundamentalism of the law is evident.

The Law decrees that thieves must not back what they took but pay back double (Exodus 22:9). And God claims to be just. If you steal one sheep you have to pay back four (Exodus 21:37). He is forcing the victims to steal from the thieves! You cannot say that the extra has to be paid in compensation as well for that would depend on the hurt caused and be variable. But God lays down a fixed overpayment. The only excuse is that he harshness is geared towards deterring the person from sin. But deterrence only makes the thieves more devious and careful. It will make them so angry that they are hurt more than justice demands that they will become hardened in evil. Deterrence can be used as an excuse for any level of brutality. It is not for deterrence when the extra is paid to the victim instead of the poor. If it is just for putting people off crime then the poor would be a better choice for the extra fine.

Exodus 34 enjoins disrespect for other religions. Israel was told by God to smash their altars and statues in case Israel would start worshipping other gods. Israel was not to tolerate people like that or to make peace with them. The "in case" is the most important part of the nasty bits. (It shows that the same must hold true for Christians today for Jesus said that we must adore God only or with all our hearts.) Here we have God accused of commanding evil and cruelty over what has shown no signs of happening yet. He is accused of being paranoid. It would have been less cruel if he had seen that the people were going to join in the false worship first, verse 37 makes it clear that all this has been sanctioned by God. It is no answer to say that the other religions were evil. Why not engage in dialogue with them to change them and improve them?

Plus Israel had a God of supernatural power looking after it so the fear of attack wasn't an incentive.

The command to kill anybody who works on the Sabbath is unduly harsh (Exodus 35:2). Nobody can deny that this was unnecessary.

The God of Moses was a liar and if there were a God he would be very offended by Moses' portrayal of him. He liked the taste of blood when he coldly commanded the putting of people to death by stoning. The name of Moses should be hated as much as that of Hitler. Jesus Christ was not the Son of God for he acclaimed the ways of Moses and had been a lifelong Jew who cherished the Law.

WEB

Final Response by Steven Carr to Dr Wilkinson
www.bowness.demon.co.uk/wilkin6.htm

Why the Roman Catholic Arguments for the Canon are Spurious?
www.christiantruth.com/canon.html

In Response to William Webster's: The Canon, Why the Roman Catholic Arguments for the Canon are Spurious
www.geocities.com/Athens/3517/Webster.html

Creationism This shows that the prime creationist apologist Duane Gish has been corrected many times for his errors and misunderstandings of his subject and has still repeated the same errors afterwards to make his case look good. He is perverting the evidence purposely. He has been known to make up quotations for the authorities he cites as evidence. He lies to prove that the skeleton Lucy which shows a transition between animal to man was just a monkey and could not walk upright. Both of his claims are false.
<http://mypage.direct.ca/w/writer/gish.html>

Dennis Mc Kinsey, Biblical Errancy
<http://members.aol.com/darrwin2/iss171.html>

Argues that the Fundamentalist claim that when the book of Leviticus says that the life is in the blood it was stating an unknown scientific fact and showing that the book was written by God is wrong. McKinsey says that since the context of this verse is about sacrifice to God it means spiritual life or holiness is in the blood and is not on about physical life. This page gives some excellent criticisms of the fantasies and lies of Henry Morris and the Institute of Creation Research. It is obvious that the fact that the Institute of Creation Research could not possibly be called scientific though it claims that label as its bedrock next the Bible for you cannot prove something as odd as creation. Creation is something coming out of nothing and who is to say that something just as bizarre as this and something that we cannot even think of is not the reason why things exist? Creation is an assumption and the idea of a God making a creation that is not part of him is incoherent for if there was only God and God is his power and God is infinite and it takes infinite power to put something where nothing was then it follows that far from creating God just metamorphosed himself into the cosmos so that Morris and me and everybody else is God.

Science in the Bible? Dr M Magee
www.askwhy.co.uk/truth/440BibleScience.html

Why It's a Load of Old Cobblers, Adrian Barnett
www.abarnett.demon.co.uk/atheism/noahs_ark.html
Exposes the utter absurdity of the Noah's Ark story in the Bible

Steven Carr, Critique of Josh McDowell's Non_Messianic Prophecies This Site cannot be overly recommended. It is superb.
www.infidels.org/library/modern/steven_carr/non-messianic.html

New Testament Contradictions, Paul Carlson
www.infidels.org/library/modern/paul_carlson/nt_contradictions.html

Rabbits do not chew their cud, Alleged Bible Contradictions
<http://unhindered.com/apolo/contradictions/index.html>

The Bible as History Flunks New Archaeological Tests
www.10.nytimes.com/library/arts/072900david-bible.html

This is one of McKinsey's online magazines. The magazine is excellent for it gives the fundies the chance to respond and carefully exposes their twisted reasoning.

This particular issue says that Herod was not a king though the New Testament says he was for the Roman tetrarchs were the rulers. It says Matthew's story that Herod massacred the boys of Bethlehem to get rid of the baby Jesus is false for Josephus liked to bring up the terrible things that Herod did and never mentioned this one. It also says that the story of Jesus being nailed between two thieves is fiction because theft was not a capital crime. It argues that when Luke said about Augustus decreeing that the whole world must engage in a census it was a lie for Augustus never had the results which he would have done. Genesis 11:26 says that when Terah was 70 he sired Abram and Nahor and Haran. The trouble is it says Abram was 75 when his father died and yet his father died at 205. The Christians argue that Genesis 11:26 does not say Abram's dad was 70 when he was born though the passage cannot mean anything else. They fudge the problem by saying that just because Abram was mentioned first that does not mean he was born first. It does in the way the verse is written for why say Terah became a father at 70 and list the sons if you don't mean one of them was born that year and it would naturally have to be the first one mentioned Abram. Pity he didn't point out that when the fundies cannot agree among themselves how to reconcile Bible contradictions that it shows that their solutions are just contrived and fraudulent.