

## Christianity as the Worship of Self-Contradiction

Christianity is, if nothing more, the worship of Jesus. According to orthodox Christianity, Jesus is the god of the Old Testament come down to the earth, incarnated in the flesh of a human being, and so-called "king of kings," even though his only crown was assembled from thorns which corrupted his flesh.

In evangelizing, many adherents to Christianity carry on as if they were really concerned about the presence of contradictions in one's worldview. While pretending that their worldview is wholly consistent and free of any contradiction whatsoever, Christianity's apologists roam about like lions seeking whom they may devour on the charge of contradiction and fallacy. What's often overlooked by both the apologists themselves and unsuspecting non-believers, is that Christianity reduces quite literally to worship of a *walking contradiction*. This is not hard to see, but it is impossible for apologists to distangle.

The [Athanasian Creed](#) makes this unmistakably clear when it affirms that Jesus is "both God and Man," that he is "fully God, fully man," that is, both wholly divine and wholly human.

But herein lies a long list of contradictions, for God is not a man, and man is not a god. The Athanasian Creed is essentially saying that Jesus is *both A and not A*. Observe the following 20 essential qualities attributed to the Christian god which man does not share with it:

- \* God is *uncreated*, but man is *not* uncreated
- \* God is *divine*, but man is *not* divine
- \* God is *supernatural*, but man is *not* supernatural
- \* God is *perfect*, but man is *not* perfect
- \* God is *immutable*, but man is *not* immutable
- \* God is *almighty*, but man is *not* almighty
- \* God is *sovereign*, but man is *not* sovereign
- \* God is *omniscient*, but man is *not* omniscient
- \* God is *omnipotent*, but man is *not* omnipotent
- \* God is *omnipresent*, but man is *not* omnipresence
- \* God is *omnibenevolent*, but man is *not* omnibenevolent
- \* God is *infallible*, but man is *not* infallible
- \* God is *infinite*, but man is *not* infinite
- \* God is *eternal*, but man is *not* eternal
- \* God is *immortal*, but man is *not* immortal
- \* God is *incorporeal*, but man is *not* incorporeal
- \* God is *non-physical*, but man is *not* non-physical
- \* God is *immaterial*, but man is *not* immaterial
- \* God is *incorruptible*, but man is *not* incorruptible
- \* God is *indestructible*, but man is *not* indestructible

And even though only one of these would have to stick in order for there to be a real (as opposed to an "apparent") contradiction, we also note that man is *biological* in nature. But how could one say that the Christian god, which is said to lack a body, is biological? And while Christians say that their god is worthy of worship, would they say that human beings are worthy of worship? In fact, it is hard to find any quality ascribed to the Christian god by Christian sources that man has.

Since Christians worship Jesus, and Jesus is claimed to be both one thing *and also its logical opposite*, we can only conclude that Christians therefore literally worship a contradiction. And since they worship contradiction, how can they find the presence of contradictions (or supposed contradictions) in non-Christian worldviews objectionable? Perhaps their complaint is that non-Christian worldviews don't have *enough* contradictions, or that non-Christian worldviews do not give contradictions enough respect. At any rate, if one is to avoid contradictions, this much is certain: one must abandon Christianity.

by Dawson Bethrick

posted by Bahsen Burner at [7:30 AM](#)

### 34 Comments:

[Aaron Kinney](#) said...

What a sweet post! That's quite a list. I'm sure that the list could be expanded even further.

I wonder what a Christian apologist would have to say in response to this dilemma?

[August 04, 2005 8:51 AM](#)

[Paul Manata](#) said...

Learn logic Dawson.

You wrote:

"But herein lies a long list of contradictions, for God is not a man, and man is not a god. The Athanasian Creed is essentially saying that Jesus is both A and not A."

So, take A, where A refers to, say, God. You just said that the Athanasian Creed said that Jesus is both A and not-A, translated, you just said the Athanasian Creed said that Jesus is both God and not God, but is that what the Creed says?

So, in the case of Jesus we would have A (God) and B (man). Jesus is both A and B. A contradiction, dear Dawson, would be if the Creeds had said that Jesus was God and was \*not\* God in the same sense and relationship. If they said this \*then,\* then dear Dawson, you'd have your A and ~A.

Do you wonder why not many comment here and read your drivel? Well, look at how you reason.

[August 04, 2005 5:34 PM](#)

[Bahnsen Burner](#) said...

Paul, you'll need to do better than that if you want to undo the obvious contradictions here. You'll have to show either that man is, for instance, immortal like your god, or that your god is, like man, not immortal. And so on for each of the qualities I have cited. You can't have it both ways. Meanwhile, tell us what it's like to worship a contradiction.

Regards,  
Dawson

[August 04, 2005 9:16 PM](#)

[Paul Manata](#) said...

This post has been removed by the author.

[August 04, 2005 10:21 PM](#)

[groundfighter76](#) said...

This post has been removed by the author.

[August 05, 2005 6:22 AM](#)

[groundfighter76](#) said...

This post has been removed by the author.

[August 05, 2005 6:22 AM](#)

[groundfighter76](#) said...

Paul is absolutely correct and I had thought about posting something similar yesterday, but then thought why bother as Dawson has 'rejected reason' (as he likes to accuse people of). It's not "A and not A", but it's "A and B".

[August 05, 2005 6:24 AM](#)

[Aaron Kinney](#) said...

Paul, the contradiction still exists. Just because you changed the "a and not a" to "a and b" doesn't take away the contradiction. Here's what you said:

*"Technically, to any trained dimwit, as it stands the athanasian creed sayeth, "Jesus is both A and B" where A stands for God and B stands for man.*

*Moreover, these are not in the same sense, hence no contradiction; again, any dimwit within 57 pages into an intro to logic text could have figured this out. So, Jesus has \*two\* natures. In respects to his divine nature he is fully God, in respects to his human nature he is fully man."*

You randomly insert a silly claim in the beginning of that second paragraph I quoted where you say "these are not in the same sense" but you don't elaborate nor do you explain how they are not in the same sense. Since they are both a set of attributes applied to Jesus, I think they ARE in the same sense.

Let's see, if Jesus is a man, then Jesus is **not** supernatural. But if Jesus is also God, then he **is** supernatural. The "a" and the "b" contain a bunch of attributes that are mutually exclusive.

All you did Paul was try to remove the context of God's and Man's attributes by using abstract logical symbols, A and B, to try to hide the obvious glaring contradiction between simultaneously being an all powerful God and a puny homo sapien. But regardless of whether it's A/notA or A/B, these mutually exclusive attributes of God and man remain.

You can insult Dawson to make yourself feel better, you can assign any letter you want to these attributes, and you can fiddle with logic all you want, but you can't avoid the fact that God and man have mutually exclusive properties.

[August 05, 2005 9:23 AM](#)

[Paul Manata](#) said...

This post has been removed by the author.

[August 05, 2005 9:28 AM](#)

[Francois Tremblay](#) said...

Great article Dawson. I'll have to put that somewhere.

What is Paul blathering about again? Is that high school kid not tired of getting disproven again and again? Geesh.

[August 05, 2005 10:55 AM](#)

[Paul Manata](#) said...

This post has been removed by the author.

[August 05, 2005 12:38 PM](#)

[groundfighter76](#) said...

This post has been removed by the author.

[August 05, 2005 12:41 PM](#)

[Aaron Kinney](#) said...

I've been made to look stupid enough in the past huh?

Like when I (with help from Not Reformed and the dictionary and the Bible) exposed the Van Til bullshit about faith/blind faith?

Oh but Im an idiot because I didnt read every word that Van Til wrote right Manata? I was an idiot up until it was exposed that Van Til doesnt actually explain the difference between blind faith and normal faith. And not to mention that the Bible doesnt differentiate between faith and blind faith either.

Yea... I sure looked stupid that time.

Sorry to say Manata, but the one that looks stupid is the one that believes in ancient superstitions and invisible ghosts in the sky. The stupid one is the one who believes that murdering an innocent man is an acceptable payment for the crimes of others.

The stupid one is the one who subscribes to a belief system where "faith" (belief in things unevidenced or without logical proof) is the key to salvation, yet tries to provide evidence and logical proof for his beliefs every chance he gets!

[August 05, 2005 3:48 PM](#)

[Aaron Kinney](#) said...

By the way Manata, why are trained logicians and the academic community much less likely to be theists compared to the general population?

[August 05, 2005 3:50 PM](#)

[Aaron Kinney](#) said...

The properties of God and the properties of man are mutually exclusive.

if A then ~B

and

if ~A then B

So to claim A&B would be a contradiction.

[August 05, 2005 4:37 PM](#)

[Bahnsen Burner](#) said...

GF76: "It's not A and not A, but it's A and B."

This doesn't work to undo a contradiction since B is simply another way of saying non-A. The charge of contradiction is not dissolved by shell-game rhetoric. We have direct and blatant contradictions here, and they are supported by statements in the New Testament.

For instance, Luke 24:39 has Jesus say "a spirit hath not flesh and bones." I've never met a man who does not have flesh and bones, so man could not be a spirit, according to this biblical criterion.

Moreover, John 4:24 states "God is a Spirit."

So, accordingly, God could not have flesh and bones (since "God is a Spirit" and "a spirit hath not flesh and bones"), but man does.

Any way you slice it, the contradiction is there.

Conclusion: Christians literally worship a walking contradiction.

Q.E.D.

Try to have a good day. I know I will.

Best regards,  
Dawson

[August 05, 2005 5:00 PM](#)

[Paul Manata](#) said...

your ignorance astounds me, and so does your lack of logical ability.

read this paper. a dialog with some people over at the iibd

[http://reformedperspectives.org/files/reformedperspectives/hall\\_of\\_frame/HOF.Ra.McLaughlin.Hypostatic.Union.Dialogue\\_10.20.pdf](http://reformedperspectives.org/files/reformedperspectives/hall_of_frame/HOF.Ra.McLaughlin.Hypostatic.Union.Dialogue_10.20.pdf)

anyway, Bob (Dawson) the 1700's are calling, they want their argument back (giggle).

[August 05, 2005 5:43 PM](#)

[Bahnsen Burner](#) said...

Paul, again, you fail to reply with any substance. When you can actually address the points in my blog, please come back. Until then, you seem to have shot your wad and are completely out of ammunition. Meanwhile, why don't you write up a new blog explaining what it's like to worship a walking contradiction in a cartoon universe.

Best regards,  
Dawson

[August 08, 2005 12:40 AM](#)

[Not Reformed](#) said...

Paul, I understand the way that certain christians try to explain the 'fully God/fully man' issue, but all you're really saying is:

"Presuppose my man-made theology based on a man-made book is true and it makes sense!"

How boring and uninteresting.

And yet, how typical of you.

[August 08, 2005 1:34 AM](#)

[groundfighter76](#) said...

Dear Dawson,

Your blog entry has been shot to hell. When are you going to actually reply to the points Paul has made in this comment section, rather than repeating that B is another way of saying non-A and other tripe which misses the boat.

Have a wonderful day in that dream world of yours.

(Now is your opportunity to re-assert that there is a contradiction).

[August 08, 2005 7:41 AM](#)

[Paul Manata](#) said...

Bob,

It's sad that all you can do is say that I haven't dealt with your argument, when I turned it into swiss cheese. If you want to think you've answered my rebuttal then go ahead, you can do so, you're a "man" remember, and you "think with your own brain." So, I can't stop you, but this comments section is out there for people to objectively judge between the two.

boo-hoo

[August 08, 2005 9:02 AM](#)

[Paul Manata](#) said...

Thought I'd burry Bob (aka Dawson) and be done with him.

I have proven, by strict rules of logic, that the contradictory of A (God) is  $\sim A$  (not-God), not "man" (which would be B) as Bobert seems to think.

His comeback was to say, "man is another way of saying not-God." So, I'll just speak to the logicians who might be frequenting this comments section. I would hope that you, being free-thinking atheists, would jump all over Bob (aka Dawson Bethrick) since truth is more important than making the atheist sheeple feel good.

Basic stuff: we all know about the square of opposition: A, E, I, O, statements. A is contrary to E but *contradictory* to O. Also, an A statement is a universal affirmative statement and an O statement is a particular negative statement.

An example of an A statement would be:

"All dogs are four-legged animals."

in logic (as we all know) is contradiction would be:

"Some dogs are not four legged animals."

Now, applying Bob's (aka Dawson's) reasoning I could write:

"All dogs are four-legged animals."

And Bob could write:

"Some *eggplants* are not four-legged animals."

Now, *everyone* and their mother knows that, logically speaking, this O statement does not contradict the A statement. But, applying Bob's (aka Dawson Bethrick's) reasoning, which has been warped by Ayn Rand, his reply should be, nay(!), would have to be in order to be consistent:

"But heeeeyyyy, eggplant is another way of saying nont-dog."

Anyway, anyone who knows anything about logic knows that Bethrick has had his little objectivist butt spanked, May this blog serve as a testimony to why I don't seriously interact with Bethrick, (and it appears that others don't as well, judging by the comments on this blog). He's a child who throws temper tantrums and only has the hearing he has because he knows how to write well.

Anyway, cheerio ole Chap!

[August 09, 2005 11:28 AM](#)

[Not Reformed](#) said...

Clown-prince said:

"thought I'd burry bob"

What the hell is 'burry?' sounds kinda creepy. Maybe a tie-in with your gay-fantasies about Mr Sansone?

clown-prince also said:

"eggplant is another way of saying nont-dog."

Your lucid communication skills astound, Paul! Perhaps some more school is in order! Hit the books clown-boy!

Insults aside...your little discussion of logic doesn't disprove Dawson in the least. You know you are the master of special pleading...and you also BELIEVE that nobody will agree with your imaginary-world analysis unless "God" calls them...so what is your point?

[August 09, 2005 1:47 PM](#)

[Paul Manata](#) said...

This post has been removed by the author.

[August 09, 2005 2:28 PM](#)

[Not Reformed](#) said...

This post has been removed by the author.

[August 09, 2005 2:35 PM](#)

[Not Reformed](#) said...

Clown-prince...

I have two words for you: Spell Check.

That last post of yours was horrible! Seriously...how does a person that supposedly is going to a place of higher learning do so poorly at spelling? Trying to make sense of your blatherings is a difficult task indeed!

"firts week" "toilett"

Maybe your brain gets too hot with the sun beating down on your shiny head and it fries your spelling neurons?

I stand by my comment about what you \*believe\*...based on this question:

Can a person \*believe\* in the Christian \*God\* without \*God\* calling them?

[August 09, 2005 2:40 PM](#)

[Paul Manata](#) said...

This post has been removed by the author.

[August 09, 2005 6:24 PM](#)

[Not Reformed](#) said...

Shiny headed short man...

Mere assertion on your part. Prove that a person can believe in God without God granting that belief.

I've read elsewhere on the web YOU stating that you didn't \*choose\* to become a believer, but the choice was given to you by God. Kinda a basic tenet of the Calvinistic clown-faith you hold, isn't it?

Four Words: hair piece shoe inserts

[August 09, 2005 6:29 PM](#)

[Bahnsen Burner](#) said...

NR, isn't it interesting how those who claim to be "thinking God's thoughts after Him" can't spell worth a hill a beans? How does the presuppositionalist account for this? Perhaps God must be a poor speller as well.

I'll be responding to Paul's drivel once I'm back in the States.

[August 09, 2005 8:22 PM](#)

[Paul Manata](#) said...

This post has been removed by the author.

[August 10, 2005 8:34 AM](#)

[Not Reformed](#) said...

Clown-prince...

So you're all excited because I didn't stipulate your particular definition of belief? Whoop dee frickin doo.

You saw 3 moves ahead that you could declare 'victory' because of a different meaning of the word 'belief?' Wow...those are some AWESOME skills you've got there, my little friend.

How about this? I knew that you would respond with another error (spelling/grammar) filled post declaring yourself VICTOR while all the while making yourself out to be a moron. And it came true!!! I saw 13 moves ahead and set the trap! MOO HOO HA HA!!!

Your silly assertions that all men \*believe\* in God (but not the MAGIC \*saving\* belief that God gives to the special few) is simply gibberish. I know, I know, you base it on Romans...but with all of the other crap that isn't true in your mystical book, I have no reason to believe that statement either.

And be honest...you don't argue because you're commanded to spread the good news....you argue because its in your nature...you're just as 'fallen' as you were before you drank the christian kool-aid. You have no 'love for the lost.' You count yourself as special, called by God, and you enjoy mocking those that don't agree with you. Subconsciously, you are seeking to reaffirm what you know isn't true by these silly discussions as well.

That's my free psychological profile for you, heavy emphasis on the PSYCHO.

[August 10, 2005 9:37 AM](#)

[Bahnsen Burner](#) said...

NR, I've long held that Paul Manata simply has an unchecked bad attitude, and if he thinks he's going to find a solution to his personal problems in the mystical beliefs of Christianity, he's sorely mistaken. All this has done has given him the moral blank check he's always wanted in order to continue in his bad attitude, as well as a wealth of evasions to enable it. As Peikoff rightly put it, "With God, all things are permissible." He's quite right.

Best regards,  
Dawson

[August 10, 2005 7:43 PM](#)

[Not Reformed](#) said...

buh bye Paulie...those posts you deleted were pretty lame, so I'm not surprised to see you got rid of them...so sad to see you go...again...

Here's a site with some tools to help you with your spelling \*challenge\*

<http://homeschooling.about.com/cs/toppicks/tp/tpspelling.htm>

[August 13, 2005 5:18 PM](#)

[Francois Tremblay](#) said...

I just added this article of yours to the Atheology section on strongatheism.net , Dawson. Hope you don't mind, but I think it makes a solid addition. Properly attributed, of course.

[August 14, 2005 9:30 PM](#)