

8

IS ‘GOD’ A SPLIT IDENTITY?

Is Godism a new form of Arianism?

‘There is nothing new under the sun’ has become a well known proverb.¹ As we look into economics, politics, history, and in the seemingly endless series of comedy and drama ‘repeats’ served up to the consuming public by the broadcast media, we do see a pattern of repetition through many aspects of human endeavour. History does seem to repeat itself. Another, slightly hackneyed, proverb is that ‘the lesson of history is that we never learn the lessons of history’ and so we carry on making the same old mistakes that were made by our grandfathers. In chapter 6 we considered whether Godism is in fact another form of Gnosticism and concluded that Godism does indeed share features of that early heresy. We pause now to consider whether Godism also borrows from the second major heresy encountered by the Christian church – Arianism. At the risk of being repetitive, let us remind ourselves once again of what Godists generally believe, but noting there is divergence of belief: a Godist is someone who believes that there are many paths to ‘god’ and that no one religion

¹ Ecclesiastes 1:9 – Ecclesiastes is the Old Testament ‘philosophical’ book that demonstrates the meaninglessness of a world view that does not press beyond the limits of human experience to include God.

THE EMPTY PROMISE OF GODISM

holds all the answers'; 'god', whoever 'he' or 'it' is, wants us all to live in harmony: our individual beliefs matter far less than the way that we conduct our lives. Concepts such as sin and salvation if accepted at all, need to be reinterpreted and constantly updated to fit with the complex and diverse world in which we live. Only serious misdemeanors, offences against our fellows when we should observe a 'Golden Rule' of compassion, will achieve God's displeasure.

Godism borrows from Theism, Deism, Monism and Gnosticism, as well as from the so-called 'higher religions'. It is God-centric, to the extent that it believes in a deity or deities which have an emotional interest in the mortal. Some Godists are adherents of particular religions but all are *religion-negative* to the extent that where religion gets in the way of the overall thrust of Godism (and it frequently does!) then the Godist is happy to bypass or trample the religion, which is not allowed to stand in the way of the overall belief.

It does not matter ultimately what you believe about God providing (a) you are sincere and (b) you do not hold your belief with excessive conviction. Something called 'compassion' is the highest virtue and is demonstrated by charitable acts. Godism is (generally) intolerant of exclusionary beliefs held with conviction by the adherents of *the religions*. To that extent Godism is as intolerant as any religion, but Godists purport to be otherwise.

Godists believe they have a heightened perception or truth as compared to the slavish adherents of *the religions* — this is *attained knowledge* rather than revelation.

All the scriptures of the higher religions are tainted, to the extent that either mankind has superimposed his beliefs and agendas onto what 'god' has revealed and/or there have

been serious mistranslations of ancient documents.² God can be held accountable for the effects of sin in this world

As Godism is a malleable thing, a sort of do it yourself (DIY) religion made up of bits and pieces of the 'higher religions' leading towards an identikit 'god', it is difficult to devise a final definitive statement of what it is. Rather we need to be alert for its inherent characteristics as we encounter it both in religious discourse and in the secular mindset. We can, however, posit this as a sort of pseudo-formula to describe Godism:

Godism is $G + R[n] + RI + AK - TS$ where

G = 'god'

R[n] = the 'higher religions' multiplied by [n] being the number of such religions as the Godist is willing to call an authentic religion of 'god'

RI = religious intuition

AK = attained knowledge

TS = tainted scriptures

The Godist belief takes priority. Where the so-called religious 'scriptures' are difficult, or contain embarrassments, or clash with other scriptures, then the Godist simply discounts them. Hence the 'minus TS' in the pseudo-formula above. We can see then that Godism is a veritable Googled belief system with a Googled 'god' — cutting, pasting and amending as seems appropriate. Although it borrows from ancient philosophies, it is postmodern in its willingness to shift ground easily and to ignore inconvenient truths. In conversation with some rather determined Godists, the author mentioned the historical and resurgent plight of

² Godists might add, aligning themselves with the Dan Brown (The DaVinci Code etc) school of 'theology', various ancient documents may have been suppressed and replaced with other writings.

the Dhimmi³ peoples as experienced in Muslim majority countries and the plight of the estimated 25,000 shrine prostitutes in Hindu India. Both these inconvenient truths were simply ignored as though they did not exist. How, we may wonder, can such troubling issues be so easily swept under the carpet? The answer seems to be because they challenge (and seemingly cannot be answered) the basic belief that ‘god’ invented **all** *the religions*, with their beliefs and practices, which are seen as fundamentally ‘good’ and harmonious. Accordingly, any unanswerable challenge to that ‘fundamentalist Godist’ view must be ignored and bypassed.

Godism, when viewed from a biblical and traditional Christian perspective, is seen to ‘borrow’ from specifically Christian heresies. A heresy (from a Christian perspective — noting that *the religions* also have definitions of heresy from their perspectives) is a belief or practice contrary to the orthodox doctrine of the Church.⁴ We might go a little further, noting that because there are different Christian denominations that hold sharply differing views, a Christian heresy can be defined as a teaching that is in clear contravention of the specific teachings of the Lord Jesus, or a teaching that is in clear contravention of what the Bible teaches and is widely understood to teach, and/or is a teaching or practice that runs counter to a straightforward understanding of the Apostles’ Creed (see below).

³ Historically non-Muslim peoples supposedly ‘protected’ by Islam. In practice under Shariah their lives became very much those of second class citizens with very few legal protections and the requirement to pay an additional tax called Jizya. The best known history of the Dhimmi peoples is that by Bat Ye’or ‘Islam and Dhimmitude’ ISBN 0-8386-3942-9 (cloth) 0-8386-3943-7 (pbk), a 500 page history from the earliest days of Islam to the 1980s.

⁴ It should be noted that we are not referring to the Eastern Orthodox tradition. By ‘orthodox’ we mean beliefs that are essentially in agreement with the clear teachings of the Bible and align to broadly mainstream Christian views.

IS 'GOD' A SPLIT IDENTITY?

Arius (born circa 250 AD; died 336 AD in Constantinople) was an initially Christian priest in Alexandria (Egypt) whose teachings created a theological system known as Arianism. This affirmed the Christ was not truly divine but a created being. Arius focused on the idea of the uniqueness of God, who alone is immutable (unchangeable) and self-existent. The Son, Arius claimed, is not self-existent and therefore cannot be God. Arius reasoned that the godhead, being unique, cannot be shared or *communicated*, so the Son cannot be God. The godhead is immutable, but the Son who grew and changed must be considered as *mutable* — and therefore cannot be God. Arius further reasoned that the Son must be a creature *created out of nothing* and must therefore have had a beginning, unlike God. The Son is therefore finite and of a different order of existence to the godhead.

Opponents were quick to see where Arius' teachings were heading: they reduce the Son to a demigod (or demiurge — part of the Gnostic philosophy); reintroduce polytheism, since worship of the Son was not abandoned by Arianism; and undermined the fundamental concept of redemption because only He who is truly God can be deemed to reconcile man to the godhead. The controversy seemed to have been brought to an end by the first ecumenical council held in Nicaea (May, AD 325) which condemned Arius and his teachings as heretical after he refused to sign the formula of faith stating that Christ was of the same divine nature as God. Influential support from church leaders in Asia Minor and from Constantina (Emperor Constantine I's daughter) succeeded in effecting Arius' return from exile and his readmission to the church after he agreed to a compromise formula. Shortly before he was to be formally reconciled, however, he collapsed and died whilst walking through the streets of Constantinople. The controversy did not die with

him and readers may want to consult a good encyclopedia or history of the early Church to follow the rather sad story. Essentially the heresy collapsed in 381 when the second ecumenical Council was held in Constantinople, when Arianism was once again proscribed.

Although this ended the battle within the Roman empire, Arianism continued amongst some Germanic tribes until the end of the seventh century. Truly there is nothing new under the sun! Today it is noteworthy that some Unitarians are virtually Arian in that they are unwilling either to reduce Christ to a mere human being or to attribute to Him a divine nature identical to that of the Father. The Christology of the Russelites (better known as the Jehovah's Witnesses) is also a form of Arianism. Although sociologists tend to lump together the Russelites and Unitarians as 'Christian' organisations, most of the orthodox church treat their belief systems as heretical and do not consider them to be part of the church. Godism, where held and accepted by church-goers as a philosophy, may not be Arian, as 'Christian Godists' would say that they affirm the Apostle's Creed: they affirm it, but in effect they add to it! So what precisely is the Apostles' Creed, and why do we conclude that 'Christian Godists' manage to affirm it? It is set out below:

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth: And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary, Suffered under Pontius Pilate, Was crucified, dead, and buried, He descended into hell; The third day he rose again from the dead, He ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholick Church; the Communion of Saints; The Forgiveness of sins; The Resurrection of the body, And the life everlasting. Amen.

A 'Christian Godist' would have no difficulty in 'confessing' all the words given above. They would simply rationalise their overall belief that Christianity is only one god-approved faith system and that 'god' loves and affirms them all. This means that all religions can affirm their creeds but Jesus, these particular 'Christian Godists' say, will 'save' all humans via their own religions. Some would add that Jesus remains the true way to God the Father and that religionists will be delighted and surprised when Jesus admits them to heaven! However the challenge reverts to the Godist: as we suggested in the Foreword to this book, if a Labour MP⁵ were to consistently sit and vote with the Conservative party there would come a point where the question had to be addressed: is this person truly a *Labourite*? The same challenge is offered to those of Godist persuasion where they are found in Church contexts. As their beliefs borrow so heavily from other religions, and from at least one clear heresy (Gnosticism), at what point do their heterodox views cease to be Christian?

Godism is not Arianism, directly. But since the Arianist view is close to the Muslim view of Christ, and since Godism borrows so heavily from or is enthusiastic about the teachings of *the religions*, there must logically come a point at which a church-based Godist, or a 'Christian Godist',⁶ ceases to be in any real sense a Christian, no matter what they think or say.

Differences Between the religions

We promised in Chapter 1 that this book would not be a comparison of religions. However we will spend a few

⁵ Member of Parliament in the UK

⁶ We use this term advisedly. A Godist cannot be a true Christian in the normative sense when we take into account the exclusive claims of Christianity.

THE EMPTY PROMISE OF GODISM

moments once again to examine some glaring differences between the world's major *faith systems* as a precursor to querying the Godist idea about the identity of God. The main faith systems in this world, or the 'higher religions' as they are increasingly dubbed, believe markedly different things. Readers may want to look again at the comparisons in chapter 6 where key religious beliefs are listed and summarized. We do at this point need to ask the logical question of all categories of Godist, whether church-based, or of *the religions* or of no-particular religion: does your 'god' have a split personality in that 'he' or 'it' can present himself/itself in such opposing ways? In chapters 6 and 7 we have posited that any 'god' who reveals himself like this could not be truly good, nor truly holy. As Godists generally believe that 'god' is ultimately responsible for sin in this world and is to some extent culpable for its effects, we conclude inevitably that along with 'his' or 'its' lack of goodness and holiness there must be something capricious in this deity. We begin to see that the Godist view of 'god' is in fact rather dismissive and irreverent. Readers may want to look at Appendix 1 to see some of the implications of basic Godist beliefs in a simple *mind-map* format. To argue that there are multiple paths to God quickly suggests, as has been argued earlier in this book, that God could not be good in the sense that we understand that term. Godists believe that their 'god' does not (really) mind about confusion between *the religions* with all the terrible implications that flow. It seems in the *mind-map* diagram at Appendix 1 that whichever path you take, ultimately it ends in a dismissive attitude to the Almighty.

We might again ask ourselves why anyone should want to create a 'god' at variance with the beliefs of all of the key religions in this world, then believe in and claim to

follow such a 'god'. In the politically correct West there is a supposed desire not to offend and to 'respect' everyone's beliefs. But this philosophy is not applied even-handedly — there is an increasing willingness to disrespect traditional Christian beliefs, so we may conclude that Western society as a whole is not shy about offending at least some of its members! There really must be a deeper reason why people seem today to be so anxious to have a 'god' whom it is difficult to discern, being comprised of different facets of different religions and belief systems — an identikit 'god'. So just what is that deeper reason? The most likely explanation is that such a 'god' is undemanding. Whilst writing this book the author was told about an interesting debate between a Christian and an acquaintance we will call Jack, who was an adherent of a traditional Christian denomination, but claimed to believe that all religions lead to God. A slightly tongue in cheek challenge was issued to 'Jack' to make up his mind about where he stood, as sitting on the religious fence for your whole life would be a distinctly uncomfortable spiritual experience for anyone! Jack's 'god' proved to be an easily controllable one. 'It' did not make any real demands upon Jack, who continued to lead a mildly hedonistic, Christ averse but 'god' tolerating lifestyle. This was a man who would not under any circumstances claim re-birth! Indeed he was suspicious of anyone who believed in such a notion, and yet he was an occasional church attender! His God was 'in a box' which is just where Jack wanted to keep the Deity. Jack could 'open the box' and access the Deity if things got tough, and keep the box lid tightly shut at all other times.

The challenge issued to Jack went something like that depicted on the next two pages

'GOD IN A BOX'

Is Jack listening to God? Or is Jack simply justifying his position?

Jack's accusation:

God is incompetent

You cannot get a reliable translation of the Bible — or any other religious book, and you cannot get trustworthy shepherds to look after your flock.

Everything is relative
(there are no absolutes)

Nothing is definite = very convenient!

Since nothing is dependable, Jack cannot be held to account, therefore Jack can do ('what the hell') he wants, providing it is within Jack's personal credo.

*= privatised religion
Jack's religion doesn't challenge, doesn't require change, doesn't require re-birth — and it allows Jack to do pretty much what he wants.*

God under Jack's thumb

*Don't you dare try and get out, or I'll accuse you of misleading people, of allowing lots of (perfectly plausible!) religions to emerge and of damning people out of hand.
Don't you dare try and get out, or I'll crucify you!*

Since every translation of every religious scripture has been corrupted, and therefore nothing can be trusted, Jack is free to make up his own credo.

It's a case of 'Heads, Jack wins, tails God loses!'. It is all very, very convenient!

Jack put his faith in the Dan Brown school of 'theology'; religion is a big conspiracy, a few people pull all the strings and religion is the opiate of the people.

Poor, stupid people. Shrewd old Jack!

But Jack is not totally certain, so he continues to curry favour with God ('just in case'). So he attends 'church' occasionally. Jack is hedging his bets!

The financial industry hedge funds hit the buffers in the financial crisis of 2008-9! Religious hedging may not be a good strategy either!

At heaven's 'pearly gates' Jack's defence is going to be: 'I went to church; if it wasn't any good then that's your fault, not mine.

Score: Jack 1 — God 0

'I'm sorry I couldn't trust your Bible; everyone was saying it was wrong so how was I to know? So that's your fault again.'

Score: Jack 2 — God 0

I picked the strongest 'Christian brand'. If it was no good, how was I to know? I'd already dismissed your Bible as unreliable — and I never fancied other churches!

Score: Jack 3 — God 0

All the religions looked OK to me — or at least all as bad as each other. If they weren't real then you should have done something about it. So it's your fault.

Score: Jack 4 — God 0

I lived my life as best I could. I sang the Frank Sinatra hymn 'I did it my way'!

BUT Jack still has the empty cross to contend with. Jack still has the empty tomb to contend with.

See Revelation 1:16.

The risen Lord Jesus when we next meet Him will be Jesus the judge, not 'gentle Jesus, meek and mild'.

The big question is: will Jack's defence stand up in the court of heaven? Does Jack believe in God or not? Is Jack simply hiding?

Jack must finally decide — and then declare just what sort of God he believes in.

THE EMPTY PROMISE OF GODISM

Whilst this character ‘Jack’ may be an unusually cynical church attender, his beliefs may not actually be so far from the beliefs of the ‘average’ man-in-the-street who, having thought for a few moments will declare that ‘all the religions follow the same “god” and what you have got to do is lead the best life you can, being compassionate where you can. The Almighty will be satisfied with that!’ It is precisely this sort of a ‘god’ that makes no (serious) demands and leaves us to get on with our lives more or less as we want to. Troublesome moral restrictions will be overlooked by this sort of ‘god’ and if we have got any of our ‘theology’ wrong, then this ‘god’ will see us all right in the end!

But is ‘god’ a split-identity as many seem to (want to) believe? Is such a ‘god’ a comfort-blanket rather than a consuming fire?⁷ Such a ‘god’ may seem to be consoling for a while, but we ought to echo the Old Testament character Job who demanded from his so-called comforters **“How then can you comfort me with empty words, since falsehood remains in your answers?”** (Job 21:34, NKJV) Where churchmen, especially church leaders, teach about a ‘god of *the religions*’ are they in reality consoling us with nonsense (in the words of the NIV) or empty words (in the NKJV translation)? We have noted elsewhere that Godists rely ultimately on a sort of *religious intuition*. Godists think they can ‘see’ things that are hidden from the singular adherents of the various religions. Godists have a special knowledge or *gnosis* of these things; they are perhaps, wise in their own eyes. But the apostle Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians poured scorn on what the world considers to be wisdom. We do well to listen to him: **Where is the wise man? Where is the scholar? Where is the philosopher of**

⁷ See Hebrews 12:29.

this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? For since in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom did not know him, God was pleased through the foolishness of what was preached to save those who believe. Jews demand miraculous signs and Greeks look for wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified: a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles, but to those whom God has called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God. For the foolishness of God is wiser than man's wisdom, and the weakness of God is stronger than man's strength. (1 Corinthians 1:20–25, NIV)

The consistency and cohesion of God's personality

A convenient god or even a *convenience* god, that is a 'god' who reveals Himself to different audiences in totally different ways ('and to hell with the consequences'!) might fairly be accused of having a split personality. We have already reviewed whether such a 'god' could be called good and holy by the yardstick of the Holy Bible, and concluded that the answer to both questions is a resounding 'no'. If people really want to invent and believe in a 'god' that behaves in such a manner then, at the end of the day, that must be their own affair. We should take a few moments however, in concluding this chapter, to ask whether God as revealed in the Holy Bible can be accused of having a split identity – in other words *is* there any justification from the pages of the Bible in saying that God actually behaves as the Godists accuse Him of behaving?

We noted earlier in this book that some critics of Christianity accuse the Old Testament revelation of God as representing the 'harsh' face of God, and the New Testament of representing the 'nice' God that we all want

to follow today. But as we looked in earlier chapters at God's holiness and at His goodness we began to see even in some of the superficially 'harsh' commands of God, the fundamental compassion and goodness of God, and His overriding concern for the weak and the defenceless, as well as His opposition to the overweening power of the world's rich and powerful who all too often abuse their positions of influence and who oppress the weak. The author prefers increasingly to consider the Old Testament as *the promise* (of the Messiah) and the New Testament as *the promise fulfilled* (in the person and work of the Lord Jesus). As we consider the increasingly insistent promise of a Saviour to come, and at the reality of that Saviour when finally He arrived and had His earthly ministry among us, we see a real consistency at work. At its most basic, God always had in mind to provide a Saviour to all who would receive Him, not just to the chosen Hebrew people.⁸ But God decided that He would represent Himself first in His chosen people, then in the Law, and finally in His Son, the fulfilment of that Law. God's manifesto, we might say, was set out definitively in the Ten Commandments (see chapter 3). God established an agreement — or a covenant — with the Jewish people⁹ but promised from earliest of times that one day that covenant would be expanded to cover all peoples. In this regard, readers are directed to Isaiah chapter 56 and its first 8 verses. The context of this passage is that God has in the previous chapter issued an invitation to all who are hungry and thirsty (for Him) because He will satisfy them: **Listen carefully to Me, and eat what is good, and let your soul delight itself in abundance.** (Isaiah 55:2, NKJV)

⁸ See for example Romans chapter 9.

⁹ God's covenant with Abraham is recounted in Genesis chapter 15 and Genesis chapter 17. It is further formalised in Deuteronomy Chapter 28.

IS 'GOD' A SPLIT IDENTITY?

Having listened to God, they will go away fully satisfied, as this picturesque language shows:

**For you shall go out with joy,
and be led out with peace;
the mountains and the hills
shall break forth into singing before you,
and all the trees of the field shall
clap their hands.**

(Isaiah 55:12, NKJV)

This promise, it should be noted, is made to the chosen, Hebrew, people. But it will be extended to cover all mankind, as we discover in the following chapter:

Thus says the LORD:

**“Keep justice, and do righteousness,
For My salvation is about to come,
and My righteousness to be revealed.”**

**Blessed is the man who does this,
and the son of man who lays hold on it;
who keeps from defiling the Sabbath,
and keeps his hand from doing any evil.”**

**Do not let the son of the foreigner
who has joined himself to the LORD**

speak, saying,

**“The LORD has utterly separated me from His
people”;**

nor let the eunuch say,

“Here I am, a dry tree.”

For thus says the LORD:

**“To the eunuchs who keep My Sabbaths,
and choose what pleases Me,
and hold fast My covenant,
even to them I will give in My house**

THE EMPTY PROMISE OF GODISM

**and within My walls a place and a name
better than that of sons and daughters;
I will give them an everlasting name
that shall not be cut off.**

**“Also the sons of the foreigner
who join themselves to the LORD, to serve Him,
and to love the name of the LORD, to be His
servants—
everyone who keeps from defiling the Sabbath,
and holds fast My covenant—
even them I will bring to My holy mountain,
and make them joyful in My house of prayer.
their burnt offerings and their sacrifices
will be accepted on My altar;
for My house shall be called a house of prayer for all
nations.”
The Lord GOD, who gathers the outcasts of Israel,
says,**

**“Yet I will gather to him
Others besides those who are gathered to him.”**

(Isaiah 56:1–8, NKJV)

This is an important prophecy: it promises that salvation in the broadest sense is not reserved solely for Jewish people. Godists may take this passage and try to reinterpret it to mean that all ‘religionists’ who keep God’s laws will be saved by Him, and/or that He will accept their personal efforts as a sufficient basis on which an eternal relationship with Him can be built. If they do so, they are building a huge ‘theology’ on a perilously narrow base. What the passage *does* clearly state is that in the future God intends to build a relationship with those who are not Jewish but

IS 'GOD' A SPLIT IDENTITY?

who nevertheless do truly follow Him. Christians see this as fulfilled precisely and without equivocation in the promise that to all who follow the Lord Jesus, salvation will be assured (John 3:15 in particular, but John 3:1 – 21 is relevant). We immediately need to add that mere belief in Jesus is not what God has in mind here — after all, even the devil believes in Jesus! So this is a belief which completely transforms and enables Jesus to present such believers before God not only as His disciples, not only as people who have conscientiously tried to live good lives in His power, but also as people who are holy! This is a difficult thing to grasp so we will return to it later in chapter 10. Rather than try to do a detailed examination of the Old and New Testaments, to show the unity between them, which would be better served by a different sort of book, we will simply posit the view that God's personality as revealed in the two Testaments is not split, but is in perfect harmony. So, to look at the key attributes of God that we glanced at in chapter 2, we list them in the table below, which indicates that beautiful harmony and consistency:

GOD'S INNER HARMONY

God's attribute revealed	Old Testament	New Testament
One and only	Is 44:6	Gal 3:15-20
Unchangeable	Mal 3:6	Jas 1:17
Invisible	Deut 4:12	Col 1:15 Jn 5:37
Infinite	1 Kgs 8:27	Eph 3:18-19
Holy	Is 6:3	1 Pet 1:15-16
Unity	Deut 6:4	Gal 3:20 (& v.16) 1 Tim 2:5, Jas 2:19
Father, Son and Spirit	Gen 1:26; Is 9:6	Matt 28:19 (name, not names!) 2 Cor 13-14 Heb 1:8, 1 Pet 1:2

THE EMPTY PROMISE OF GODISM

Eternal pre-existence	Gen 1:1, Dan7:9, 13, 22	Jn 1:1,1 Jn 1:1
Wisdom	Prov 3:3 Prov 4 (all)	1 Cor 1:25
Sovereignty	Ps 24:1	Rev 6:10
Immensity	Ps 139:7-12	2 Pet 1:3
Independence	Ex 3:14 (I AM)	Jn 8:58
Spirituality	Gen 1:1-2	Lk 1:35, Rom 15:19
Omnipotence	Job 42:2 Gen 18:14	Matt 19:26
Truthfulness	Num 23:19	Jn 14:6
Love	Gen 34:6 Ps 136 (all)	Jn 3:16, 1 Jn 3:11-18 1 Jn 4:8

It is important to state that the texts above are *not* proof-positive of the key claims they make and the author does not expect the reader to accept them slavishly as such. However it is difficult to argue, as Godists seem to, that God's personality is in some way split so that He has to reveal Himself (or has chosen to reveal Himself) in diametrically opposed ways in the various religions. The passages cited here do at least suggest — and this author would claim, suggest beyond reasonable contradiction — that God as revealed in both Old and New Testaments of the Holy Bible is entirely self-consistent. Rather it is for the Godists to prove the point that they are making (whether they acknowledge it or not — and many of them will not!) that 'god' has in fact contradicted Himself by His supposed employment of multiple, fractured and inconsistent 'revelations' (and indeed to prove their claim beyond reasonable doubt).