

The Origin of Sin – briefly stated

While doing research on what various Christian denominations and groups believe about the origin of sin, I ran across the following article "[Where Did Sin Come From?](#)" which explored the question of the origin of sin. The summation of the article did not answer the question at all, but left the reader with the following questions:

To answer our question, 'Where did sin come from?', we make the following conclusions:

- 1. Although Lucifer spawned the first sin, he was not the creator of the concept of sin.*
- 2. The concept of sin has always been known to the all-knowing God.*
- 3. Sin exists because—either it is a created concept of God brought about by God's decrees, or, it has always co-existed as the eternal antithesis of everything that God is.*
- 4. Sin could only experientially exist because, although God cannot sin, He made creatures who could.*

I could not bear it, and emailed the webmaster with the following question:

Who wrote this nonsense? Give me a name please.

And listed the questions above. I then finished with the following statement:

This evidences a complete and total lack of understanding. Whoever wrote this, missed the mark.

The gentleman who wrote it answered back, and was gracious

(considering my initial contact email) and stated that I had contested, but gave no reasons for disagreement. Moreover, he would be glad to address my concerns.

Fair enough. After all, had he been less than gracious, I would have deserved it. I thanked him for being gracious, and sent the following reply:

Sin has a cause, and that is transgression, which is brought about because of iniquity:

And I will cleanse them from all **their iniquity, whereby they have sinned** against me; and I will pardon all **their iniquities, whereby they have sinned, and whereby they have transgressed** against me. (*Jeremiah 33:8*)

Iniquity leads to transgression, which immediately results in sin.

Iniquity is the property of being unequal in any of one's ways:

Yet saith the house of Israel, **The way of the Lord is not equal**. O house of Israel, are not **my ways equal? are not your ways unequal?** Therefore **I will judge you,** O house of Israel, every one **according to his ways,** saith the Lord GOD. Repent, and **turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin.** Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel? (*Ezekiel 18:29-31*)

When the LORD states that the ways of the people of Israel are unequal, and He then calls them to turn so iniquity will not be their ruin, He is defining what iniquity is. To help in our understanding, we can use the analogy of a math equation (which is an equality):

In thinking about equations: If we introduce into it any element that makes it unequal, what are our chances of making it equal if we don't realize what we did? What are our chances of actually realizing we introduced an inequality? Moreover, if our understanding is not accurate because we perceive the equation wrongly (unequally – that is, not as it actually is), what are our chances of self-correction?

When a mistake is made working an equation, generally the person does not realize they erred, else they stop immediately and correct the error. However, the divergence with righteousness and iniquity here is that once a thought exists, it cannot be unthought or taken back. Since it is that the LORD judges the thoughts of the heart, once Lucifer had that one thought of being more glorious than the LORD on the throne, he committed an iniquity. Due to the very nature of inequality, he could not go back, nor find his way back. Because of this iniquity, pride arose, and Satan viewed himself to be better than the LORD God in numerous ways. Hence, he rebelled.

Now to look at righteousness: Being righteous is being equal in all one's ways (which only the LORD God is):

Before the LORD; for he cometh to **judge the earth: with righteousness** shall he **judge the world, and the people with equity**. (*Psalms 98:9*)

Here, like in Ezekiel, the LORD defines another term. Only in this case, it is righteousness. Putting the two together: Righteousness is the property of being equal in ALL one's ways, and iniquity is the property of being unequal in ANY of one's ways. It is of necessity true that if righteousness requires for all ways to be equal, that being (or becoming) unequal in any of one's ways, means that one has iniquity. Moreover, like the math equation, being unequal in one part,

spreads to every other part – and it grows.

Once one cannot perceive correctly because of being unequal (iniquity), the determination of what is the right thing to do is clouded and misperceived. It is easy to see then how we can transgress the bounds if we have difficulty perceiving where the bounds are. As soon as we transgress, we have missed the mark (sinned).

Briefly, to answer the final points you put forth in the article:

To answer our question, 'Where did sin come from?', we make the following conclusions: [My answers are in square brackets – italics for the web]

1. *Although Lucifer spawned the first sin, he was not the creator of the concept of sin. [There is no "concept of sin." Sin is not a concept. Rather, is a direct result of transgression (which is exceeding the bounds – thus missing the mark), which is brought about because of iniquity. Satan exercised iniquity because he thought in his heart that he was better than the LORD sitting on the throne he was covering (the descriptions of both the LORD and Satan are in the Scriptures, and that difference is significant). The "problem" is that the LORD gave both angels and men freewill and the ability to judge, but they were not given omniscience. Hence, perception and understanding were limited. Satan lost sight of who created him and gave him all that he had. To man, Satan is beyond genius. But he lost sight of the fact that he was GIVEN that. Just like his beauty and musical ability, his intelligence was given him by the LORD God. However, once he lost sight of that, it was a mere thought of the heart to become unequal – which slipped him into iniquity. Now Satan can never return from that, but only gets more and more unequal over time.]*

2. *The concept of sin has always been known to the all-*

knowing God. [No, the fact that creatures with free-will and the ability to judge, yet not having omniscience would have the potential to slip into iniquity, was known to the LORD God. Nevertheless, He chose to create them that way, and would deal with the consequences. The LORD God already knew what those consequences were, but He desired to create beings that would love Him of their own volition. The very nature of free-will, combined with the ability to judge, creates a situation in which the potential for iniquity exists. However, for love to be genuine, the will must be free, and to actually choose freely, one must be able to judge independently – that is, of oneself, given the facts to make a determination.]

3. Sin exists because—either it is a created concept of God brought about by God’s decrees, or, it has always co-existed as the eternal antithesis of everything that God is. [This is a false choice. We are to choose between the LORD God being the ultimate author of sin, or the core of Taoism? This is expressly man’s view, which lacks understanding of iniquity and righteousness.]

4. Sin could only experientially exist because, although God cannot sin, He made creatures who could. [Here you are closest to being right, but answer no questions. You would have to explain what you mean by “He made creatures who could.” How, and in what way?]

You are getting the essence of the doctrine. This is by no means extensive in addressing the ramifications of iniquity. But, it should briefly explain where sin came from. Of course, if you are of Calvinist or Reformed persuasion, you will likely reject everything I say.

In Christ,

Paul W. Davis

A Question for Calvinists

In the Scripture the following account is given of an interaction between the Lord Jesus Christ and a young man:

And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? *there is none good but one, that is, God*: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? Jesus said, Thou shalt do no murder, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Honour thy father and *thy* mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. The young man saith unto him, All these things have I kept from my youth up: what lack I yet? **Jesus said unto him, If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come and follow me.** (*Matthew 19:16-21*)

In light of the Calvinist doctrine of predestination, please answer the following questions:

1. If Calvinism is true, why did the Lord Jesus Christ lie to the young man?
2. Why did he not tell him that he was not ordained to eternal life, and there was no point in trying?
3. Surely Jesus knew the young man would not believe. Why did he string him along with a promise he had no intention of fulfilling?
4. In fact, what he told the young man couldn't be fulfilled as the man was obviously not ordained to life. Why did Jesus do this?

Why did the Calvinist Jesus deceive the man (and everyone else who has knowledge of this incident) and lie to him? How

is this righteous?

Here's the short answer: It isn't.

Moreover, no amount of logic twisting and distorting the words of Scripture are going to make it so. How can it be acceptable for the Lord Jesus to not tell the man the truth of his predicament? After all, in Matthew 23, he told the Pharisees the truth of their predicament? What would be the difference here?

If you tell one, you have to tell the other. That is the only righteous way to deal with both situations. That is the only way that is equal.

Don't be like the Catholics and tell me "It's a mystery." That is a cop out and a dodge. Besides, it is obvious that there can only be one answer under Calvinist doctrine:

This 'Jesus' committed iniquity.

And, since the Calvinist Jesus committed iniquity, how does he pay for the sins of anyone else? How is he that "perfect sacrifice" which is necessary for the payment of the sins of those he 'saves?'

I would like an honest answer. Unfortunately, based upon all my interaction with those holding Calvinist/Reformed doctrine, I am not going to hold my breath waiting for it. I have yet to meet one that is intellectually honest.

Still, it would be good to see the explanation.

Why and How is the LORD God Able to Maintain His Righteousness

Yet saith the house of Israel, The way of the Lord is not equal. O house of Israel, are not my ways equal? are not your ways unequal? Therefore I will judge you, O house of Israel, every one according to his ways, saith the Lord GOD. Repent, and turn *yourselves* from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin. (*Ezekiel 18:29-30*)

Why is it that the LORD God is able to maintain His righteousness, or the equality of all His ways in and of Himself.

To begin with, the LORD God is omniscient, that is, He knows all things. This is not merely having all knowledge, (which we typically think of as mere information) but includes all understanding of that information, and all wisdom to properly apply that information.

We must understand that having knowledge, which is information, is not merely enough, but one must know the significance of that information, which is understanding. One must also know how to apply the information to everything that concerns them. The ability to properly apply the information and understanding one has, is called wisdom. The Scripture is express that the LORD God's understanding is infinite, which of necessity, means that His knowledge is infinite, or omniscient.

Great *is* our Lord, and of great power: his understanding *is* infinite. (*Psalms 147:5*)

Understanding in itself is a kind of knowledge. It does not simply deal with information, but deals with the significance

of that information: that is what that information means and how it relates to everything else. Understanding is essential to wisdom, for without understanding, there is simply no way to determine the weight, or significance of one thing versus another: whether something is to be of concern, or whether it can be ignored, or is of lesser significance.

Hence, we are led to wisdom, which is essential for the construct of things. Wisdom in itself is a kind of knowledge. It is the knowledge of how information is to be applied and how it will work out as things interact. Without it, it would have been impossible for the LORD God to create anything that worked. And yet, so wise is the LORD in His creation that even in a corrupted state, it still is a wonder to behold and works quite well.

To him that by wisdom made the heavens: for his mercy *endureth* for ever. (*Psalms 136:5*)

The LORD by wisdom hath founded the earth; by understanding hath he established the heavens. (*Proverbs 3:19*)

Thus, when we say the LORD God is omniscient, it, in practical terms, means that the LORD God knows all that exists, and knows all the significance of everything, and is able to properly weight that information and thus apply it properly and correctly to every situation that exists or could exist, for all eternity.

In sum, the LORD God knows all things, and all out-workings that are and can be of those things and their interaction with all other things, for all time and eternity. Moreover, He knows that He knows all things which are, and knows that He knows all out-workings that are and will be. Additionally, the LORD God knows there is nothing else to know that can be known.

Without this knowledge and understanding, maintaining His righteousness would be impossible as He must know the end, and

possible ends of everything that is or could be. Else, there exists the possibility of any action made by the LORD God that would be unequal in its end. This would yield unrighteousness, which is impossible with the LORD God.

But omniscience is not enough to maintain righteousness. It is not sufficient to merely have all knowledge so that in all workings accomplished, the end of all is known. Rather, one must also love equity or equality:

Thus saith the LORD, Let not the wise *man* glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty *man* glory in his might, let not the rich *man* glory in his riches: But let him that glorieth glory in this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that **I am the LORD which exercise lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness, in the earth: for in these things I delight,** saith the LORD. (*Jeremiah 9:23-24*)

The LORD *is* in his holy temple, the LORD'S throne *is* in heaven: his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men. The LORD trieth the righteous: **but the wicked and him that loveth violence his soul hateth.** Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible tempest: *this shall be* the portion of their cup. **For the righteous LORD loveth righteousness;** his countenance doth behold the upright. (*Psalms 11:4-7*)

(Here I speak as a man, from man's perspective): Without a love for righteousness, there is no motivator to be righteous, though one may know all things which are, or could be, and the outworking of them all,

The LORD God delights in equity in all things, and in all His ways. It is His greatest pleasure to see things which are equal, balanced and true. Whether that equity, which is righteousness, is from the things He makes directly, or from His creatures, it is a delight to His soul to behold them.

Without this love for equity, righteousness and truth, which

is in and of Himself, coupled with His omniscience, which is in and of Himself, righteousness would not be maintained.

This post updated and expanded – 07/21/2014

When Ignorance Speaks

I do not watch, nor do I care about Duck Dynasty. I don't have time for television, and I really don't need to waste what time I have on a "reality show." That stated, I do happen to know a bit about Duck Dynasty as there are those I work with who do watch it, and news about it is all over the internet.

So, when the elder of the family that the program is about makes comments that get him fired from the show, it makes news. It is the comments that interest me. More precisely, it is the reaction to the comments that I am interested in. Comments such as this one:

*"Phil and his family claim to be Christian, but Phil's lies about an entire community fly in the face of what true Christians believe," GLAAD spokesperson **Wilson Cruz** said. "He clearly knows nothing about gay people or the majority of Louisianans – and Americans – who support legal recognition for loving and committed gay and lesbian couples. ([\('Duck Dynasty's' Phil Robertson on Indefinite Hiatus Following Anti-Gay Remarks, The Hollywood Reporter\)](#))*

Now, I happen to know that the family that the show is built around is Church of Christ. I take issue with the perversion of the Gospel of Christ that the Church of Christ puts forth as the "truth." I can legitimately do this as I do know something about the Scripture and the doctrine of Christ,

specifically the Gospel. However, I just don't think Wilson Cruz does.

I don't think Wilson Cruz is anywhere near qualified to state what Christians believe, or to make comment about anything relating to the Scripture.

Why?

Let's try the following passages of Scripture, and keep firmly in mind that the LORD in the Old Testament that came to man and dealt directly with man, is none other than the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. Yes, bear that in mind that the one who died on the cross is also the one that spoke to Moses out of the burning bush, and spoke to Job and his friends out of the whirlwind.

The sun was risen upon the earth when Lot entered into Zoar. Then **the LORD rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the LORD out of heaven;** And he overthrew those cities, and all the plain, and all the inhabitants of the cities, and that which grew upon the ground. But his wife looked back from behind him, and she became a pillar of salt. And Abraham gat up early in the morning to the place where he stood before the LORD: And he looked toward Sodom and Gomorrah, and toward all the land of the plain, and beheld, and, lo, the smoke of the country went up as the smoke of a furnace. And it came to pass, when God destroyed the cities of the plain, that God remembered Abraham, and sent Lot out of the midst of the overthrow, when he overthrew the cities in the which Lot dwelt. (*Genesis 19:23-29*)

This same LORD had eaten a meal with Abraham the previous day, and Abraham had interceded for Sodom and Gomorrah, that the LORD should not destroy them should at least ten (10) righteous men be found in them. By the way, what was Sodom and Gomorrah's wickedness that warranted destruction?

Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is

abomination. Neither shalt thou lie with any beast to defile thyself therewith: neither shall any woman stand before a beast to lie down thereto: it is confusion. (*Leviticus 18:22-23*)

If a man also lie with mankind, as he lieth with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination: they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon them. (*Leviticus 20:13*)

Just who was it that gave the Levitical Law to Moses to give to the children of Israel? Who was it that met with Moses on Mount Sinai?

Well, that would be the Word, who would take the office of Christ and die to reconcile man to the LORD God.

This also belongs to Christ Jesus:

Nevertheless I tell you the truth; It is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: Of sin, because they believe not on me; Of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; Of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged. I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come. (*John 16:7-13*)

Hence, when the apostle Paul wrote the epistle to the Romans, he penned chapter one by the Holy Ghost, who instructed him in accordance with what the Lord Jesus Christ wanted conveyed. And what does chapter one convey to everyone?

The descent into destruction:

Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, And changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonour their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen. **For this cause God gave them up unto vile affections: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is against nature: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust one toward another; men with men working that which is unseemly, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their error which was meet.** And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them. (*Romans 1:22-32*)

Why does the LORD God call homosexuality an abomination?

Answer a couple of simple questions:

1. What if everyone engaged in same gender relationships only?
2. What would happen to the human race?

Suicide. Self-murder.

Homosexuality is against the very design of man. This kind of

activity is destructive to the entire human race.

There is only one creature, one man that would delight in seeing the race of man engage in self-destructive behavior.

Satan.

Why? Because man is made in the similitude of God, and Satan hates the LORD God.

However, man does not need any help in engaging in self-destructive beliefs and behavior. Our own iniquity is plenty sufficient a generator of bad doctrine and the resultant behavior.

It won't be any comfort to Wilson Cruz, but Phil of Duck Dynasty has his own set of problems to resolve before the LORD – his corrupt understanding of the Gospel:

But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, **let him be accursed**. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, **let him be accursed**. (*Galatians 1:8-9*)

You see, Church of Christ doctrine demands that you be baptized for salvation. Hence, they hold that one is not saved unless one is baptized. However, the Scripture states otherwise:

For Christ sent me **not to baptize, but to preach the gospel**: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect. (*I Corinthians 1:17*)

And:

And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work. (*Romans 11:6*)

Quite obviously water baptism is a work, and it is not part of the Gospel. Which means Church of Christ salvation is of works, and thus under a curse.

Being right about the wickedness of homosexuality is cold comfort when the most important knowledge to obtain is a true Gospel. Whether one is an abomination, or simply accursed, wrong is still wrong. Both individuals fall short of the truth – and it is going to cost them in the end.

Ignorance, it seems, has a rather loud voice.

When Ignorance Rules

The following was posted on Facebook by someone who will remain nameless:

I think man wants to believe in god because believing in our ourselves would require taking responsibility for the horrible things we have done, it's much easier to lay the blame for that on our "nature" and pray to an imagined construct for salvation than to take responsibility for ourselves.

Christianity, why are you so fallacious?

sigh

Either it is ignorance of history, particularly recent (last 200 years or so) history, or the individual posting this just wanted to say something, anything to strike back. The reason I state that is because of the unmitigated slaughter which has taken place in the last 200 years by governments and organizations which, as a tenet of their philosophy, expressly deny the existence of God.

Let's look at the numbers
 ((<http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/20TH.HTM>)):

TABLE 1.2
20th Century Democide

REGIMES	YEARS	DEMOCID (OOO)[1]			ANNUAL RATE % [2]	
		TOTAL	DOMESTIC	GENOCIDE		
MEGAMURDERERS	1900-87	151,491	116,380	33,476		[4]
DEKA-MEGAMURDERERS	1900-87	128,168	100,842	26,690	0.18	[4]
U.S.S.R.	1917-87	61,911	54,769	10,000	0.42	
China (PRC)	1949-87	35,236	35,236	375	0.12	
Germany	1933-45	20,946	762	16,315	0.09	
China (KMT)	1928-49	10,075	10,075	Nil	0.07	[5]
LESSER MEGAMURDERS	1900-87	19,178	12,237	6,184	1.63	[4]
Japan	1936-45	5,964	Nil	Nil	Nil	
China (Mao Soviets) [3]	1923-49	3,466	3,466	Nil	0.05	[5]
Cambodia	1975-79	2,035	2,000	541	8.16	
Turkey	1909-18	1,883	1,752	1,883	0.96	
Vietnam	1945-87	1,670	944	Nil	0.10	
Poland	1945-48	1,585	1,585	1,585	1.99	
Pakistan	1958-87	1,503	1,503	1,500	0.06	
Yugoslavia (Tito)	1944-87	1,072	987	675	0.12	
SUSPECTED MEGAMURDERERS	1900-87	4,145	3,301	602	0.24	[4]
North Korea	1948-87	1,663	1,293	Nil	0.25	
Mexico	1900-20	1,417	1,417	100	0.45	
Russia	1900-17	1,066	591	502	0.02	
CENTI-KILOMURDERERS	1900-87	14,918	10,812	4,071	0.26	[4]
TOP 5	1900-87	4,074	2,192	1,078	0.89	[4]
China (Warlords)	1917-49	910	910	Nil	0.02	
Turkey (Atatürk)	1919-23	878	703	878	2.64	
United Kingdom	1900-87	816	Nil	Nil	Nil	
Portugal (Dictatorship)	1926-82	741	Nil	Nil	Nil	
Indonesia	1965-87	729	579	200	0.02	
LESSER MURDERERS	1900-87	2,792	2,355	1,019	.1	[4]
WORLD TOTAL	1900-87	169,202	129,547	38,566	.1	[6]

1. Includes genocide, politicide, and mass murder; excludes war-dead. These are most probable mid-estimates in low to high ranges. Figures may not sum due to round off.
2. The percent of a population killed in democide per year of the regime
3. Guerrilla period. 4. Average.
5. The rate is the average of that for three successive periods.
6. The world annual rate is calculated for the 1944 global population

20th Century democide

And the numbers of dead are from those humanists who (according to the poster on Facebook) have no problem taking responsibility for what they have done. Of course, that is a

lie as the regimes attempted to hide what they were doing as long as they could. Moreover, to the victims of such regimes, I really don't think it makes any difference – dead is still dead. We must also remember that the God-rejecting communists did all this in the name of making man “better,” of creating the “new communist man” devoid of any “superstition.” ((ibid))

In the following chart (also taken from the Democide site), the numbers above are narrowed to include only communist regimes:

Communist Democide 1900-1987

STATE/QUASI-STATE/GROUP	START YEAR	END YEAR	TOTAL DEMOCIDE (000)		
			LOW	MID	HIGH
Afghanistan	1978	1987	62	228	703
Albania	1944	1987	25	100	150
Angola	1975	1987	100	125	200
Bulgaria (Communist)	1944	1987	172	222	322
Cambodia (Khmer Rouge)	1975	1979	635	2,035	3,035
Cambodia (KR guerr.)	1968	1987	222	362	462
Cambodia (Samrin)	1979	1987	68	230	383
China (Communists) [19]	1923	1949	1,838	3,466	11,692
China (PRC)	1949	1987	5,999	35,236	102,671
Cuba (Castro)	1959	1987	35	73	141
Cuba (Rebels)	1952	1959	0	1	1
Czechoslovakia (Communist)	1948	1968	24	65	181
El Salv (Guerrillas)	1979	1987	1	1	1
Ethiopia (Communist)	1974	1987	236	725	1,285
Ethiopia (Eritrea)	1974	1987	2	2	2
Ethiopia (Rebels) [23]	1976	1977	0	0	0
Germany (East)	1948	1987	70	70	70
Greece (ELAS)	1946	1949	14	20	25
Grenada (Coup)	1983	1983	0	0	0
Guatemala (Guerrillas)	1954	1987	8	14	23
Hungary (Communist)	1948	1987	27	27	27
Indonesia (Communists)	1948	1948	2	2	2
Korea, North	1948	1987	710	1,663	3,549
Laos (Pathet Lao)	1960	1975	33	38	55
Laos (PDR)	1975	1987	46	56	70
Malayan (Communists)	1946	1951	3	3	3
Mongolia	1926	1987	35	100	200
Mozambique	1975	1987	153	198	350
Mozambique (Frelimo)	1964	1975	3	3	3
Nicaragua (Sandinistas)	1979	1987	4	5	7
Peru (Shining Path)	1980	1987	2	4	5
Philippines (Communists)	1972	1986	5	5	5
Poland (Communist)	1948	1987	10	22	54
Rumania (Communism)	1948	1987	245	435	920
USSR [27]	1917	1987	28,326	61,911	126,891
Vietnam [28]	1945	1987	721	1,670	3,664
Yemen, South	1967	1987	1	1	1
Yugoslavia (Partisans)	1941	1944	50	100	150
Yugoslavia (Tito)	1944	1987	585	1,072	2,130
TOTAL =			40,472	110,286	259,432

It is the 259,432,000 persons that is utterly staggering to consider. At this time (10/2013) there are approximately 300,000,000 individuals in the United States. If the number of

dead, killed by the humanist-driven communists, were to be subtracted from our present population, the United States would be left with barely over 40,000,000 individuals. That is just a tad over 86.4 percent of the population of the United States.

The following is from the page "[HOW MANY DID COMMUNIST REGIMES MURDER?](#)" By R.J. Rummel, in which he explains the motivation of the communists:

How can we understand all this killing by communists? It is the marriage of an absolutist ideology with the absolute power. Communists believed that they knew the truth, absolutely. They believed that they knew through Marxism what would bring about the greatest human welfare and happiness. And they believed that power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, must be used to tear down the old feudal or capitalist order and rebuild society and culture to realize this utopia. Nothing must stand in the way of its achievement. Government—the Communist Party—was thus above any law. All institutions, cultural norms, traditions, and sentiments were expendable. And the people were as though lumber and bricks, to be used in building the new world.

Constructing this utopia was seen as though a war on poverty, exploitation, imperialism, and inequality. And for the greater good, as in a real war, people are killed. And thus this war for the communist utopia had its necessary enemy casualties, the clergy, bourgeoisie, capitalists, wreckers, counterrevolutionaries, rightists, tyrants, rich, landlords, and noncombatants that unfortunately got caught in the battle. In a war millions may die, but the cause may be well justified, as in the defeat of Hitler and an utterly racist Nazism. And to many communists, the cause of a communist utopia was such as to justify all the deaths. The irony of this is that communism in practice, even after decades of total control, did not improve the lot of the average person, but usually made their living conditions worse than before

the revolution. It is not by chance that the greatest famines have occurred within the Soviet Union (about 5,000,000 dead during 1921-23 and 7,000,000 from 1932-3) and communist China (about 27,000,000 dead from 1959-61). In total almost 55,000,000 people died in various communist famines and associated diseases, a little over 10,000,000 of them from democidal famine. This is as though the total population of Turkey, Iran, or Thailand had been completely wiped out. And that something like 35,000,000 people fled communist countries as refugees, as though the countries of Argentina or Columbia had been totally emptied of all their people, was an unparalleled vote against the utopian pretensions of Marxism-Leninism.

But communists could not be wrong. After all, their knowledge was scientific, based on historical materialism, an understanding of the dialectical process in nature and human society, and a materialist (and thus realistic) view of nature. Marx has shown empirically where society has been and why, and he and his interpreters proved that it was destined for a communist end. No one could prevent this, but only stand in the way and delay it at the cost of more human misery. Those who disagreed with this world view and even with some of the proper interpretations of Marx and Lenin were, without a scintilla of doubt, wrong. After all, did not Marx or Lenin or Stalin or Mao say that. . . . In other words, communism was like a fanatical religion. It had its revealed text and chief interpreters. It had its priests and their ritualistic prose with all the answers. It had a heaven, and the proper behavior to reach it. It had its appeal to faith. And it had its crusade against nonbelievers. (<http://www.hawaii.edu/powerkills/COM.ART.HTM>)

No, the poster on Facebook is quite incorrect. When the humanist considers in his heart that there is nothing he will have to pay for when he leaves this earth, then he is free to do whatever he wants when he is in power. Conversely, rather

than God being a crutch and excuse, one who is truly saved understands that they are accountable for every thought, every word, every action. Moreover, they understand that they are no better than their fellow man and that everyone is judged by the LORD, who uses the same standard for all.

The poster of the comment on Facebook also does not understand that one of the great shortcomings of communism is that it does not allow for a diversity of opinion. Not one single tenet of its doctrine allows for liberty of the conscience. In fact, this shortcoming is found in virtually every false system of belief. There are those who claim that Biblical Christianity doesn't either. But, I will submit to them that they never truly read the Scripture:

Of Liberty of the Conscience

I believe that liberty of the conscience, which is the liberty of the soul to freely choose what one will believe and accept, is essential for the individual to be accountable before God for the choices that are made and actions that are taken. I believe that the LORD God, in creating men and angels with a free will, bestowed upon us liberty of the conscience, and it is His desire that it be no other way. Howsoever, it is also the LORD's express will that all men be reconciled to Him through Christ Jesus so that the original design of man is fulfilled, in that man is able to freely fellowship with the LORD God, which is not possible in man's unregenerate state. In making the capacity to freely choose possible, the LORD God has provided in His word both the commandments He has given as our Creator, and explanation of the consequences of the choices we, as individuals, may make.

As such, it is not proper or permissible that anyone coerce, force, or attempt to force another to believe anything. This is particularly true concerning the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ. A person must freely choose, being fully persuaded in their heart and soul, to repent and believe the Gospel. This freedom to choose holds true in all service to the LORD. One

must freely choose to serve the LORD, just as one must freely choose to bring tithes and offerings. Anything less than this free choice will not be, and is not accepted of the LORD, as it comes of a heart improperly motivated. Thus, it is required in all a person may do pertaining to the LORD, from salvation and throughout all service, that it be done of a genuine and sincere love for the LORD God for it to be accepted.

In all cases, the individual must and will bear the express consequences for the choices made, as all choices the individual may make are solely the responsibility of that person, even if it appears the choice were made under duress.

Scripture References

Isaiah 1:18; Proverbs 3:31-32; Leviticus 1:1-3; II Corinthians 9:7; Genesis 4:6-7; Deuteronomy 30:15-20; Joshua 24:15; Romans 4:16-21; II Kings 17:13-15; Proverbs 1:20-30; Jeremiah 6:16; Ezekiel 33:10-11; II Peter 3:9; Ezekiel 18:1-4; Ezekiel 18:20; Matthew 23:37-38; Acts 7:51-53; Hebrews 9:27; Galatians 5:13-14; I Peter 5:5-7; Isaiah 56:1-7; Revelation 22:12-17.

Hence, I could ask: Humanist, why are you in denial of the truth about man? Do you not know that makes you full of fallacy and doomed to fail?

Changes

Back in 2003-4 time frame, I penned a statement of faith that was based upon the statement of faith of the first true New Testament church I was in. What I did was essentially corrected and amended their statement as there were (and to

this day still are) typographical errors, citation errors, and statements which were either nonsense, or were arcane enough so the average person could not actually understand what was expressed. Primarily, I did this to more fully express what I believed, and to solidify in my own mind how best to do that. Nothing accomplishes those purposes quite like writing.

In 2009, Ebenezer Baptist mission undertook the task of writing its statement of faith, which resulted in some changes to my statement, as I am under the authority of the mission. Most of the changes were not significant or substantial, but clarifying of held doctrines. A couple of articles were split for clarification, and one new was added ([Of Liberty of the Conscience](#)). With those basic changes the statement of faith was pretty much complete.

However, that was four years ago, and much teaching has gone on since then. There is a far better understanding of certain doctrines, and for the first time, an valid, defined, testable understanding of iniquity, transgression and sin. There is also a far better understanding of how man is made in the image of God. These things and others warranted looking again at the statement of faith to see what needed to be changed and/or clarified. This time, there are significant changes.

Do these changes alter the doctrine? Actually, no, they do not. What they do is clarify the foundations of the belief and add significant information to the doctrine, which strengthens the doctrine. Additionally, gaps and ambiguities are removed so there is no misunderstanding as to what is believed. To illustrate what I mean, article six (VI) is set forth below. First is the statement from 2009, and below it is the newly agreed to statement.

VI. Of The Creation (5/31/09)

I believe in the Genesis account of creation, and that it is to be accepted literally, and not allegorically or figuratively; that man was created directly in God's own

image and after his own likeness. I hold that all of creation was not, and is not a matter of evolution or evolutionary change of species, or development through interminable periods of time from lower to higher forms; that all animal and vegetable life was made directly, and God's established law was and is, that they should bring forth only "after their kind." Moreover, that the earth is approximately 6000 years old, and that the creation of the entire physical universe occurred in six, twenty-four hour days, and that on the seventh day the LORD rested.

Some things to note in the original statement from 2009 are a lack of specificity as to where everything came from, and whether the twin errors of the Gap theory and day/age theory are allowed. Moreover, only the minimum is mentioned about the creation of man. Since the majority of the rest of the statement of faith deals with man and the LORD's provision of salvation in Christ, it is rather odd that so little is mentioned about man and how he was created, and why he is accountable.

You are free to judge, but I believe that is fixed with the following statement:

VI. Of The Creation (9/25/13)

I believe in the Genesis account of the creation of the physical universe; that it is to be accepted as factually and literally true: That all things which are, were created ex nihilo, or out of nothing, by the infinite knowledge and power of the LORD God. I reject any assertion that the account is allegorical or figurative as pertaining to the events of creation and their sequence. I reject as spurious both the "Gap" theory and "Day/Age" theory of the creation account. I hold that all of creation was not, and is not, a matter of evolution or evolutionary change of species, or development through interminable periods of time from lower to higher forms. I believe, as Scripture plainly expresses, that all

animal and plant life was made directly, and God's established law was, and is, that they should bring forth only "after their kind." I believe that all of creation was formed fully functional, or "in-process," as if it had always existed; that all life was created in a mature state. I hold, in accordance with the Biblical timeline, that the earth is approximately 6000 years old; that the creation of the entire physical universe occurred in six, twenty-four hour days, and that on the seventh day the LORD rested.

I hold as true, that man was created directly by the LORD God, and in the similitude of God. That this likeness is found in five distinct aspects: That man is a tri-unity of parts: soul, spirit, and body; That man has the innate ability to judge; That man has free-will within the parameters of his given existence; That man is creative, being able to bring forth out of that which exists; That man has the moral imperatives of mercy, compassion, forgiveness, grace, and love. Accordingly, man is the pinnacle of the LORD's creation. I believe that the LORD God, having bestowed upon man such attributes, holds every individual accountable for the conduct of his existence.

It is my prayer that the updated articles in the statement of faith are a benefit and a blessing as they are intended to clarify and answer why certain things are as they are. Additionally, there are three (3) new articles which are identified as necessary:

[Of Righteousness and Iniquity](#)

[Of the Penalty for Sin](#)

Of the Father

Two have already been added, and the third will be shortly. These articles are necessary as these subjects are prone to error and very little is taught and/or understood about them.

May you be blessed,

Mindless Drivel

So the new Pope wrote a letter. And what did he write? Well, it sounds sort of nice. Indeed, it probably will play well in some progressive circles, but for the hardened atheist, the following by Pope Francis is, well... drivel:

*In comments likely to enhance his progressive reputation, Pope Francis has written a long, open letter to the founder of La Repubblica newspaper, Eugenio Scalfari, stating that **non-believers would be forgiven by God if they followed their consciences.***

*Responding to a list of questions published in the paper by Mr Scalfari, who is not a Roman Catholic, Francis wrote: "You ask me if the God of the Christians forgives those who don't believe and who don't seek the faith. I start by saying – and this is the fundamental thing – that God's mercy has no limits if you go to him with a sincere and contrite heart. **The issue for those who do not believe in God is to obey their conscience.***

"Sin, even for those who have no faith, exists when people disobey their conscience." ([Pope Francis assures sceptics: You don't have to believe in God to go to heaven, The Independent, 9/11/2013](#))

Uh-huh. However, last time I checked, the Catechism said no such thing, and, as far as I can tell, the Pope is NOT greater than the Catechism. In fact, the Pope can be fired, but if you did away with the Catechism there would be NO Catholic Church.

It seems to me, that the Catechism trumps the Pope whenever there is any conflict – and there certainly is conflict here.

II. HANDING ON THE FAITH: CATECHESIS

*4 Quite early on, the name catechesis was given to the totality of the Church's efforts to make disciples, to help men believe that Jesus is the Son of God **so that believing they might have life in his name**, and to educate and instruct them in this life, thus building up the body of Christ. ((CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH))*

PART TWO – THE CELEBRATION OF THE CHRISTIAN MYSTERY

SECTION TWO – THE SEVEN SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH

CHAPTER ONE – THE SACRAMENTS OF CHRISTIAN INITIATION

ARTICLE 1 – THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM

*1213 **Holy Baptism is the basis of the whole Christian life, the gateway to life in the Spirit** (vitae spiritualis ianua),⁴ and the door which gives access to the other sacraments. Through Baptism we are freed from sin and reborn as sons of God; we become members of Christ, are incorporated into the Church and made sharers in her mission: "Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration through water in the word."⁵*

I. WHAT IS THIS SACRAMENT CALLED?

1214 This sacrament is called Baptism, after the central rite by which it is carried out: to baptize (Greek baptizein) means to "plunge" or "immerse"; the "plunge" into the water symbolizes the catechumen's burial into Christ's death, from which he rises up by resurrection with him, as "a new creature."⁶

*1215 This sacrament is also called "the washing of regeneration and renewal by the Holy Spirit," for it signifies and actually brings about the birth of water and the Spirit **without which no one "can enter the kingdom of God."** ((CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH))*

Perhaps if the “vicar of Christ” had bothered to read his own church’s documentation, he might not have engaged in mindless drivel...

Stupidity – Writ Large

Of late, my time is consumed by many things which have prevented me from posting and writing the way I would like. However, the time is spent preparing lessons, conducting those lessons, and preaching. Between those things and working full-time, and trying to fix my house, my time to write is non-existent. Nonetheless, in researching and attempting to write, one of the subjects I am studying is the issue of righteousness: what constitutes it, what destroys it, et cetera, et cetera. In my apologetics research on righteousness I came across the following:

Fundamentally, there are two opposite errors regarding original sin. One is an error of deficiency, in which original sin is treated as less damaging to human nature than it actually is. That is the error of Pelagius. The other is the error of exaggeration, in which original sin is treated as more damaging to human nature than it actually is. (([Protestant Objections to the Catholic Doctrines of Original Justice and Original Sin, Bryan Cross, Oct. 16, 2011; NOTE: It is unclear here whether Mr. Cross is quoting Professor Lawrence Feingold or simply building off his material.](#)))

So the Catholics mean to say that the effect of Adam’s fall was/is a nuanced thing in which we have to understand precisely the effect it had, else we will either:

A.) Not go far enough in assigning the effects of the fall.

or

B.) Go too far in assigning the effects of the fall.

I am sorry, but this sounds like something I would shovel out of my neighbor's barn.

Why?

Because the Scripture could not be more plain:

Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, **and death by sin**; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. *(Romans 5:12-14)*)

And again:

For since by man *came* death, by man *came* also the resurrection of the dead. **For as in Adam all die**, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. *(I Corinthians 15:21-22)*

And yet again:

Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage. *(Hebrews 2:14-15)*

I really do not know how you can "go too far in assigning the effects of the fall" as it were. After all, this death includes the following:

And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the

book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And **whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire.** (Rev 20:12-15)

I suppose there is something out there worse than eternity in the Lake of Fire, but nothing ever describes it or even alludes to it.

So then, how is it that one can “go too far” in holding that the effect of the fall upon man was utterly devastating, warping man’s perception and distorting man’s ability to understand?

I suppose it could be that most Baptists and Protestants hold that man is utterly depraved and incapable of righteousness at all.

Well, not quite:

Here we find the opposite error with respect to original sin, namely, an exaggeration of original sin.

Martin Luther

Luther’s two principal errors with respect to original sin are as follows:

(1) Treating original sin as the complete corruption of human nature, rather than as the loss of the preternatural and supernatural gifts.

(2) Treating concupiscence (i.e. the involuntary disorder in the lower appetites) as original sin. ([Protestant Objections to the Catholic Doctrines of Original Justice and Original Sin, Bryan Cross, Oct. 16, 2011](#))

Without going into all the convoluted arguments, let us examine what the Scripture declares about man's fallen state:

And *you hath he quickened*, who were **dead in trespasses and sins**; Wherein in time past **ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience**: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; **and were by nature the children of wrath**, even as others. (*Ephesians 2:1-3*)

The fool hath said in his heart, *There is no God*. They are corrupt, they have done abominable works, *there is none that doeth good*. The LORD looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, *and seek God*. They are *all gone aside*, they are all together become filthy: **there is none that doeth good, no, not one**. (*Psalms 14:1-3*)

Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me. (*Psalms 51:5*)

Well now, if we are all the children of wrath by nature, dead in trespasses and sins, and exist in iniquity prior to coming to Christ, and there in nothing we can do about it outside of coming to Christ for salvation... How do you exaggerate that?

I find it hard to believe that anyone could think, especially after the evidence of Scripture, that the depravity of man could be worse.

No, if you are borne with a nature to do wickedness, and the LORD God accounts you as dead in trespasses and sins, bound to do every evil work, it is kind of hard to top that. No, there is no exaggeration when it is stated that man is utterly depraved and incapable of any righteousness. That is, if you evaluate what the LORD God evaluates – the soul.

If, on the other hand, you ignore the soul and concentrate on the flesh, and concentrate on sin, rather than iniquity, then you could claim that declaring the soul utterly corrupt is in error and excessive. However, since it is the LORD God who is the sole determiner of who is righteous and who is not, it really matters little what the Catholic Church believes and teaches.

The sad part is, the Catholic Church has had over 1500 years to get this teaching right – and they have not. Instead, they cling to a doctrine that is provably wrong.

That is the very definition of Stupidity – writ large.

Science Finally Catches Up to the Scripture

In the area of life in the womb...anyway.

And these *are* the generations of Isaac, Abraham's son: Abraham begat Isaac: And Isaac was forty years old when he took Rebekah to wife, the daughter of Bethuel the Syrian of Padanaram, the sister to Laban the Syrian. And Isaac intreated the LORD for his wife, because she *was* barren: and the LORD was intreated of him, and Rebekah his wife conceived. **And the children struggled together within her; and she said, If *it be so*, why *am I* thus? And she went to enquire of the LORD. And the LORD said unto her, Two nations *are* in thy womb, and two manner of people shall be separated from thy bowels; and *the one* people shall be stronger than *the other* people; and the elder shall serve the younger. (Genesis 25:19-23)**

[SIBLING RIVALRY: Video shows twins fighting in the womb](#)

Of course, when the LORD revealed to Moses about Rebekah's quandary concerning what was happening inside her, everyone would have said it was impossible to know. In fact, until recently everyone would have said it was impossible to know – and Rebekah's situation took place about 3500 years ago. It just makes me smile.

The Everyone Test

NOTE: This article stems from the Wednesday night lesson on 2 May, 2012. The audio of that lesson can be found here, on [Ebenezer Baptist Church's Audio: Messages and Lessons; The Everyone Test](#) page.

When it comes to the issue of behavior, there seems to be an unwillingness to confront certain behaviors as inherently destructive. Rather than call those behaviors out, and ensure that everyone knows those particular behaviors are wrong, many leaders opt out of responding, leaving such behaviors unchallenged. In fact, there is a general attitude in this generation that all behaviors, unless they are immediately dangerous to life and health, are essentially equal and there is no real consequence for engaging in one particular behavior over another.

This thinking comes about because the moral absolutes have been generally discarded in favor of a subjective approach that inherently denies that there are behaviors which are always evil in their consequence. Behaviors which could not come about except the persons which engage in them, abandon reason and consideration for others, in favor of self and the immediate gratification of self. They do so because it appears to them that such actions are without consequence.

Naturally, this would seem to violate a principle which everyone observes from their earliest age:

That every action, no matter how minor and insignificant it may appear, has at least one consequence.

However, because the consequences of some actions take much longer to be realized than others, it appears (especially to those who deliberately blind themselves) that certain actions have no real consequence. Hence, they can be engaged in with impunity.

[Continue reading . . .](#)