

The Absurdity of the New York Times

On May 23, the New York Times Editorial Board decided to weigh in on the “same sex” marriage referendum in Ireland.

Granted, the Irish decided to continue down the road to national oblivion in approving “same sex” marriage as legal in their constitution. However, that is Ireland’s business if they are insane enough to do that. But, it hasn’t helped Ireland that it has been on the wrong side of history for quite a few decades now. Ireland has been steadily going down the road to cradle to grave socialism for quite some time now – and it has had its effect.

Presently, Irish debt to GDP is at 123%, which means they owe more than they can make. In short, they are economically bankrupt. However, that mirrors the moral situation perfectly, as they are morally bankrupt as well.

Nevertheless, that is Ireland’s problem, and not the United States’ problem. However, the New York Times decided to stick its nose in that situation, sniff, and then pontificate to us poor, unwashed, unenlightened masses about how worthless our values and morals are.

Specifically, what they stated is this:

“In a statement conceding defeat, the Iona Institute, the main opposition group, said it would continue to affirm “the importance of biological ties and of motherhood and fatherhood.” The absurdity of that statement speaks for itself.” ([\(\(The Victory for Same-Sex Marriage in Ireland\)\)](#))

I suppose the members of the Editorial Board of the Times entered the world as hatchlings? They surely couldn’t be

human, because humans require a mother and a father. When we don't have that, it is destabilizing.

It is quite clear that children that have both a father and mother who are present and accounted for, do far better than children in any other "arrangement" that exists. If you really care to dispute that, then look at the crime demographics, particularly for children of unwed mothers, or children of households in which one parent is missing. Kindly look at the suicide rate for those who identify themselves as "gay." Examine the suicide rate for children of those "non-traditional" households.

I guess the New York Times thinks these are good things?

However, that is not the end of the story. The Times Editorial Board evidently thinks that history doesn't matter. They would do well to note that the rise of Western Civilization was built on families which had a mother and a father. Western Civilization is being torn down and destroyed even as the "traditional" family is collapses. So it is that the short-sighted journalists of the Times cannot see that they are cheerleading destruction and degradation.

I am well aware that the Times Editorial Board does not believe in the LORD God. Thus it is virtually pointless to warn them about history and the witness of every society on earth which has turned this way. All those societies were destroyed. I am certain the Times is totally blind to that. Thus, it would be pointless to warn them.

That's okay. They will have all eternity to figure it out.

Does Anyone Have the Right to Abort?

Do you have the inherent right to abort a child?

Do you have the inherent right to abort the life of anyone?

I had a lengthy conversation with a gentleman today. During that conversation he brought up a point that was dead on applicable to so much of the culture we live in. The belief that so many have regarding whether they have a “right” to perform some action doesn’t seem to be grounded in anything – period. The specific topic at that point in the conversation was atheism and the inane idea atheists have about how everything came to be. With regard to the creation of things, he made a statement that was profound in its implications. I don’t know whether he came up with this or heard it and repeated it, but it is well worth considering and taking to heart particularly in certain contexts, such as the abortion debate:

If you can’t create it, you have no business destroying it.

However much anyone might like to claim, getting pregnant is not a sure thing for any woman. Moreover, the child that is destroyed in an abortion, cannot be brought back to life again. Unless the person killing the child has the power to bring it back to life again, they have no business killing the child.

If you do not have the inherent power to create life and bring the dead back to life, then you don’t have the inherent right to take life.

This is why that all taking of life must be legally justified. The state cannot take life unless the person deprives another

of their life, and that is proven beyond the shadow of a doubt. The individual cannot take life unless theirs is imminently threatened. There must be a compelling, beyond the shadow of a doubt reason for life to be taken – and for such a drastic action to be justified.

Otherwise, you are simply a murderer.

– End of story –

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.

How Very Rich, How Very Ignorant

Today, the [New York Times ran an article about one Michael Bloomberg](#), former mayor of New York City and a very wealthy man. Unfortunately, Mr. Bloomberg has decided that he can play nanny to everyone and decide for them what is best for them. To that end, Mr. Bloomberg opposes firearms ownership, the use of tobacco, and the consumption of certain foods, holding that all are bad for the rest of us.

In the final paragraph of this puff piece, Mr. Bloomberg had this to say about the end of his efforts:

But if he senses that he may not have as much time left as he would like, he has little doubt about what would await him at a Judgment Day. Pointing to his work on gun safety, obesity and smoking cessation, he said with a grin: "I am telling you if there is a God, when I get to heaven I'm not stopping to be interviewed. I am heading straight in. I have earned my place in heaven. It's not even close."

Let it never be said that Michael Bloomberg runs short on pride. However that may be, Mr. Bloomberg missed the standard by which one gains entrance into heaven:

Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me. (*John 14:6*)

The reason it is by the Lord Jesus Christ and Him alone, is because He, and He alone meets the standard of righteousness the Father demands. Hence, through the Lord Jesus Christ and His work of redemption, salvation is, always has been, and ever will be by grace, and grace alone:

For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast. (*Ephesians 2:8-9*)

And again:

Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace. 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 11:5-6*)

Thus, the Scripture is quite plain that you will do it by grace and grace alone, as works and grace are mutually exclusive. But, it is quite evident Mr. Bloomberg has chosen works for his justification before the LORD God, which is to his condemnation:

And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. 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.

(Revelation 20:11-15)

Moreover, poor Michael misses the boat altogether in that he thinks being wealthy and powerful are what might qualify him in the first place. However, had he read the following, he would have known the LORD God has no use for him in his present state:

For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; And base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: That no flesh should glory in his presence. *(I Corinthians 1:26-29)*

And he compounds his error in that he stated "I am telling you if there is a God,..." which is a blatant insult to the LORD God, and shows how very far away Mr. Bloomberg is from ever pleasing the LORD:

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)*

Pray for the poor man. He needs all the help he can get. He is wretched, naked, poor and blind, and doesn't even realize it.

For what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? *(Mark 8:36)*

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 (000)[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?

The Hour is Late

In case you haven't noticed, the hour grows very late. Whatever ministry things the LORD God has laid on your heart to accomplish, get them done.

Even if the hour weren't late, consider your age and how much time you have left to fulfill your ministry. For me, I have many things to write and document before that time is shut off. I would like to be able to stand before my Lord and know that they were accomplished.

The Unbelievable Ignorance of Dan Savage

There is a rather large bruhaha over the remarks of one Dan Savage, who, in an incredible moment of rank hypocrisy, attacked the Scripture (and thus the LORD God who is the Author of it) at a journalism conference. Mr. Savage is supposed to be the leader of an anti-bullying organization, but when students walked out on him for his remarks about the Scripture, he rather hypocritically bullied them.

According to the CNN report the following is what Mr. Savage stated:

*Columnist and gay-rights advocate Dan Savage is standing by his comment that "we can learn to ignore the bulls**t in the Bible about gay people" at a recent conference for high school students, a line that prompted some to walk out and spurred intense online debate. ([Columnist Dan Savage stands by comments on 'bulls**t in the Bible'](#))*

When some of the students walked out, the following is what came next:

Some Christian students walked out of the Seattle speech, prompting another controversial line from Savage: "It's funny

*to someone who is on the receiving end of beatings that are justified by the Bible how pansya**ed people react when you push back.” (([Ibid](#)))*

The problem here is that “anti-bullying” as defined by Dan Savage is not about opposing and preventing all forms of bullying. Rather, it is about preventing anti-gay or anti-homosexual bullying. Hence, it is unsurprising that the veneer disappeared for a few moments and the true feelings of Mr. Savage came out. What it also reveals is the incredible ignorance of Dan Savage when it comes to the Scripture. However, we should not be surprised by this ignorance as the vast majority of individuals are ignorant of the Scripture. Sadly, this includes an awful lot of Christians.

Does the Scripture condemn the “gay lifestyle?”

Absolutely. Beyond question, for one to engage in homosexual behavior is to engage in that which is an abomination to the LORD God.

What Mr. Savage and others have failed to do, is ask “Why?”

1. Why does the LORD God so vehemently condemn homosexual behavior?
2. Why did the LORD God destroy Sodom and Gomorrah for that sin?
3. As a matter of fact, why has the LORD God destroyed every single society that has turned that way throughout history?

All it takes to understand why, is a little bit of reason. Think about it for just a moment: What is homosexual behavior?

Now, what if every single person on the earth engaged in that behavior. Just where would the next generation come from?

The short answer is: There would be no “next generation.” Within one generation man would be extinct – gone forever.

Do you even want to guess where the encouragement for homosexual behavior comes from?

Try Satan.

Why?

Because he hates man. He hates man because man is made in the image of God, and he is not. He hates man because man will judge the angels – of which he (albeit fallen) is. And, if he can get man to destroy himself, he can thwart the plan and purpose of the LORD God – thus making the LORD “unrighteous” and himself the “victor.” All at the expense of man.

Does this mean that those deceived by Satan are guiltless? Not hardly. Each of us are solely responsible for the choices we make. We are under no compulsion to believe Satan’s lies about who and what we are.

If we forget that we are involved in a spiritual war, we will not understand what is happening and why. Unfortunately for Dan Savage, being raised Catholic did not help him (not that being raised anything else would have particularly helped him – you do have to want to know the truth), as Catholics do not, as a rule, read the Scripture. In fact, the Catholic Church does not encourage any reading of the Scripture. Moreover, like most denominations, Catholics are not taught to reason about what the Scriptures state. Rather, they are taught to just “have faith and believe.”

Hence, in all Mr. Savage’s experience he has never been exposed to any real truth about the Scripture, and never been encouraged and challenged about what the Scripture states and why. In short, he is an excellent tool for the Devil.

However, that is not the end of it: It is also apparent Mr. Savage cannot reason out the end of his behavior and see the destructive nature of it. It is quite apparent that Mr. Savage does not know how to be decent, and pen anything suitable for

any mind, let alone young, impressionable minds. The utter vulgarity Dan Savage uses is corrupting of society and debasing of everyone who reads his words or hears his voice. Without having to actually read what he writes, or hear his voice, just a basic search of the internet and you will get a very clear understanding of how vile and vulgar this person is. Moreover, for someone who is supposed to be “anti-bullying,” he does enough of it for two or three individuals in his attacks on Rick Santorum.

In all, it truly is unbelievable how ignorant (and willfully so) Dan Savage is. If he weren't so bent on remaining ignorant, perhaps he could see how the LORD God desires to save him from himself (just like the LORD has to save each of us from ourselves), and save him from an eternity of suffering in the Lake of Fire.

Thank You for Your Service? – An Open Letter to Laurence Vance

The following is in response to a column by Laurence Vance, dated 19 July 2011, and titled “[Thank You for Your Service?](#)” in which Mr. Vance excoriates the U.S. Military and those who support them and thank them for their service to America. This response is written and published publicly because of one outstanding feature of the column: overt and blatant bitterness.

And four, what is a Vietnamese man – who most certainly has relatives, or friends or neighbors of relatives, that were killed or injured by U.S. bombs and bullets during the

Vietnam War – doing joining the U.S. military where he can be sent to shoot and bomb foreigners like the U.S. military did to his people?

And aside from these four things, I'm afraid I must also say: Sorry, soldiers, I don't thank you for your service.

- *I don't thank you for your service in fighting foreign wars.*
- *I don't thank you for your service in fighting without a congressional declaration of war.*
- *I don't thank you for your service in bombing and destroying Iraq and Afghanistan.*
- *I don't thank you for your service in killing hundreds of thousands of Iraqis and Afghans.*
- *I don't thank you for your service in expanding the war on terror to Pakistan and Yemen.*
- *I don't thank you for your service in occupying over 150 countries around the world.*
- *I don't thank you for your service in garrisoning the planet with over 1,000 military bases.*
- *I don't thank you for your service in defending our freedoms when you do nothing of the kind.*
- *I don't thank you for your service as part of the president's personal attack force to bomb, invade, occupy, and otherwise bring death and destruction to any country he deems necessary.*

*Thank you for your service? I don't think so.
((<http://lewrockwell.com/vance/vance250.html>))*

Everyone needs to know: This is not a Christian spirit and attitude. It is not a Scriptural spirit and attitude.

Mr. Vance,

Have we just a bit of bitterness? I see NO justification for your attitude and spirit anywhere in the New Testament.

I don't find it in John the Baptist:

And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, neither accuse *any* falsely; and be content with your wages. (*Luke 3:14*)

I don't find it in the Lord Jesus Christ:

And when Jesus was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion, ((An officer in the Roman military.)) beseeching him, And saying, Lord, my servant lieth at home sick of the palsy, grievously tormented. And Jesus saith unto him, I will come and heal him. The centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof: but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed. For I am a man under authority, having soldiers under me: and I say to this *man*, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth *it*. When Jesus heard *it*, he marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. And Jesus said unto the centurion, Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour. (*Matthew 8:5-13*)

I don't find it in the apostle Peter:

And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius ((Cornelius was a Centurion in the Roman Army.)) met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped *him*. But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man. And as he talked with him, he went

in, and found many that were come together. And he said unto them, Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; but God hath shewed me that I should not call any man common or unclean. Therefore came I *unto you* without gainsaying, as soon as I was sent for: I ask therefore for what intent ye have sent for me? And Cornelius said, Four days ago I was fasting until this hour; and at the ninth hour I prayed in my house, and, behold, a man stood before me in bright clothing, And said, Cornelius, thy prayer is heard, and thine alms are had in remembrance in the sight of God. Send therefore to Joppa, and call hither Simon, whose surname is Peter; he is lodged in the house of *one* Simon a tanner by the sea side: who, when he cometh, shall speak unto thee. Immediately therefore I sent to thee; and thou hast well done that thou art come. Now therefore are we all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God.

Then Peter opened *his* mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him. The word which *God* sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: (he is Lord of all:) That word, *I* say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judaea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; How God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him. And we are witnesses of all things which he did both in the land of the Jews, and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree: Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly; Not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, *even* to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God *to be* the Judge of quick and dead. To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever

believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.

While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Then prayed they him to tarry certain days. (Acts 10:25-48)

I don't find it in the apostle Paul:

But after long abstinence Paul stood forth in the midst of them, and said, Sirs, ye should have hearkened unto me, and not have loosed from Crete, and to have gained this harm and loss. And now I exhort you to be of good cheer: for there shall be no loss of *any man's* life among you, but of the ship. For there stood by me this night the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, Saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Caesar: and, lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee. Wherefore, sirs, be of good cheer: for I believe God, that it shall be even as it was told me. Howbeit we must be cast upon a certain island. But when the fourteenth night was come, as we were driven up and down in Adria, about midnight the shipmen deemed that they drew near to some country; And sounded, and found *it* twenty fathoms: and when they had gone a little further, they sounded again, and found *it* fifteen fathoms. Then fearing lest we should have fallen upon rocks, they cast four anchors out of the stern, and wished for the day. And as the shipmen were about to flee out of the ship, when they had let down the boat into the sea, under colour as though they would have cast anchors out of the foreship, Paul said to the centurion and to the soldiers, Except these abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved. Then the soldiers cut off the ropes of the boat, and let her fall off.

And while the day was coming on, Paul besought *them* all to take meat, saying, This day is the fourteenth day that ye have tarried and continued fasting, having taken nothing. Wherefore I pray you to take *some* meat: for this is for your health: for there shall not an hair fall from the head of any of you. And when he had thus spoken, he took bread, and gave thanks to God in presence of them all: and when he had broken *it*, he began to eat. Then were they all of good cheer, and they also took *some* meat. (*Acts 27:21-36*)

In fact, I do not find your attitude and spirit among any of the apostles, or in Christ, or in John the Baptist. Your spirit is bitter and hateful and not conducive to ministry or presenting the gospel to anyone, let alone a member of the military. What? Are members of the military not worthy to be presented the gospel? Instead of trying to reach them, you preach hate. Are you kin to Fred Phelps? You must be spiritually, because you share [a common spirit](#). ((Note: Phelps use of the passage is out of context. However much he would like it to be so, America is not ancient Babylon.))

Wouldn't it be so much better to have the spirit and attitude presented in the following passage?

I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, *and* giving of thanks, be made for all men; For kings, and *for* all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this *is* good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For *there is* one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time. (*I Timothy 2:1-6*)

Next time you see a member of the military, present them with the gospel. I guarantee you – they need it. Unless of course, you hate them so much that you want to keep them on the road

to Hell. But what kind of person would that make you?

In Christ,
Paul W. Davis