

CHAPTER 9

WISE PEOPLE LOVE THE TRUTH AND THEREFORE REJECT POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

*There is a way that seems right to a man,
but its end is the way to death.*

Proverbs 14:12 (ESV)

My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge"....

Hosea 4:6(a) (ESV)

"....and a people without understanding shall come to ruin."

Hosea 4:14(b) (ESV)

*But he who is noble devises noble things,
and by noble things he stands.*

Isaiah 32:8 (RSV)

*And Saul said to Samuel, "I have sinned; for I have transgressed the commandment of the LORD
and your words, because I feared the people and obeyed their voice.*

1 Samuel 15:24 (RSV)

*And he said to man,
'Behold, the fear of the Lord, that is wisdom,
and to turn away from evil is understanding.'*

Job 28:28 (ESV)

*Make me to know your ways, O LORD;
teach me your paths.*

Psalms 25:4 (ESV)

*Righteousness exalts a nation,
but sin is a reproach to any people.*

Proverbs 14:34 (ESV)

*"And you, Solomon my son, know the God of your father and serve him with a whole heart and with
a willing mind, for the LORD searches all hearts and understands every plan and thought. If you
seek him, he will be found by you, but if you forsake him, he will cast you off forever.*

1 Chronicles 28:9 (ESV)

Most people fit in with whatever the majority currently thinks, rather than simply accept what God says.

Most of us get our beliefs, attitudes and opinions from the media and the people around us. But isn't it obvious that before forming an opinion about any major issue, whether it be Israel, abortion, euthanasia, capital punishment, the roles of men and women, homosexuality, 'gay marriage', gender, pornography, sex outside marriage and so on, we should first of all find out *what God says* about those things? In fact, shouldn't we just find out His view on *every issue* and then immediately adopt that view for ourselves? What God says ought to be our starting point, but it should be our *finishing point too*.

The only exception would be those issues upon which He has not made any pronouncement. Then it is legitimate to form our own views. But even then, we should still be guided by what God has said *in*

general terms, or by what He has said about *other issues or principles* which indirectly touch upon what we are now considering. The problem is that is not how most of us operate, even within churches. We either make up our own minds for ourselves or we absorb the views expressed in the media, or by politicians, or by people we know.

However, very few of us ever take the essential step of trying to find out *what God has to say* on that issue, let alone feel obliged to adopt His view as our own. But surely, if a person is a genuine Christian, the obviously right approach is simply to *find out what God's view is and then automatically agree with Him*. How can anyone argue against that, if the point is put as starkly as that? But the problem is the point is not made at all, starkly or otherwise. At any rate, it is not how most of us operate in practice.

Only a fool can read what God says but then disagree with Him and maintain their own opinion instead.

Even if God has set out His view on an issue, and even if we are aware of it, many of us still consider ourselves to be entitled to form our own opinions on that issue. In other words, some of us feel free to *'disagree'* with God and to maintain our own opinion, *even after hearing what He says*. Once we stop to think about this, it is blindingly obvious that that approach is absurd. But, as we saw, the problem is that most of us don't stop to think about it.

Many don't even bother to find out what God thinks in the first place, and it does not even occur to many of us that we should. It would be interesting to hear anybody try to explain how their own opinion could be more authoritative than what God says. The moment you hear the idea stated, you know it is ridiculous. Perhaps that is one reason why we don't question ourselves. It is more comfortable, as well as requiring a lot less effort, if we don't bother to examine our basis for thinking what we think, or for believing what we believe.

Recognise the wrongness of this approach. Then find any issues where you and God currently disagree and simply abandon your own opinions and adopt His in their place.

We need to recognise this foolish tendency in ourselves and learn a new way of forming beliefs and opinions. Above all, we need to be willing to abandon any belief as soon as we realise it is contrary to what God says. That sounds simple enough, but the problem is that few of us actually do it, even in the Church. Most people keep whatever social, political, or even religious, views they held before they became Christians. Therefore, few of us will abandon an opinion, and take up another one, simply because *it is what God says*.

Therefore, if you do, you will be swimming against the tide, even within the churches. Nevertheless, be willing to be the odd one out. Reject the received 'wisdom' of this world and, in particular, all forms of political correctness. Instead, find out what God says on every issue and then immediately get your thinking into line with His. This won't make you popular, and you'll be seen as a misfit, but it is self-evidently the right approach.

To 'disagree' with God, just so that we can be accepted and approved of by the people around us, is plainly idiotic. We might achieve a kind of peace by taking that approach, at least for a while. But it will be deeply damaging to us in the longer term, not least because we will find ourselves coming under God's curse for calling evil things good and good things evil. That is something which He strongly condemns. We will then be opposed by Him as a result, which is essentially what it means when God pronounces a 'woe' on a person:

²⁰ ***Woe to those who call evil good
and good evil,
who put darkness for light***

*and light for darkness,
who put bitter for sweet
and sweet for bitter!*
²¹ *Woe to those who are wise in their own eyes,
and shrewd in their own sight!*
Isaiah 5:20-21 (ESV)

Wise people resist political correctness, whereas the wicked promote it. The simple and fools go along with it passively.

I am not that old, but I have a memory of political events going back to when I was a child in the 1970s. Since that time, due to the erosion of Christianity in the West, biblical values, language and principles have become far less evident in politics and in our institutions, workplaces, schools, hospitals and courts. Our society is now much more influenced by secular humanism than by Christianity. That overall package of unbiblical values and beliefs is called *political correctness* and the ground that it has captured over the past 30-40 years is staggering.

If a person was transported in a time machine from the 1970s to today they would not be able to believe how drastically things have changed and would be astonished by things which we now regard as commonplace. This change in the public's beliefs and attitudes is the result of a deliberate satanic strategy. The thinking of most of the Western world has been diverted onto another perverted path which rejects all biblical values and promotes the direct opposite *on every count*. That is why we can be sure there is nothing accidental about it.

An intelligent mind was needed to coordinate thousands of organisations, universities, media outlets and governments, all over the world, and to pull all the necessary strings to bring about this social transformation in just a few decades. The essence of political correctness is for a small and strident minority to create a set of beliefs, values and principles which are the *opposite of what God wants*. They then force the rest of us into adopting their way of thinking by peer pressure, ridicule and intimidation.

The majority of the population now accept these alien ideas, or at least remain silent about their disagreement. By contrast, only 25 years ago most people felt free to express their own opinions in public. Now they shrink back for fear of who may be listening and what they might do. For example, with so called 'gay marriage', multitudes privately oppose it and know it to be wrong but, in public, they feel forced to say they support it. At any rate, they won't speak against it, or even appear to be neutral about it, for fear of being called 'homophobic', which is portrayed as something reprehensible.

That word, in itself, is an example of the victories our opponents have won in the battle over the language. To be 'phobic' actually means to have an *irrational fear*, not a well thought-out and soundly-based *objection*. Nevertheless, a person who opposes homosexual activity is now automatically labelled as 'homophobic'. The impression is then deliberately given that they have an *irrational fear of something good*, rather than a *well-founded opposition to something bad*. We must strenuously resist being pressurised into using other people's politically correct words and phrases.

Resolve always to use your own words instead. Never submit to being told what you can and cannot think or say, or to be forced to say things which you know are untrue, just in order to fit in and be accepted. The success of political correctness as a manipulative control strategy depends on the whole population being pressured and intimidated into saying things which they already know to be false, but to keep on saying them anyway. Your own words then put you into a straitjacket.

But it is even worse than that because, when you give in to pressure and agree to say politically correct things, it also adds to the pressure that is put on *others*. Those who seek to control us through political correctness rely heavily on our cowardice. If, however, we were to show courage instead, and we

refused to submit to their bossy and intrusive rules as to what we are allowed to think and say, their whole policy would unravel. Then their ideas would be exposed for the deceitful, illogical, even ridiculous, nonsense that they are.

Therefore, the first step in the battle to defeat political correctness is to simply *stop cooperating with it and stop submitting to it*. As soon as you do that you will be set free. Then you will be able, perhaps for the first time in years, to be completely yourself and to do exactly what God wants you to do, instead of what others expect of you. Moreover, you will also stop putting added pressure on other people through your own acquiescence and your parrot-like repetition of the views of the PC establishment.

Have the courage to stand up to political correctness, even if you are the only one. Others may be emboldened by your bravery.

It is no use you waiting for others to show courage first, so that you can then follow them. They are waiting for you! Therefore, *you* must be courageous first and insist on your own freedom of thought and expression, no matter where you are, or who is with you. In this way evil can be resisted. But if we are passive, and sit back doing and saying nothing, it will defeat us. As Edmund Burke said:

“All that is required for evil to triumph is for good men to do nothing.”
Edmund Burke

Therefore, if you are good, or want to be good, then stop caving in to these bullies. Stand up and be counted. Be brave and set an example to those around you, thereby bolstering their courage. Note also the wise words of President Ronald Reagan, one of the greatest presidents ever:

“Evil is powerless if the good are unafraid.”
Ronald Reagan

I therefore refuse to use the word ‘*homophobic*’ because I don’t accept the premise on which it is based. That is to say that I do not have any *fear* of homosexuality, or of homosexuals. The critical views that I express are only of their *actions*, and are due to my opposition to the practice of homosexuality, not from any fear of it, or of those who do it. Likewise, I use the word ‘homosexual’, not ‘*gay*’, because I am simply not willing to be manipulated into using words that I don’t accept and don’t want to use.

In any event, the word ‘*gay*’ is a misnomer because, as the Radio Four Rabbi, *Lionel Blue*, once said, “*most homosexuals are sad, not gay*”. The same technique is used in the debate over abortion. Those who promote it know that it would not help their cause if they were to call themselves ‘*pro-abortion*’. So, they give themselves the far more attractive and marketable label, ‘*pro-choice*’.

That phrase is a pure euphemism, and is designed to obscure, not reveal, their position. Yet, it displays an excellent grasp of tactics. On the same basis, they refuse to use the label ‘*pro-life*’. Instead, they call their opponents ‘*anti-choice*’. In messing about with the meaning of words and phrases in this way, so as to mislead those who are not alert to their schemes, they are fulfilling the prediction made by Winston Churchill, which was remarkably prophetic:

“The fascists of the future will call themselves anti-fascists”
Winston Churchill

Our opponents are keenly aware of the power that carefully crafted phrases have to shape our thinking. Their approach is therefore utterly dishonest but, in propaganda terms, it is highly effective, especially amongst those who do not take the time, or make the effort, to think for themselves. Of course, if we all thought carefully about the words that other people use, we would quickly see the absurdity of all of this. But, again, that is the problem - the vast majority of us don’t ever stop to think, or to examine the meaning of words, or to discern the agenda of those who insist on their use, or their non-use.

We are therefore easily influenced by these manipulative tactics, and allow other people's slogans, euphemisms and propaganda to shape what we believe. Political correctness is imposed on us by human beings, but the strategic thinking behind it is Satan's. He invented it and it is coordinated by his demons. That is obvious, because there is no way that political correctness could have taken over the thinking of whole continents, in such a short time, if it was of solely human origin.

The straitjacket of political correctness has been accepted unthinkingly by fools *but also by the simple*, including a huge number of naïve Christians. Only those who are determined not to conform, and who insist on getting their beliefs from the Bible, rather than the world, will refuse to comply. Sadly, they are very few and are hugely outnumbered within the media, and in our institutions, especially amongst those who reach the top. Even so, you must resolve to be one of that brave minority who refuse to conform, not only for your own sake, but also for the benefit of those others whose courage will be strengthened by your example.

Wise people reject relativist thinking and values.

A key ingredient of political correctness is '*relativism*'. That is the view that nothing is inherently right or wrong and that there are no moral or ethical absolutes. Instead, it is assumed that "*all things are relative*" and that everything depends on your personal perspective or circumstances. At first sight it sounds like a reasonable approach, even a '*tolerant*' one, to use another of their perverse buzzwords. However, relativism is the opposite of how God thinks. He does not operate on the basis of what is *expedient, convenient* or *fashionable*, but in terms of what is *right or wrong*.

He also takes an *absolute* stance about such questions every time. If a thing is true, then it is true and if it is false, then it is false, *regardless of who you are*, or where you live, or what your circumstances are. So, if God says homosexual activity is wrong, which He does, then it *is* wrong. Moreover, it is wrong for *everybody*. It does not become right for someone else just because they believe it to be right. Likewise, if Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism and Sikhism are false religions, which they are, then they are false for *all of us*, in *all places*, and at *all times*.

They can't be false for you, but true for someone else. Neither can we say that any of them are true at the same time as saying that Christianity is true. The various religions of the world are all contradictory sets of beliefs. We therefore have to choose one, or other, or none. What we cannot validly do is to simultaneously believe *more than one* of them, let alone all of them. That is totally obvious, or at least it should be, to any honest and reasonable person.

Yet it is not obvious to millions of confused, woolly-minded, dumbed-down liberals who have been taught to think in *relativist* terms. To them, a set of mutually exclusive and contradictory ideas can all be accepted at the same time. Indeed, they don't find any difficulty in doing so. Such thinking is self-evidently ridiculous and 100 years ago, or even 50 years ago, the vast majority of people, even fools, would have conceded that. But not now.

There has been such a catastrophic dumbing-down in the West, that it is now entirely normal to believe two or more contradictory ideas all at the same time. Such muddled thinking may appeal to our own foolish generation, but it was not how our parents or grandparents thought and it must never be the way that a Christian thinks. At any rate, no wise person would ever think that way, or fail to recognise it as nonsense when he hears someone else speaking in that way.

Wise people don't accept the modern definition of '*tolerance*'.

The new meaning of the word '*tolerance*' is not what you would imagine it to be, or what it used to be. It has taken on tones of Orwellian double-speak and now means the direct opposite of what it ought to. In the past, a '*tolerant*' person was someone who, while having clear beliefs of his own, and being aware

of where and why he disagrees with others, nonetheless gives them the freedom to believe what they want. He feels free to disagree with them, but remains courteous while doing so. However, that is not what tolerance now means to our PC generation. The new definition of a *tolerant* person is one who:

- a) accepts other people's beliefs in the sense of assuming that all of them are *also true*, alongside, and at the same time as, his own
- b) never says that any belief that he holds is *exclusively true*, i.e. the *only* truth, or *the* truth
- c) never says that any other person's belief is *wrong*, unless, of course, it is biblical, which is treated as an exception, and can therefore be said to be wrong
- d) is only intolerant of people who claim that what they believe is the exclusive truth, i.e. that it alone is true, and thus that any contrary belief is, by definition, wrong.

This absurd new definition of tolerance creates no difficulties for most of the population, because they do not have what the Bible calls '*the love of the truth*'. Therefore, they have no strong beliefs about which they would ever feel under a duty to make a stand. It only presents a problem to one group, namely *real* Christians who believe the Bible is absolutely true and that Jesus is the *only* way to salvation. Nobody other than a committed Christian has difficulty with this modern notion of tolerance because only genuine, biblical Christianity makes the claim that it is the only way for us to be saved.

All other religions, plus false, apostate, watered-down, liberal, ecumenical forms of Christianity, or what I call '*churchianity*', are relaxed about other people's beliefs. They feel no need to insist that there is only one way to get to God. They don't even believe that themselves, let alone feel obliged to say it to others. Therefore, this new and perverse definition of tolerance is usually only a problem for real Christians, for whom the truth is paramount. It creates profound issues of conscience for them, but not for others.

At the time I was writing this, a proposal was being put forward in the UK by *Sajid Javid MP*, the then Communities Secretary, that all public sector employees and office holders should be required to swear an '*equality oath*' or else be disqualified from holding any public office or even from working in the public sector at all. This would affect vast numbers of people including council staff, councillors, public sector employees and Members of Parliament, but also those employed in the National Health Service, the armed forces, the police and so on. It would catch millions of us in its net.

The idea came from a report written by *Dame Louise Casey* in relation to her review of '*integration and extremism*'. Because she is rampantly politically correct, her approach is to treat *all* forms of supposed '*extremism*' as wrong, not just those which emanate from Islam and involve rapes, beheadings, paedophilia and the pursuit of Jihad. Therefore, she also wants to target those Christians who are so '*extreme*' as to believe the Bible, and to take it seriously, such that, for example, they oppose the Government's policies on gay marriage or gender, or publicly criticise Islam.

She considers those beliefs to be just as extreme, and therefore just as anti-social, as the beliefs of those who blow up aeroplanes or set off suicide vests. Thus she, and those like her, are more concerned about those who *criticise* Islam than they are about those who follow its teachings by engaging in Jihad, or rape, or by grooming vulnerable children for sex. The Government have no adequate plans to tackle any of them, or at least not with any zeal. They are only motivated to restrict the people who speak out *against* Islam or tell the truth about it, or who expose the inadequacies of the Government's policies.

The same applies with homosexuality, gay marriage, gender confusion, and many other such weird and perverse things which the UK Government now believes are "*in line with British values*" and which therefore need to be protected by this draconian '*equalities*' legislation. Hopefully the Government will fail to get this law through the House of Commons, but even if they do fail, or are delayed for a while, this is plainly the direction in which their minds are thinking. Therefore, they may seek to reintroduce it again later when the wind is blowing more strongly their way.

It is only genuine Christians who are seriously harmed by new politically correct rules and requirements because only they are committed enough to refuse to comply

If this repressive legislation does come in, it will only harm one group, namely genuine Bible-believing Christians. That is because a person from any other religion, or a lukewarm, wishy-washy, compromised ‘churchgoer’, doesn’t mind what he is required to say, or what anybody else believes, unless of course it goes against political correctness. Therefore, such a person would not bother to contradict anybody anyway, or refuse to say something that they are trying to force him to say, as he doesn’t have enough conviction to be motivated to take a stand on anything.

Thus, the distorted new definition of tolerance and, in particular the proposed equality oath, will hit genuine Christians very hard, but it won’t affect anybody else, because only committed Christians will refuse to swear an oath saying they accept gay marriage, or agreeing that there are multiple genders, or promising not to criticise Islam, and so on. Followers of false religions, atheists, and liberal churchgoers will just sign the equality oath without a qualm, because they don’t have ‘the love of the truth’ and therefore don’t care what they sign.

As for Muslims, they probably won’t be asked to sign anything anyway, because most officials won’t dare to confront them. In any case, deliberately lying to an infidel is not considered to be a sin in Islam, due to their doctrine called ‘*taqiyya*’ which permits it. Consequently, most Muslims would just swear the equality oath anyway, without having any intention whatsoever of abiding by it. Therefore, genuine Christians, *and only them*, will lose their jobs. Nobody else will, and the supporters of the new oath are well aware of that fact, which is precisely why they are pressing for it.

It will be like the late seventeenth century when, from 1661 to 1688, the *Test and Corporation Acts* meant that anyone who was not an Anglican, and who was therefore not willing to accept Anglican doctrines, could not hold any public office. Neither could they serve in the army or navy, or be an MP, lawyer, magistrate etc. That was an evil time in British history, during which genuine Christians were frozen out and had to go into business on their own or try to make a living in some other way.

However, even if the proposed equality oath does not become law, we are already subject to increasing levels of pressure and persecution by the general imposition of politically correct values and beliefs and the insistence that we submit to it all or go out of business. This is already happening now, and on a rapidly growing scale, and it is one reason why I decided to stop practising law. An example of this persecution is what happened to the evangelical hotel-keepers, Peter and Hazemary Bull. They ran a guest house in the UK which was also their own home.

They had always had a clearly stated policy that only married couples could stay in their hotel, not unmarried couples or, more recently, homosexual couples. Then two militant homosexuals, who had no genuine wish to stay at the hotel, but just wanted to attack Mr and Mrs Bull, asked to book a double room. When this was refused they sued, claiming they had been *discriminated against* on the basis of their sexual orientation. The two homosexuals won their case. It was held that the Bulls had acted unlawfully, by not letting them stay in their hotel/home, in which the two men may have engaged in homosexual sex.

That would have gone against the Bulls’ consciences, which is why they had always had that policy of only accepting married, heterosexual couples. They did so to prevent both adultery and heterosexual fornication, even before homosexuality became so fashionable. Their case went all the way to the Court of Appeal which, sadly, found against Mr and Mrs Bull by a majority of 3:2. The fact that the Court was so divided shows how controversial this is and that there is, therefore, every reason to continue to fight over these issues.

Two outrageously unjust cases involving street preachers who were treated appallingly by the UK police

In another case some years ago, Harry Hammond, an old man, was preaching in the open air when some homosexuals began to heckle him. He had a sign in his hand which said that homosexuality is sinful and that what is needed is repentance. Some homosexuals in the crowd then *physically attacked him* and knocked him to the ground, injuring him.

Amazingly, when the police arrived *they arrested him, not his attackers*. Moreover, they then prosecuted him, not them, on the basis that he was guilty of a so called '*hate crime*'. His attackers were not charged with any offence, even though it was a clear physical assault upon him, by any reasonable standard. The police chose not to prosecute the two homosexuals for assaulting Mr Hammond.

Of course, if the facts had been the other way round, and two *heterosexuals* had assaulted a placard-wielding *homosexual*, it would inevitably have led to a prosecution. Moreover, it would have been classed as an aggravated assault, because antipathy towards their sexual orientation would have been seen as the motive behind it.

However, the police and the Crown Prosecution Service were not willing to apply the same thinking in reverse, so as to protect Mr Hammond's stance on sexual orientation. Sadly, Harry Hammond died before his case reached the Court of Appeal. So he died with a criminal conviction, as if he was a wrongdoer, whereas he was actually a godly man and wholly innocent. I feel sure that, at the Judgment Seat of Christ, he will have his name publicly cleared and receive a major reward, on the basis of what Jesus said:

¹¹ "Blessed are you when men revile you and persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account. ¹² Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven, for so men persecuted the prophets who were before you.

Matthew 5:11-12 (RSV)

Happily, in the later case of John Craven, another street preacher, public vindication came much earlier. He was preaching on John 3:16 when two homosexual teenagers *asked him* what he thought of gays. He said it didn't matter what *he* himself thought and that what really mattered was what the Bible says. He then quoted from the Bible. He did not do it publicly, via his microphone. He had switched that off and was, by then, speaking privately and quietly, just to the two homosexuals. All he said was that homosexuality is sinful but that, "*whilst God hates the sin, He loves the sinner.*"

They responded by making a show of kissing each other in front of him and insulting him with crude gestures. Greater Manchester Police then *arrested Mr Craven, not them*, and alleged that what he had said to the two young men was "*insulting*", that it was "*harassment*", and that it had caused them "*distress*". Yet, all he had done was to politely and privately answer the question which *they had put to him* and also to quote from the Bible. To compound that injustice, for almost 15 hours, the police then denied him food and water, and even access to medication for his rheumatoid arthritis.

There was absolutely no need for any of that mistreatment, even assuming he had done anything wrong, which he hadn't. It was contrary to all normal procedure. Of all the people I have ever arrested, or that I have seen being dealt with by my former colleagues, not one of them was ever denied food, water or medicine. It was never necessary or justified, just as it was not in Mr Craven's case. The police were uncharacteristically harsh with Mr Craven and they would never have acted in that way with a burglar or a drug dealer, or even a terrorist.

In my professional view, both as a lawyer, and a former police officer, the police made a deliberate exception in his case. They went out of their way to treat him severely, because they wanted to intimidate him, and also to deter anyone else from speaking as he did and especially from preaching and quoting the Bible in the street. It was probably also a flesh reaction, arising out of their own anti-

Christian bias, because the UK police are now a very left wing and socially liberal institution on the whole.

Many officers, even if they themselves aren't personally left wing or PC, have concluded that *acting as if you were* politically correct is the only way to get promoted in today's police forces. It is totally unlike how it was when I was a police officer from 1983-1986. In those days the police had a strong sense of natural justice, and of right and wrong. Therefore, political correctness was something which only happened in a few left wing London boroughs, and which the wider public laughed at. But nobody is laughing now.

However, in the end, Mr Craven's case had a much more pleasing outcome than Mr Hammond's. The Greater Manchester Police were sued in the civil courts by his lawyers, supported by an excellent organisation called *The Christian Institute*. Mr Craven was claiming wrongful arrest, false imprisonment and breach of human rights. When the case was only a few days from trial, the Police caved in and settled the claim out of court, agreeing to pay £13,000 in damages and more than £50,000 in legal costs.

They clearly expected that they were going to be soundly defeated at trial. It was very gratifying to see the police getting their 'come-uppance' and that they got it so publicly. We can all take encouragement from his legal victory and be emboldened to speak the truth, politely and lovingly, even when in public. The police wanted to intimidate people, and to discourage others from preaching in public, or from criticising homosexuality, but their tactics seriously backfired on them on that occasion.

Some examples of the politically correct ideas that have been accepted unthinkingly by most of our generation and even by many Christians

1. Abortion

For nearly 6000 years, ever since the Creation, every nation on Earth has agreed that abortion is self-evidently wrong. It is totally obvious, and our own conscience tells us that, regardless of what the law now says. We also know instinctively that to kill a child is even worse than to kill an adult and that the younger the child, the worse the crime is. However, in 1967 in the UK, and then in 1973 in the USA, abortion was legalised, based on the extraordinary assumption that the unborn child is not a human being, even though we all know, deep down, that it is. Indeed, what else could it be?

This is a classic example of how political correctness works. People choose to be blind and deaf to obvious facts because they want to feel comfortable about doing wrong. Thus, the West is now carrying out abortions on an industrial scale. The UK alone has killed over 8,000,000 since 1967. In America it is over 58,000,000. The people of ancient Judah killed their own children too, by offering them as sacrifices to demon gods like Baal and Molech. But instead of millions, they only killed hundreds, or at most thousands. Yet, note how intensely God felt about the wickedness of what they did:

³ *and say, 'Hear the word of the LORD, O kings of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem: thus says the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel, "Behold I am about to bring a calamity upon this place, at which the ears of everyone that hears of it will tingle. ⁴ Because they have forsaken Me and have made this an alien place and have burned sacrifices in it to other gods, that neither they nor their forefathers nor the kings of Judah had ever known, and because they have filled this place with the blood of the innocent ⁵ and have built the high places of Baal to burn their sons in the fire as burnt offerings to Baal, a thing which I never commanded or spoke of, nor did it ever enter My mind;*

⁶ *therefore, behold, days are coming," declares the LORD, "when this place will no longer be called Topheth or the valley of Ben-hinnom, but rather the valley of Slaughter. ⁷ I will make void the counsel of Judah and Jerusalem in this place, and I will cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies and by the hand of those who seek their life; and I will give over their carcasses as food for the birds*

of the sky and the beasts of the earth. ⁸ I will also make this city a desolation and an object of hissing; everyone who passes by it will be astonished and hiss because of all its disasters.

Jeremiah 19:3-8 (NASB)

Note also what the Psalmist said, centuries earlier, about how God viewed the wickedness of those who killed their own children. He responds to it with very severe judgment, handing them over to their enemies:

³⁷ *They sacrificed their sons*

and their daughters to false gods.

³⁸ *They shed innocent blood,*

the blood of their sons and daughters,

whom they sacrificed to the idols of Canaan,

and the land was desecrated by their blood.

³⁹ *They defiled themselves by what they did;*

by their deeds they prostituted themselves.

⁴⁰ *Therefore the LORD was angry with his people*

and abhorred his inheritance.

⁴¹ *He gave them into the hands of the nations,*

and their foes ruled over them.

Psalm 106:37-41 (NIV)

That is how God chose to deal with the people of Judah, and Israel as a whole, for the comparatively small numbers of children they murdered. Therefore, how much more strongly must He feel about the atrocities being carried out today, on such a massive scale, in our hospitals and abortion clinics? Those who promote abortion have been careful to invent new words and phrases to describe it. Their aim in doing so is to obscure the truth and to prevent us seeing how wrong it is. They also want to tell us, and themselves, that it is not “*killing a child*”, but merely “*terminating a pregnancy*”.

However, if you were to shoot one of your colleagues at work, nobody would call it “*terminating a career*”. Also, instead of referring to a *child*, doctors and others speak of the unborn child as a *foetus*, or even as a “*product of conception*”, a truly Orwellian phrase. How would you feel if your boss ceased calling you a member of staff and called you instead “*a product of employment*” or a “*product of contract formation*”?

The clear purpose of contriving such absurd new words and phrases is to *deliberately dehumanise the child*. They are trying hard to distract your attention, and also their own, from what is being done. They also want to make it appear less real, both to you and to themselves. We must therefore go out of our way to resist that manipulation and to *insist on using the correct words*, even if we are the only person doing so.

I used to be a member of the Research Ethics Committee of a large hospital. I was invited to join it because I was a lawyer. One of the issues that came up before us was a research project on contraception. The researcher came to present their project before the committee and became very agitated when I used the word “*child*” to refer to an unborn baby. She didn’t like that at all and sharply corrected me.

It mattered to her very much and she really wanted me to stop saying ‘*child*’. However, I refused to be told how to speak and I told the committee that I try to avoid using words like *foetus*, *embryo* or *zygote* because their implications matter to me. For the same reason, the implications of the word ‘*child*’ really mattered to that researcher. If not, she would not have objected so fiercely to my choice of words.

When we consider the issue of abortion, or any other issue, we must think about it in a consistently biblical way and use biblical words and principles wherever possible. If we are not aware of any biblical words for the thing in question we should at least express ourselves in plain English, using clear, honest,

ordinary, everyday words. By contrast, the usual starting point for supporters of abortion is to argue along these lines, based on these principles, and using these weasel words:

- a) Abortion is an issue affecting the woman's 'own body' and every woman can do *anything she chooses* with her own body.
- b) Nobody has any right to interfere with that woman's right to choose, least of all male politicians.

However, their argument is based upon a false premise. The woman's body is *not* entirely her own. In fact, it does not actually belong to her at all. *It belongs to God*, as does everything and everybody else in the entire universe, including men's bodies, for the simple reason that He created us. Therefore, a woman is not free to do anything she wants to do with the child's body, *or even her own body*, because, neither the child's body, nor hers, actually belong to her. That is how God sees it, as these verses demonstrate:

***The earth is the LORD's and the fullness thereof,
the world and those who dwell therein,
Psalm 24:1 (ESV)***

***For everyone belongs to me, the parent as well as the child—both alike belong to me.....
Ezekiel 18:4(a) (NIV)***

***Who has first given to me, that I should repay him?
Whatever is under the whole heaven is mine.
Job 41:11 (ESV)***

¹⁹ Do you not know that your bodies are temples of the Holy Spirit, who is in you, whom you have received from God? You are not your own; ²⁰ you were bought at a price. Therefore honour God with your bodies.

1 Corinthians 6:19-20 (NIV)

***¹⁰ For every beast of the forest is mine,
the cattle on a thousand hills.***

***¹¹ I know all the birds of the hills,
and all that moves in the field is mine.***

***¹² "If I were hungry, I would not tell you,
for the world and its fullness are mine.
Psalm 50:10-12 (ESV)***

***The heavens are yours; the earth also is yours;
the world and all that is in it, you have founded them.
Psalm 89:11 (ESV)***

Another reason why God owns us is that Jesus *bought us back again* from Satan, the ruler of this world, by His death on the cross. That means that God doubly owns us because He made us and He also bought us back. Accordingly, He has every right to tell us what we can and cannot do, whether with our own bodies, or anyone else's. Therefore, in forbidding abortion, He is not *interfering*. There is nothing illegitimate about Him pronouncing on this, or on any other issue. It is He who has all the rights. We don't have any rights at all, so far as God is concerned. Neither do we own anything.

The Bible never speaks in terms of *rights*, but only *responsibilities*. Therefore, the whole pro-abortion argument starts from the wrong place, is based on wrong assumptions, and is conducted using bogus principles and flawed logic. The starting point should not be ourselves, or what we claim to own, or our own supposed 'rights' or 'entitlements'. We should always begin, *and end*, with God's commands, instructions and pronouncements. That is how we ensure that we start from the right place on abortion,

and on every other issue, and also how we make sure that our thinking is soundly-based and biblical thereafter.

Another illegitimate argument which is routinely used in support of abortion is that it is necessary, “*to save the mother’s life*”, where complications arise in pregnancy. They maintain that if the doctors have to choose between saving the life of the mother or the child, it is legitimate to get rid of the child to save her life. They don’t only use this argument to deal with situations in the very late stages of pregnancy, or during the birth itself, but all the way through. Thus, they even speak in terms of aborting the child at an early stage to avoid purely theoretical risks to the mother which *might arise later*, but which have not, as yet, actually arisen.

In this way they try to get maximum value from their argument, by applying it even where no danger or complication has yet occurred. However, the claim is entirely false and insincere. Although many women died in childbirth in past centuries, that is no longer the case, or at least not in the West, where the abortion industry exists. There are still some deaths in childbirth in the developing world, but they don’t practise abortion anyway and therefore don’t need to use this bogus argument about the danger to the mother. But don’t just take my word for it. This is what was said by C Everett Koop, the Surgeon General of the United States in the 1980s:

“Protection of the life of the mother as an excuse for an abortion is a smoke screen. In my 36 years of pediatric surgery, I have never known of one instance where the child had to be aborted to save the mother’s life. If toward the end of pregnancy complications arise that threaten the mother’s health, the doctor will induce labor or perform a Caesarean section. His intention is to save the life of both the mother and the baby. The baby’s life is never wilfully destroyed because the mother’s life is in danger.”

C Everett Koop

God’s judgment is surely bound to come upon the Western nations because of their policies on abortion. Moreover, it would seem clear that His judgment will be more severe on us, in the semi-Christianised European nations and in the United States, Australia, Canada etc, than it will be on countries like Japan and China which have little or no Christian heritage. They are doing the same wicked things as we do, but I believe they are going to be held less accountable because they have not had the privilege of the centuries of Christian teaching that we have had.

Until the 19th century, the Gospel was largely unknown in Asia. Therefore, given our comparative advantages, we in the West ought to tremble at the prospect of God’s coming judgment, even for abortion alone, let alone for our many other sins. Indeed, His judgment has already begun, because He will not leave it all to be dealt with on the Day of Judgment.

For example, the financial crisis endured by the Western nations since 2008, plus the crises over healthcare and pensions, are directly related to the abortions we have carried out. I say that because we are missing millions of people, aged from zero to their late forties, who would now be working and paying taxes if we had not aborted them. Their absence is one of the main reasons for our social and financial problems, which are a kind of grim justice in themselves.

Let’s now look at some other issues and identify similar errors, lies and absurd beliefs which have caused our society’s thinking, and even the thinking of many Christians, to become so unbiblical.

2. Opposition to discipline in schools

In 1987 the British Government allowed a free vote in the House of Commons on whether corporal punishment should be banned in schools, i.e. the use of the cane or slipper, and our MPs foolishly voted to ban it. Ever since then there has been a drastic decline in discipline in our schools. The change was made based on the misguided idea that the ‘*child is at the centre*’, and ‘*has rights*’.

The campaigners argued that all corporal punishment is automatically and inherently “*child abuse*”, regardless of how or why it is done. However, such thinking is the exact opposite of what the Bible says. It clearly tells us that physical punishment is appropriate, and indeed absolutely essential, if children are to be properly disciplined. Therefore, due to choosing politically correct ideology instead of biblical wisdom, Britain’s schools have seen a collapse of discipline, behaviour and respect.

That, in turn, is one reason why academic standards in the UK have declined so dramatically. Successive governments since the 1980s have chosen to hide that decline by a policy of deliberate grade inflation. Until 2012, exam results were not just held at the same level, despite the fall in real standards. They were fiddled to such an extent that average grades actually improved by about 1% every year. That blatant dishonesty went on for over 25 years, even though real standards, when measured objectively, were actually falling steadily throughout that entire period.

3. Opposition to parents disciplining and smacking their own children, even within the home

Despite the obvious decline in discipline and academic standards, the politically correct are completely blind to the harm that was done by banning corporal punishment in schools. Therefore, once they had achieved that, they set about trying to ban *all* smacking of children *anywhere*, even by their own parents *and even within the home*. However, smacking is actually God-ordained and is seen by Him as an essential part of bringing up children.

In the warped thinking of the liberals, it is the child who is at the centre, rather than God, or the parents. Therefore, they conclude that to smack one’s own child at all is abuse, in and of itself, no matter how justifiably or responsibly it is done. The vast majority of parents disagree with that *in private*, but are intimidated into silence when in public. If those who are seeking to ban all smacking succeed, it will be an even bigger disaster than what has already happened in our schools.

Sadly, many liberal churches are actively involved in supporting that misguided lobbying and they even imagine themselves to be doing God’s will. They are so steeped in rights-based thinking that they assume that that is how God thinks, whereas it is actually the reverse of how He approaches issues. Therefore, Christians need to take a bold stand and be willing to speak up openly to resist the tide of humanist thinking on this issue.

In fact, there is a desperate need for *more* discipline for our children, not less, and it needs to be physical. Mere verbal correction, or other non-physical sanctions, will never be enough to discipline a child properly, especially young ones, aged between two and twelve. During those early years the correction needs to be simple enough for the child to understand. That is not just my own subjective view. *It is what God says*, clearly and repeatedly. If you disagree, then you are disagreeing with God, not me, because His views are as follows:

***He who withholds his rod hates his son,
But he who loves him disciplines him diligently.
Proverbs 13:24 (RSV)***

***Discipline your son while there is hope,
And do not desire his death.
Proverbs 19:18 (RSV)***

***Train up a child in the way he should go,
Even when he is old he will not depart from it.
Proverbs 22:6 (RSV)***

***Foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child;
The rod of discipline will remove it far from him.
Proverbs 22:15 (RSV)***

*The rod and reproof give wisdom,
but a child left to himself brings shame to his mother.
Proverbs 29:15 (ESV)*

¹ “Children, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right. ² Honor your father and mother (which is the first commandment with a promise), ³ so that it may be well with you, and that you may live long on the earth. ⁴Fathers, do not provoke your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord.”

Ephesians 6:1-4 (NASB)

4. Opposition to parental authority and to the very role of parents

The PC lobby are now going even further and are undermining the very idea of parents being in authority at all. They object to the very concept of parental authority, in itself, regardless of how it is exercised. People who hold such views claim to be *pro child* and to be promoting the interests and welfare of children, but they are actually doing the opposite. That is what comes from rejecting God’s wisdom and replacing it with men’s ideas and with what Paul calls *doctrines of demons*. By that phrase Paul means false ideas and doctrines that demons have whispered into men’s minds to lead them into error.

As a mark of the absurdity of modern thinking in this area, much of which comes from the European Union, it is being seriously proposed in Scotland that the state should appoint a ‘guardian’, referred to as a ‘*named person*’, for every child. That legal guardian would *not* be one of their parents. On the contrary, the whole idea is that that state appointed guardian will represent the child *against its parents* and ‘protect’ it from their antiquated, illiberal, politically incorrect views. One of the aims of these so called ‘guardians’ would be to prevent any parent from disciplining their own child.

The State could then bring legal proceedings to take the child into local authority care if the parents were to smack them. The likely next step is to stop parents home-schooling their own children and thereby passing on their own Christian beliefs. Adolf Hitler saw the vital importance of influencing the minds of young children. He therefore made home-schooling illegal in Germany because it hindered him in brainwashing children with Nazi ideology. He wanted the State to take the place of parents so that he could instil his own ideas into the minds of children.

Western governments now seek to do the same. Therefore, for example, many members of the British government want to make it compulsory for children as young as five to be shown DVDs about sex. If that was not appalling enough, these videos will also promote homosexuality, ‘gay marriage’ and ‘transgenderism’! They also want to make it *illegal to withdraw your child* from these lessons, whereas it has always been the case that no school could force any child to attend any lessons which are about sex or religion.

Like many other Western politicians, those who are behind this are so determined to impose their liberal dogma on our children that they are willing to do whatever it takes to get their own way. Indeed, elements within the British government are also proposing to take the same approach with the issue of creation and evolution. It is now being proposed that teaching creation should be made illegal, even in private schools, and even for those who are home-schooled.

The point is likely to be reached where children may be taken into council care if their parents oppose the Government’s perverse laws about teaching, just as people are already forbidden to adopt, or even to foster, children if they are not politically correct. That is why, before being allowed to foster or adopt a child, people are now asked what they think about gay marriage etc and if they give the ‘wrong’ answer they are rejected.

That may soon be the position even with our own children, with the State seizing them if our views are not politically correct or are excessively Christian in the opinion of social workers. Indeed, it is already

starting to happen in Canada, whose Prime Minister, Justin Trudeau, is perhaps the most wicked leader of any Western nation.

Contrary to what our law now says, a child is not, and never should be, at the centre of anything. Putting him there will only spoil him, not benefit him. We need to resist this tide of political correctness about children's so-called rights and emphasise instead the parents' duty, *and right*, to bring up their own child in the way that God says they should. That plainly includes smacking. It also involves sheltering the child from any sinful activity, or from any false teaching which goes against God's standards, even if that comes from the State itself.

5. Disrespect for the elderly in general and support for euthanasia in particular

Over the last few decades, there has been a steep decline in the level of respect and honour that we show to the elderly. We see it all around us and in the media. Old people are not valued and, very often, they are not properly cared for. That has become apparent in recent years with the cascade of shocking disclosures about old and dying patients being neglected, and even abused, in hospitals and nursing homes. Therefore, we are now frequently doing the very opposite of what the Bible commands, which is that we must *honour* the elderly.

“You shall stand up before the gray head and honor the face of an old man, and you shall fear your God: I am the LORD”.

Leviticus 19:32 (ESV)

Instead of caring for every old person properly until they die, an alarming proportion of staff in hospitals and care homes are mistreating elderly patients. However, the problem doesn't originate in our hospitals and care homes. The terrible things happening in some of those places are really just a symptom of a much deeper problem in the hearts and minds of the British population. The doctors and nurses who behave in those ways (by no means all of them) are simply reflecting the way that the wider British community has come to see the elderly.

Much of British society now has a disregard, and even a contempt, for the old. The worst hospital staff reflect that wider callousness, which is endemic within a growing proportion of the general public. The elderly are not only neglected. Active steps are actually being taken to try to legalise *euthanasia*, i.e. bringing forward the deaths of the old. That is not technically legal at present, though I expect it soon will be, for economic reasons if nothing else. The fact that, since 1967, the UK has aborted over eight million babies means that the distribution of our population is now seriously skewed.

There are at least eight million people 'missing' from the United Kingdom due to having been aborted. They would, by now, have been aged between zero and 49 years old. However, that doesn't even take into account the many millions of children, and also grand-children, that those aborted babies would have gone on to have themselves, if they had been allowed to live. Therefore, adding all of these numbers together, we in the UK are probably missing about *fifteen million people*.

So, not only the absolute numbers, but also the *proportions* of the British population are not as they should be. That is to say there are relatively *too many old* people and *too few young* people. More to the point, there are far too few people of *working age* to pay the *taxes* we need. For that reason alone, it is becoming necessary, in many people's opinions, to solve our financial problems by disposing of the elderly.

The pressure for that is only ever going to increase as our society's average age continues to rise. We shall eventually reach a point where there will be only one tax payer for every pensioner, which is completely unsustainable financially. Therefore, some doctors are already taking practical steps to hasten the death of the elderly, even without officially calling it euthanasia.

They refer to it as putting the patient on a *'pathway'* whereby they cease to provide medical treatment. Some do this without the patient's consent or knowledge and simply stop giving them food and water. The obvious objective is to *cause* death, an outcome which can hardly be a surprise, given that all food and water is denied to them. But the doctors hide behind the technicality that this does not legally amount to euthanasia, as they say they are not *directly causing* death, but merely taking no active steps to *prevent* it.

There may, perhaps, be a time and a place for not feeding someone who is in the very final hours or days of life and is unable to eat. However, in creating this distinction between causing death and merely choosing not to prevent or delay it, they are being disingenuous, as withholding food and water inevitably causes death. Those who advocate this approach will keep on pushing the boundaries further until we eventually have an overt policy of compulsory euthanasia. In fact, even if we don't currently call it by that name, it is effectively what we already have in some places.

Therefore, in many hospitals, we now have a de facto policy of euthanasia, which is being put into practice by those doctors who are currently willing to operate in that way. Moreover, their numbers are growing. All of this is a very long way from what God wants, which is for the elderly in general, and those who are sick and dying in particular, to be honoured and cared for. Any human being, whatever their age, is made in God's image. That fact alone gives them an infinitely important status and makes them inherently worthy of honour, even if God had not expressly commanded it, which He has.

They also have the gift of life which God gives, and which *only He can take away*. Therefore, it is not ours to take, even from a person whom we know is already dying. The only exception is for murderers, whom God has said *should* be executed. However, that exception is made in order to *uphold* the sacredness of human life, not to undermine it. Therefore, a profound change is urgently needed in the way that we view the old and the dying. We need to view them as God does and to adopt policies and procedures, right across the board, which reflect a biblical approach to their care.

As with all the other issues we have looked at, we need to get our attitudes, values, practices and policies *from the Bible*, not from the increasingly warped thinking of our society, which is diverging ever farther away from a biblical world-view. At any rate, that is what the churches ought to stand for, and to speak up for, irrespective of whether we ever succeed in changing public opinion, or Government policy, and implementing what the Bible teaches.

6. Homosexuality and gender confusion generally

The Bible is unmistakably clear in saying that homosexual activity is wrong. It says so just as plainly as it says that adultery and fornication between men and women are wrong:

You shall not lie with a male as with a woman; it is an abomination.
Leviticus 18:22 (ESV)

If a man lies with a male as with a woman, both of them have committed an abomination; they shall surely be put to death; their blood is upon them.
Leviticus 20:13 (ESV)

²⁴Therefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts to impurity, to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves, ²⁵because they exchanged the truth about God for a lie and worshiped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever! Amen. ²⁶For this reason God gave them up to dishonorable passions. For their women exchanged natural relations for those that are contrary to nature; ²⁷and the men likewise gave up natural relations with women and were consumed with passion for one another, men committing shameless acts with men and receiving in themselves the due penalty for their error.

Romans 1:24-27 (ESV)

Likewise, *'transgenderism'*, or any other form of confusion about your gender, is an abomination. It is not a lifestyle choice, as we do not actually have a choice in this at all. We have no say in the matter, as our gender is given to us at conception and is fixed forever. To deny it, or seek to change it, is not only sin, but utterly silly, because it simply cannot be done. Moreover, to try to act like a member of the other sex, or to dress in their clothes, is also an abomination in God's eyes. That is not what I say. It is what He says Himself:

A woman shall not wear a man's garment, nor shall a man put on a woman's cloak, for whoever does these things is an abomination to the LORD your God.

Deuteronomy 22:5 (ESV)

However, our society, and even much of the Church, is increasingly being mentally reprogrammed to accept such perverse and unbiblical things. Alarming, in a recent survey, a majority of American Christians i.e. those who claim to be Christians, said they support homosexuality.

Initially, campaigners only sought to change society's view to the extent that homosexual acts would no longer be treated as a *criminal offence*. However, having succeeded in that, they wanted to go further. Their aim now is to *prevent even the expression of any disapproval* of homosexuality by silencing anyone who dares to speak the truth about it. They have now largely achieved that too.

Therefore, having been emboldened by the success of the second stage of their long campaign, they are seeking to go even further. They are no longer content with our silence. The mere absence of our disapproval is not enough for them any longer. They now want to *compel us to positively approve of what they do* and to express it openly, whenever they tell us to do so, and with words of their choosing.

Accordingly, few things will now produce more rage than saying that homosexual activity is wrong. Consequently, very few preachers are now brave enough to say it. But we must hold absolutely firm to what God says, no matter what our society says, or does, to us for speaking the truth. However, in saying that homosexual activity is sinful, we are not to look down on the people who commit those sins. Homosexuals are just sinners, as we all are.

We therefore have no right judge them, in the *'kreetace'* sense, as prohibited by Matthew 7:1, which means to usurp Jesus' role as Judge or to assume any superiority over other people. I say that because the criticism is often made of those who oppose homosexuality, gay marriage or gender confusion that they are being *judgemental*. But that is not usually the case. It is simply that we must call sin by its right name, and say what God says about it, whether we are dealing with homosexuals or heterosexuals.

In doing so we *are* of course judging, but only in the *'diakrino'* sense. That means to weigh up, assess or classify people, so as to know who or what we are dealing with, and whether or not they are a valid teacher, or can be trusted. That is something which the Bible actually *requires* us to do, unlike the *kreetace* form of judging, which the Bible *forbids* us to do.

See my audio teaching series on Matthew's gospel, and also my audio series on forgiveness, for more detail on the distinction between these two very different Greek words for two very different forms of judging, both of which are translated as 'judge' in English. Therefore, even over the meaning of the word *'judge'*, there is much confusion, which wrongly silences many people.

7. Ecumenism

Ecumenism became fashionable in Western churches after World War Two. It involves the belief that all the churches should come together and be *united*. However, it is based on a very misguided and unbiblical definition of 'unity'. What they are looking for can only be achieved by each of us abandoning any important doctrinal beliefs which might *create division between us*. Their view is that by such wholesale compromise we can then achieve unity. This comes from a distortion of the legitimate idea that God wants Christians to be *united*, which of course He does.

However, the unity that God wants for us is that which comes *from all of us believing the truth*, i.e. from knowing and accepting true biblical facts and having *accurate doctrine*. It has nothing to do with abandoning, or even adjusting, our beliefs to fit in with whatever is currently the majority view, even within churches, let alone amongst the unbelieving world. Ironically, in order to achieve this kind of shallow, artificial, unbiblical unity, the ecumenical movement urges us to get rid of two things that God very much wants us to keep.

Those are, firstly, our commitment to *truth* and, secondly, the maintenance of *accurate doctrines*. False, man-made unity, based on luke-warmness and compromise, actually destroys the real unity that God wants for us. Genuine unity can only be based on truth and sound doctrine. Otherwise, it would consist of nothing more than the fact that we are all engaging in the same kinds of error and apostasy, or at least that we are not objecting to each other doing so. But that is not unity. It is just an agreed sharing of error.

8. Israel and the Jewish people

This is a vast subject, but I am only going to deal with it very briefly here because I intend to address it more fully within later books which will be about prophecy, Israel, Islam, the end times, and other related issues. For now, let it suffice for me to say that Israel and the Jewish people are deeply loved by God. Indeed, they are *“the apple of His eye”*, i.e. the pupil of His eye, about which He is acutely sensitive and protective:

For thus said the LORD of hosts, after his glory sent me to the nations who plundered you, for he who touches you touches the apple of his eye:

Zechariah 2:8 (ESV)

Israel is special to God because, nearly 4000 years ago, He made a promise to a man called Abraham that He would form a nation out of him, through which the whole world would be blessed. That nation is the Jewish people. God also promised Abraham that He would give his descendants a land of their own which would be theirs *forever*. That land is Israel. These promises which God made to Abraham, and which He later repeated to his son, Isaac, and to his grandson, Jacob, are central to the whole Bible and to all of God’s dealings with the human race and to His future plans for the establishment of God’s Kingdom on this Earth.

This Kingdom will be based in Jerusalem, from which Jesus will reign, as King of Israel, after He returns. All of this is made explicitly and unmistakably clear throughout the Bible, in which the word ‘Israel’ occurs 2563 times. Yet, largely due to Satan’s deliberate intervention, so as to deceive vast numbers of people about God’s plans, these facts are largely unknown, even in the churches. Indeed, a very false and damaging teaching has spread through many denominations to the effect that God has *“finished with the Jews”* and that *“the Church has replaced Israel”*.

Nothing could be further from the truth, because God has expressly, and repeatedly, said that He will never forget, abandon, forsake or replace His Chosen people, the Jews, and that He will ensure that they return to their land and dwell in it forever. So that, in a nutshell, is God’s position but the world, and a large proportion of the churches, either don’t know it, or deliberately reject it. Therefore, instead of loving, blessing and supporting the Jews, as God has commanded us all to do, there is widespread animosity and even hatred towards them from all over the world.

That has been the case consistently for nearly 4000 years and it is called *‘anti-Semitism’* because Abraham and the Jews descend from the line of *Shem*, one of the sons of Noah. However, this consistent, uniform, ongoing hatred and violence towards the Jews is no coincidence. It is whipped up by Satan himself, who is well aware that the Jews and Israel are central to God’s plans for the future of the Earth, and to his own personal doom. Therefore, he has made opposing them central to his own plans.

That is why, for example, the United Nations spends an absurdly disproportionate amount of its time discussing Israel, a tiny country with very little land and only 8 million people, and why it is always condemning it and lying about it. It also explains why, for 4000 years, the Jews have been persecuted, most recently by the Nazis and now by the Muslims. But that persecution and hate are also coming from hundreds of millions of private individuals, all over the world, who have believed the blatant lies told about Israel.

By the way, there is another less well-known phrase which people are increasingly using to justify criticising Israel and the Jews. That is “*anti-Zionism*”, but it is a dishonest and weasel-worded phrase because it is actually hiding its true meaning and purpose, which is just to provide a more respectable cover for opposing Israel. The word ‘*Zion*’ refers to Mount Zion in Jerusalem but it has also come to stand for Israel itself and it is used in both senses in the Bible and also amongst modern Jews today.

As a further development of the word, when Jews refer to ‘*Zionism*’ or to themselves as being ‘*Zionists*’, what they mean is that they support the right of Jewish people, all over the world, to return to the land of Israel and to live there permanently, buying houses and raising families in the land which God gave to them forever. So, to refer to yourself as being ‘*anti-Zionist*’, and to pretend that that is somehow not *anti-Semitic*, is simply playing with words to disguise your real meaning and intentions.

Moreover, to be an anti-Zionist is, by definition, to be anti-God and to be opposed to *His purposes*, because He is the original Zionist. I say that because he has clearly and repeatedly stated that *He* wants the Jews to return to Israel, and to inhabit all of the Promised Land and that He is going to *cause them to return*. Therefore, do not be deceived by this phrase, which the world, and even a great many Christians, use because it is simply anti-Semitism by another name.

Please refer to the book that I am planning to write on Israel for a much fuller discussion of these issues. However, for now, let me simply say that almost everything that is said about Israel in the mainstream media is a lie. So is probably about 80-90% of what is said on social media. Therefore, if you want to know the truth you are going to have to search for it and be very discerning, even within churches, many of which are just as rabidly anti-Jewish as the secular world is.

Obviously, the place to begin is the Bible itself, which spells out God’s plan for Israel and the Jews, and for their future, none of which has changed and all of which is going to be fulfilled. But also go out of your way to love and bless the Jewish people, and not to hate, accuse or criticise them. To be blunt, you would be a fool not to do as God has commanded us because God Himself has sworn to bless those who bless Israel and the Jews and to curse those who curse them. That is why Israel’s enemies always come to a grisly end:

“...cursed be everyone who curses you and blessed be everyone who blesses you”
Genesis 27:29(b) (ESV)

“...blessed are those you bless you, and cursed are those who curse you”
Numbers 24:9(b) (ESV)

Pray for the peace of Jerusalem!
“May they be secure who love you!”
Psalms 122:6 (ESV)

For the nation and kingdom
that will not serve you shall perish;
those nations shall be utterly laid waste
Isaiah 60:12 (ESV)

...whoever stirs up strife with you
shall fall because of you *Isaiah 54:15(b) (ESV)*

*For the LORD has chosen Jacob for himself,
Israel as his own possession.*

Psalm 135:4 (ESV)

*Therefore all who devour you shall be devoured,
and all your foes, every one of them, shall go into captivity;
those who plunder you shall be plundered,
and all who prey on you I will make a prey.*

Jeremiah 30:16 (ESV)

*For the LORD has a day of vengeance,
a year of recompense for the cause of Zion.*

Isaiah 34:8 (ESV)

There isn't space here to go into all the details, but do yourself a big favour and, from now on, resolve to swim completely against the tide of public opinion by making sure that you:

- a) find out the truth about Israel and the Jews and about God's love for them and also His plans for their future
- b) love the Jewish people in every way you can
- c) support Israel – and do it publicly, not just in private
- d) speak up for Israel in your church, amongst your friends, and on social media
- e) pray for Israel and the Jews
- f) reject the lies told about them, and the hate felt for them, in the secular world and in many misguided churches, and let it be known that you are doing so.

9. Islam – the so-called “*religion of peace*”

Again, as with Israel above, I am only going to mention this hugely important topic very briefly because I will deal with it much more fully in chapter 16 below, and also in my future books. However, Islam is another one of those topics about which the mainstream media, and the vast majority of politicians, are consistently lying, to the point of absurdity. I say that because there are daily atrocities committed by Muslims all over the world, and also explicitly clear statements made in the Koran, the hadith and the sira, which repeatedly and unmistakably instruct Muslims to engage in jihad and, in particular, to do so by beheading. Yet we are still constantly told that “*Islam is a religion of peace*”.

That lie would be farcical if it was not so tragic and if it was not so widely repeated and believed. This is, therefore, perhaps the most blatant lie that we are told, and which political correctness aggressively requires us to accept. However, the following things are not only true of Islam, *but required by it*, as core teachings. Moreover, they are all things which Mohammed himself did personally and told his followers to do:

- a) Violence – it is central to Islam, i.e. authentic Islam, not the supposed ‘misrepresentation’ thereof, that it must be spread by invasion, fighting and murder. The express aim is to force people either to become Muslims or be put to death – usually by beheading, but by various other means too, including burning, boiling alive, and even gouging out of eyes.
- b) Rape – again this is a central part of true Islam, and it is what Mohammed not only taught, but did. So too did his followers, on a consistent basis, even in front of the women's husbands! Therefore, the rapes we keep hearing about on social media, though rarely on mainstream media, which

imposes a blanket of silence about this, are completely normal activities for genuine Muslims. They are exactly what the Koran instructs them to do.

- c) Paedophilia – sadly, this too is entirely normal within Islam and Mohammed himself married Aisha, one of his 11 wives, when she was *six years old* and had full intercourse with her when she was *nine*. However, even before that, he interfered with her sexually, from the age of six. By the way, please don't imagine that these facts are denied by Muslims. They fully admit it and see nothing wrong with it. How could they, given that it is all clearly written about in the Koran, hadith and sira? They are not ashamed of it in the least. It is only western liberals who deny that Mohammed did these things, or that his followers do exactly the same today on an industrial scale.
- d) Lying – it is a core teaching of Islam that Muslims can, and should, lie to infidels whenever it suits them. This is called '*taqiyya*' and it explains why deception is so endemic within Islam and why nothing that we are told by Muslims can be safely relied upon, even if they are not terrorists.
- e) Conquest by emigration – at the moment we are seeing millions of young Muslim men, all of military age, coming to the West as supposed 'refugees'. Yet, the vast majority are not from areas where any war is being conducted. In any case, why would they come here to flee an alleged war, but leave their wives, children and mothers behind? It is another blatant deception, which gullible western politicians either cannot see or are too spineless to admit. Actually, this policy of taking over other nations by massive waves of emigration also has a name. It is called '*hijrah*' i.e. "*migration for the sake of Allah*".

So, each of these young men who have been allowed in to the West, and who are causing so much chaos and crime, will soon seek, and be granted by our feeble governments, permission to bring their entire extended families over here. They will then begin to have enormous families to take over the West by 'out-breeding' the native population. This is not merely my own allegation. It is exactly what Islam teaches Muslims to do and what they have been doing consistently for 1400 years. That policy has helped them to take over in 57 countries and to be well on the way to taking over in many more.

- f) Taxing the infidels – i.e. taking money from us, either by halal certificates, or via our hopelessly naive benefits systems, so as to fund Muslim families and mosques at the expense of the infidels. That is one reason why so few Muslims go out to work, even as few as 20% in some places. Many prefer to have huge families and claim state benefits while paying no tax.

I could say a great deal more about Islam, and the lies that we are told *by our own politicians and media*, but please refer to my future books for a much fuller account. I would just add that it is my growing conviction that the coming antichrist whom the Bible speaks about will be a Muslim and that the religion of the antichrist will be Islam.

There are many reasons why I have reached that conclusion, which are too lengthy to set out here. However, with the alarming expansion of the Muslim population that we are now seeing, plus the avalanche of immigration towards the West, and the vast increase in the scale and ferocity of the Jihad ('holy war'), I am convinced that the arrival of the antichrist cannot now be far away. The pieces are falling into place at an astonishing pace.

At any rate, I have written chapter 16, and also include this brief section here about Islam, in a book which is about wisdom, because I do not believe that anyone can claim to be wise if they do not see Islam for what it is but instead naively believe the nonsense we are told about it being a religion of peace. It is not. It is a religion of war and conquest, of rape, paedophilia and repression, and of deception and theft. There is no point pretending otherwise, or at least not if you claim to be wise, or want to become so.

10. Pornography

The changes that have occurred since the early 1960s, with the unsuccessful trial for obscenity of the publishers of the book *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, have transformed Britain. The same explosion of pornography which came from that defeat has also occurred throughout the Western world. In the space of one decade the legal and social measures we had put in place to uphold decency were swept away and things are now shown on TV, and on the internet, which used only to be seen in seedy cinemas in Soho.

There is now so much of it that pornography no longer shocks most of us. That may be seen as acceptable by our lawmakers, but not by God. Therefore, neither should we accept pornography, or consider it normal, however widespread it becomes. There are many ways in which pornography harms our society, including degrading women, and corrupting the minds of men.

Countless men are now drawn to it and they are becoming increasingly unable, or unwilling, to break free of its hold over them. Even more tragically, it is promoting promiscuity between children and also destroying their innocence, which is one of the most wonderful things about childhood, i.e. as God intends it to be. That is to say that God positively wants children not to know anything about such things, and to remain in that position for as long as possible.

For all those reasons, the demons have pulled the strings of our politicians very skilfully, so as to ensure that pornography was first legalised and then widely promoted. Again, such consistent and widespread changes could not have occurred at the same time, all over the world, without the involvement of demons. Perhaps the worst feature of pornography, although one which few people recognise, is that it is a *deseccration of the image of God*. I say that because the human race have all been created in His own image.

That means what it says, quite literally. God made us to *look like He looks*, which was an immense privilege and honour for us. He actually allowed us, and also the angels, to share His physical appearance. Therefore, to take the human body, which is made in God's image and likeness, and to use it for pornography, is a terrible desecration. Indeed, it is a blasphemy. We may not see it that way, but God does. It is therefore an insult to Him, quite apart from all of the other dreadful harm that it causes.

11. Promiscuity

Alongside all the above changes, there has also been a vast increase in promiscuity. It is now considered normal, *even in many churches*, for people to have sex prior to, and even outside of, marriage. Therefore, it is no longer even seen as a basis for comment, let alone disapproval, if people live together before their marriage. The idea that there should be faithfulness between husband and wife, forsaking all others, is now considered by many to be unrealistic, old fashioned, and even ridiculous.

At any rate, it is certainly not seen as important and, even in the churches, many cannot see why this matters so much to God. The resultant chaos and misery that we now see in terms of unfaithfulness and divorce obviously harms women and children, but it also damages men. It is the direct and foreseeable end-product of this new permissive attitude to sex, both before and outside of marriage, which our society, and even many of our churches, have adopted.

12. Feminism

It now takes an exceptionally courageous man to tell the truth in public, even in a church meeting, about what God says about men and women and the way in which they should relate to each other and to Him. For any man to speak about women at all, and especially to mention so called "*women's issues*", is seen as an outrage. It is felt that only women are allowed to say anything about women. Therefore, woe betide any man who intrudes into this area, especially if he dares to say that men and women are not the same, or that they have different God-given roles.

However, the truth is that although God has made men and women equal, they are obviously and undeniably different. Moreover, He made them different deliberately, for a number of very good reasons. Although they are quite definitely of equal value in God's eyes, He wants the husband to be in authority over his wife and for the wife to submit to her husband.

This is all meant to take place in a context of *love, not domination*, and is intended to mirror the relationship between Jesus Christ and His Church. Indeed, the husband has actually been given the harder task. He has to love his wife "*as Christ loves the Church*". That is a very tall order indeed, which none of us has ever fully achieved.

Feminist thinking, which few are now brave enough to contradict, even in private, has led to the very opposite of what God wants. It has promoted hostility, suspicion, contempt, and even hatred, towards men in general. In particular, it rejects the leadership role of the husband. It also promotes anger, stridency and the practice of women seeking to imitate male characteristics. That may seem to be an odd thing for feminists to want, given their dislike of men. Nevertheless, it is a central part of their policy to seek to 'masculinise' women.

At the same time they will seek to feminise men, i.e. to undermine and devalue the whole God-given concept of masculinity and to urge men to think, act, and even dress, like women. Both of these aims are very wrong, because the truth is that God deliberately designed men and women to be different, but also complementary. His aim is to make them a perfect whole when they are joined together in marriage.

The thinking behind feminism is unbiblical and profoundly misguided. It has therefore resulted, unsurprisingly, in terrible unhappiness, not least in the collapse of marriage in the West and the resultant broken homes and fatherless children. Ironically, feminism has probably done its greatest damage to women themselves. Its adherents have responded to their perceived mistreatment with a level of rage that has only ever made them more miserable and has achieved nothing constructive.

Feminism therefore harms children, families, husbands and society as a whole, but probably women most of all. Interestingly, the vast majority of women are now seeing what feminism really is and they are rejecting it in droves. A recent survey shows that only 7% of British women describe themselves as 'feminists'. Yet, that same survey shows that 92% of British women believe that men and women are of equal value and that they should be paid the same wage if they do exactly the same job.

The point is that women themselves can see that those obvious facts are not what feminism is about. That must be so, because if they thought it was just about being of equal value, and getting equal pay, then the same percentage of women would call themselves feminists as there are who say that men and women are equal. In the 1980s and 1990s many women assumed that feminism was indeed about women being of equal value. However, they have since come to realise that it is actually a militant ideology and a nasty, spiteful, sour-spirited movement, led by women who *simply hate men* and want to knock them down.

Most women don't think that way and don't have that aim, even though they feel fully equal and do want to be paid the same. Accordingly, feminism, when correctly defined, is now being rejected by the vast majority. Sadly that 7% who do hate men, and whose hearts are filled with rage, are very influential, mainly because they operate so militantly and loudly. They then seek to impose their warped agenda on us all, including other women, whether we agree with it or not. As with all political correctness, it is not primarily our *agreement* that they seek, but our *compliance*.

One of the biggest errors of feminism is that it devalues the role of *mother*. It especially despises those mothers who choose to stay at home and to care for their own children rather than go out to work and let a nursery or a child minder bring them up in her place. It is central to feminism that a woman can *and should* do everything that men do, including going out to work, rather than caring for their own

children. They see that role as demeaning and restrictive and they are not inhibited about saying so, regardless of the feelings of those mothers who freely choose to look after their own children.

Therefore, going out to work instead of bringing up children is not something which feminists merely wish to make possible, *for those who want it*. They push their ideology aggressively and many of them despise those mothers who don't share their beliefs or their priorities. By contrast, women who think biblically will focus first of all on meeting the needs of their children during their crucial formative years, rather than being preoccupied with themselves, or their careers, or anything else that they want out of life.

However, the policies of recent British governments, and especially the Coalition from 2010 to 2015, which was influenced by the Liberal Democrats, has been to push mothers to go out to work as soon as possible and to place their children in nurseries! Few things are sadder than a policy of deliberately seeking to put young children under the care of other people, *instead of their own mothers*, and thus depriving them of that precious time together at such a vital formative stage.

In pursuit of that ideologically driven foolishness, the Coalition Government said they would pay a further £1,200 per annum to working mothers to help with child care fees. But they proposed to give nothing to those mothers who choose to bring up their own children at home. They referred to them disparagingly as having made a "*lifestyle choice*", as if caring for their own children was inappropriate, and even selfish.

One of the worst aspects of feminist thinking is the way in which it not only fails to honour men, but deliberately seeks to *dishonour* them. The aim is not only to undermine the role of the husband, but to devalue *men in general*. They portray them as inadequate, stupid and worthy only of contempt. This can be seen even in films and TV programmes in which women are now portrayed as strong and independent, with no need for men to protect or rescue them. One often hears of there being a "*war on women*", as if women are being undermined. In fact, it is largely the other way round, with men and masculinity being attacked and sneered at.

Feminist ideology is particularly hostile to genuine, red-blooded masculinity whereby the God-given qualities and attributes of men are allowed to be fully and properly expressed. Masculinity, as God designed it and intends it to be, is a good thing, not a problem or a fault. God actually wants men to be capable of fighting, including physically, to defend their wives and families, and also to stand up for their country and generally for what is right.

That aggression, and the in-built instinct to fight, is not a defect or a sin. God has programmed it into the 'software' of the male and He wants it to be properly harnessed and allowed to find an outlet, although obviously only at the right times and in the right way. However, that aspect of maleness is now mocked and spoken of as if it had no value. Yet, strangely, whilst criticising these aggressive qualities in men, they promote and advocate them in women.

Therefore, for example, in two different TV series which I watch, the women police officers are usually the ones who fight the villains, and they always win, whereas the men do not, and even depend on the women. Men are often depicted on TV as spineless and feeble and as the butt of the jokes, whereas the female characters never are. That is forbidden because it would "*stereotype women as weak and stupid*", and would be an outrage.

However, storylines which undermine manliness are seen as acceptable, and even necessary, so as to recondition our thinking. Their portrayal of men is tiresome, and also damaging, because the effect of that propaganda is to undermine men, and maleness. The thinking of feminists is effectively "*If we can only show men how bad and pathetic we think they are, and how much we despise them, they will see our perspective and then change for the better*". As a policy, that does not seem likely to work, and it certainly hasn't worked so far.

When feminists set out to mock and denigrate men, it does not cause men to examine themselves and embark on a process of self-improvement. On the contrary, it only produces a matching contempt for women. That seems self-evident, given how little respect is now shown in return to women, especially in the area of sex, where many men now see women as objects to be conquered and then cast aside, rather than honoured, cherished and loved.

I fear even more for the future because a whole generation of young people are now being brought up with no concept of what it means to honour the opposite sex, how to do so, or why they should. In the past young boys were taught 'chivalry' at school and, for example, to stand when a lady entered or left the room, to seat them at the dining table, and to open doors for them. Sadly, that rarely ever occurs today and, if it did, it would be said to be "demeaning" and "patronising", and as "reinforcing gender stereotypes".

It has gone so far that it may now be impossible to reverse the rot in our nations as a whole. But we can at least do so in our own marriages and families, and even perhaps within our churches, if others will allow it. We should therefore set out to deliberately swim in the opposite direction to most of our generation and to take every opportunity to honour our husband or wife, especially in public, and never to make jokes at their expense.

Women in particular need to avoid criticising or disrespecting their husbands in front of others, or complaining about them, even privately, to their female friends, because it has such a corrosive effect. It will diminish the woman who does it, and cause her own heart to be hardened, even if her husband never comes to hear of it. Rather than join in with the belittling remarks that so many women engage in, be different. When other women criticise or mock their husbands, go out of your way to praise yours instead and to let it be seen that you honour him and admire his achievements.

You may stick out like a healthy thumb in a fracture clinic, but it will be good for you and for them and may even cause some of them to rethink their own approach. The same applies to men. Never speak disrespectfully of your wife or girlfriend and always speak up for her if she is criticised. Honour her in every way, even if you are the only one of your male friends who does so, and even if they think less of you for doing so. Their opinion of you doesn't really matter, but hers does, very much indeed, and God's opinion of you matters even more.

13. The abolition of the death penalty

It is a peculiar anomaly that liberals support abortion for innocent unborn children, but oppose the death penalty for murderers. One might imagine that their approach to both issues would be consistent. But it isn't. They do not even recognise the life of an unborn child, let alone ascribe any value to it, but they strenuously defend the lives of heinous criminals.

On both counts they have ended up saying the exact opposite of what the Bible says, which ought not really to surprise us, given that their beliefs are 'doctrines of demons'. As an example of how muddled the West has become, the European Union is warning Turkey not to execute murderers or else they will not allow them to join the EU. Yet that is just about the only thing which Turkey is getting right.

What then is God's stance on the question of whether convicted *murderers* should be executed? We are told this very clearly in the book of Genesis. Also bear in mind that this command about capital punishment *is not part of the Law of Moses*. It was given to Noah long before then and is, therefore, applicable to *all of mankind, not just Israel*. Moreover, unlike the Law of Moses, this command has never been suspended or revoked. Therefore, this is what God still has to say *to every human being*, whether they are Jewish or Gentile:

⁵ ***And for your lifeblood I will require a reckoning: from every beast I will require it and from man. From his fellow man I will require a reckoning for the life of man.***

⁶ ***"Whoever sheds the blood of man,***

*by man shall his blood be shed,
for God made man in his own image.*

Genesis 9:5-6 (ESV)

Nevertheless, let us also look at what the Law of Moses had to say about capital punishment. Even though we are no longer under the Law of Moses, it clarifies God's thinking on this issue and its principles are still of relevance to us:

*“Whoever takes a human life shall surely be put to death
Leviticus 24:17 (ESV)*

²⁹ *“And these things shall be for a statute and ordinance to you throughout your generations in all your dwellings. ³⁰ If any one kills a person, the murderer shall be put to death on the evidence of witnesses; but no person shall be put to death on the testimony of one witness. ³¹ Moreover you shall accept no ransom for the life of a murderer, who is guilty of death; but he shall be put to death. ³² And you shall accept no ransom for him who has fled to his city of refuge, that he may return to dwell in the land before the death of the high priest. ³³ You shall not thus pollute the land in which you live; for blood pollutes the land, and no expiation can be made for the land, for the blood that is shed in it, except by the blood of him who shed it. ³⁴ You shall not defile the land in which you live, in the midst of which I dwell; for I the LORD dwell in the midst of the people of Israel.”*

Numbers 35:29-34 (RSV)

Although the death and resurrection of Jesus has fulfilled the Law of Moses and brought it to an end, that does *not* mean that the death penalty has been abolished. The command to put murderers to death was given to *all of mankind*, long before the Law of Moses was given. Moreover, Jesus has not subsequently cancelled it either.

In Romans, Paul discusses how rulers and governing authorities “*bear the sword*” in order to do God's will. Therefore, when murderers are put to death, it is done with God's full approval, to “*execute His wrath on the wrongdoer*”. Paul explicitly confirms, in the New Testament, that God endorses the death penalty:

¹ *Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. ² Therefore he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment. ³ For rulers are not a terror to good conduct, but to bad. Would you have no fear of him who is in authority? Then do what is good, and you will receive his approval, ⁴ for he is God's servant for your good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword in vain; he is the servant of God to execute his wrath on the wrongdoer.*

Romans 13:1-4 (RSV)

Every human being is made in the image of God. For that reason, and for other reasons too, every human life is sacred. One reason why God ordained the death penalty for every murderer was precisely in order to uphold the sanctity of human life, not to undermine it. It makes a clear statement that nobody has the right to *murder* any other person. If they do so, then their own life is justly forfeited. That stark response demonstrates the seriousness of murder and shows how precious every human life is to God. So, it is not *killing* that God forbids, but *murder*, because He clearly spells out situations in which it is lawful to kill, whereas murder is unlawful killing.

It is for the very reason that human life is so sacred that the life of a murderer has to be taken away from him. That might sound counter-intuitive at first sight, but it actually makes perfect sense if you think it through. Of course, it also serves as a *deterrent* and as a *punishment*, both of which are valid additional reasons for the death penalty. However, let's be clear. The main purpose of the death penalty is neither punishment nor deterrence. It is primarily *to uphold the sanctity of human life* and to send out a clear message about its infinite value.

It is no coincidence, therefore, that when capital punishment was abolished in the UK in 1965 it quickly led to the passing of the Abortion Act in 1967. Our legislature made a clear statement in 1965 that, in the UK, human life is no longer sacred. We then followed that up, only two years later, by making it lawful to kill an unborn child. The one decision led to the other by a clear chain of logic, albeit a perverse and unbiblical one.

Had we done what God wanted, then we would have done *the exact opposite on both points*. That is, we would have retained the death penalty for murder, but continued to forbid abortion. Both of those policies would have upheld the sanctity of life and would also have been entirely consistent with each other. However, we chose instead to undermine the sanctity of life on *both* fronts and we are already paying a heavy price for that now as God's judgement falls on the UK and on the West as a whole.

Wise people fear God and seek only for His approval for what they think and say, not for the approval of other people.

The Bible promises many blessings and benefits to those who fear the LORD:

*The fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom;
all those who practice it have a good understanding.
His praise endures forever!*

Psalm 111:10 (ESV)

God also commands us not to fear the reproach or disapproval of other people:

⁷"Hearken to me, you who know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law; fear not the reproach of men, and be not dismayed at their revilings. ⁸For the moth will eat them up like a garment, and the worm will eat them like wool; but my deliverance will be for ever, and my salvation to all generations."

Isaiah 51:7-8 (RSV)

One of the many benefits of the fear of the LORD is that it greatly reduces our desire to be approved of by others. That craving for people's approval gets us into a lot of temptations and problems, and makes us willing to say all kinds of nonsense in order to be seen as politically correct and therefore to be accepted. Wanting the praise of men may even cause us to deny Jesus rather than be openly identified as one of His followers:

⁴²Nevertheless many even of the authorities believed in him, but for fear of the Pharisees they did not confess it, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: ⁴³for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.

John 12:42-43 (RSV)

By contrast, note the approach taken by apostle Paul. He saw pleasing God and pleasing men as *mutually exclusive alternatives*, such that you can please one, or the other, but not both. Realising that fact can set you free and enable you to give up trying to please the people around you. Instead, just decide to please God from now on, regardless of what others may say, and always be determined to think and speak the truth, not what society and the media consider to be right:

Am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God? Or am I trying to please men? If I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ.

Galatians 1:10 (RSV)

Wise people do not vote at elections on the basis of mere slogans and ‘soundbites’

Ours is probably the stupidest generation in all of world history, at least within the Western democracies, if not the rest of the world. The western nations have rejected God, and embraced all sorts of wickedness and folly, such as evolution, abortion, homosexuality, promiscuity, divorce, gay marriage, feminism, pornography, transgenderism, political correctness, the appeasement of Islam, and even the myth of global warming or ‘climate change’. All of these false beliefs have caused our generation to become dumbed down to an extent that has never been seen before.

It is, in part, the result of God handing our generation over and leaving them to get on with whatever evil nonsense they want to think and whatever wickedness they want to engage in. One also sees this dumbness in our generation’s handling of debate and political decision-making. In the past, even when most people left school at age 14 or earlier, or did not even go to school at all, there was far greater wisdom and straightforward common sense than we now see.

In elections, past generations only voted after carrying out a thorough examination of the facts, arguments and issues and after weighing up the views of the candidates. One only has to look at old newspapers and election literature and manifestos to see that, even in the 1970s and 80s, let alone the early twentieth century. People would go, in large numbers, to political meetings where they would listen to detailed arguments and debate the issues. They would also read avidly to get the fullest possible understanding. That kind of diligence has now largely disappeared.

Today, the majority of people, especially those in their twenties and thirties, vote on the basis of mere slogans and vastly over-simplified ‘soundbites’. I do not primarily blame the politicians for that dumbing down, or for our unwillingness to study the issues or hear sustained debate. Our leaders know that we are a stupid generation and that any political party which tried to talk sense to us, or which went into detail about complex issues, would lose heavily in any election. They know that the attention span of a modern voter is measured in seconds, not minutes, and certainly not hours.

Thus, they only give us what they know we want, which is *short, catchy slogans*, regardless of whether they are true, or balanced, or reflect reality, or address the substantive issues. Most of us like the message to be couched in bright, simple, colourful images and, ideally, in pictures rather than words. Then we are not even required to think, let alone engage in any arduous study. In short, we are being treated like idiots, for the very good reason that most of us *are idiots*, at least in comparison to previous generations.

Look for example at the childish, dumbed-down arguments presented by both sides in the 2016 Referendum in the UK over the issue of the EU, though far more so by the Remain camp, who were also dishonest and aggressive. It was amazing to see the simplistic nonsense that was being posted on social media, not just by the public, but by the political parties. People were deciding which way to vote on the most trivial points, rather than on any genuine and thorough understanding of the real issues. It was as if the debate was being conducted in a primary school, amongst 10 and 11 year olds, not an adult electorate.

The myth of man-made ‘global warming’, one of the biggest, but most widely believed, lies in history

There isn’t space in this crowded chapter to deal adequately with this huge subject of alleged man-made *global warming*. However, I wanted to at least flag the issue and to urge you to investigate it properly, with an open mind, and to re-think it if you have, hitherto, believed it. I should also mention that the supporters of this theory have recently changed its name to ‘*climate change*’ because, ironically, for the past two decades, there has not actually been any *global warming at all*. Even they are forced to admit that.

Therefore, to avoid embarrassment, a more flexible name was given to it so that now, whatever happens, whether it is hot or cold, wet or dry, calm or windy, it can all be attributed to carbon dioxide and other alleged 'greenhouse gases', such as methane. Thus, what we used to call *weather*, the subject which we in the UK spend 30% of our lives talking about, is now seen as proof of this theory, no matter what may be happening. Yet, we were already talking about the weather in Shakespeare's day, and even when the Romans invaded, before any industrially produced carbon dioxide existed.

Interestingly, when I was at school in the late 1970s, and even up until the mid-1980s, the 'consensus view' of much of the supposedly scientific community was that we were actually about to enter into another *ice age*. That was literally what we were taught. Then, in the mid-1980s, that view was quietly dropped and replaced by the idea that man's activities were causing the planet to heat up, hence the phrase 'global warming'. This new view was then pushed aggressively and anyone objecting to it is now called a 'denier' and accused of not thinking 'scientifically'.

Whenever anyone refuses to accept this belief, or suggests that there is no evidence for it, the global warming lobby simply says that their belief is now '*settled science*'. They then add that "*the time for questioning it has passed*", and that we should all accept the '*consensus view*', without further debate. But science is not about consensus views. What other people think, and whether or not they are in the majority, is totally irrelevant.

Science is not about majority votes. It is about identifying truth and error, based on properly conducted experiments and enquiry. So, for example, it used to be the consensus view amongst scientists that the Sun orbited around the Earth, yet that was completely untrue. In the beginning, only one man challenged that view, but he was right, and the consensus was wrong. I believe the same applies today. That said, it is not only one man who disagrees. Multitudes of scientists reject the theory of man-made global warming.

In fact, although the media have given this zero coverage, more than 30,000 scientists, over 10,000 of whom have PhDs, have signed a public petition confirming that they reject it. So, it doesn't actually sound like much of a consensus after all. As for why so many politicians, and so much of the media, are so aggressively pushing the global warming/climate change ideology, I believe the main reason is that it lends itself very conveniently to the *one world government* agenda. Therefore, pushing this theory helps them to gain greater levels of control over every aspect of our lives.

It means an ever-increasing role for the government and greatly increased regulation. Those are essential prerequisites for a one world government of the kind that they seek. Accordingly, be willing to question what you are told in the media, or at school or college, or even by governments, about alleged global warming. Be ready to challenge all of it, to think about it for yourself, and to test the evidence, rather than simply going along with whatever you are told.

Wise people can control their own temper so as debate controversial issues without reviling others.

When did you last hear even a discussion, let alone a debate, on issues such as Bible prophecy, Israel, spiritual gifts, the roles of men and women, demonology, deliverance, divine healing etc? In most churches such topics are felt to be too sensitive and controversial to be mentioned. Thus, they aren't even taught at all, let alone debated within or between churches. This is a shame, as we lose so much as a result. It also brings disgrace on the body of Christ.

Therefore, we need to learn, or rather relearn, how to engage in discussion and how to debate courteously, with good manners and self-control. That requires a determination to focus only on the *issues*, not on attacking or belittling the *person* who is disagreeing with us. Sadly, that kind of aggression is now the standard approach on social media, where insults are traded and harsh language

is routinely used. A wise person refuses to engage in such *'ad hominem'* debates, where the *person* who is speaking is attacked rather than addressing the *issue itself*.

That brutish, uncivilised approach is now the standard default setting for much of the debate that occurs on social media and also the mainstream media, and even within churches. By contrast, a wise person speaks with courtesy and self-control, without any loss of temper, or even raising of the voice. That said, this is a lot easier said than done, especially if those around us don't reciprocate and are therefore ill-tempered with us, or seek to silence us, whenever our argument can't be defeated.

Again, silencing your opponent, and preventing him from making his argument, or from being heard at all, rather than responding intelligently to the points he makes, is another standard technique today. We see it all the time in universities where the natural assumption, when a visiting speaker is coming, is to try to ban him. Or, if they can't do that, they will 'shout him down', so that he can't be heard, rather than just try to answer him with reasoned responses. So, instead of trying to *win* the debate, their aim is to *prevent* any debate from happening.

Nevertheless, whether or not others cooperate with us in this, each of us must go to great lengths to maintain our own self-control and to persist in trying to operate calmly and graciously. We must do so even if we are the only one who has that aim, which we might well be. Therefore, don't write people off if they disagree with you, or assume that they are stupid. Don't get angry either, even if they get angry with you. Stay calm. Be patient. Keep to the issues and avoid being drawn into trading insults or point-scoring.

Make the effort also to lower the volume of your voice when others are raising theirs. That last tactic, in itself, can be very helpful. It was a tip I was given in the police for defusing tense situations. Strangely, the more quietly you speak, the more authoritative you will sound and the more people will calm down and listen to you. However, if you raise your voice, you won't be heard, because others will immediately raise theirs and they will usually be able to out-shout you.

A wise person has regard to the real purpose of any discussion or debate. That is not to sound clever, or impress others, or even to be seen to win. The aim is, or should be, either for you to teach something to someone else, or for you to learn something from them. As soon as you start competing with others, or seeking to prove your superiority, or merely to show that you were right, rather than addressing the issue, you are moving into operating in the flesh. If so, that can't please God or achieve anything of value.

⁴ in order that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit. ⁵ For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit. ⁶ For to set the mind on the flesh is death, but to set the mind on the Spirit is life and peace. ⁷ For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God, for it does not submit to God's law; indeed, it cannot. ⁸ Those who are in the flesh cannot please God.

Romans 8:4-8 (ESV)