

AND THE PEOPLE CAME...

- Week of September 8, 2024 -

Sunday School -----	24
Sunday Morning Service -----	41
Sunday Evening Service -----	21
Wednesday Eve., 09/11/24 Service -----	9

AND THE PEOPLE GAVE...

- Week of September 1, 2024 -

<u>Undesignated</u> Tithes & Offerings -----	\$ 2,046.70
Children's SS Class Missionary Offering -----	\$ 1.00
Auditorium A/C Replacement Fund -----	\$ 150.00
TOTAL RECEIVED FOR WEEK OF 09/08/24:	\$ 2,197.70

- Week of September 1, 2024 -

<u>Undesignated</u> Tithes & Offerings -----	\$ 2,119.61
Auditorium A/C Replacement Fund -----	\$ 150.00
TOTAL RECEIVED FOR WEEK OF 09/01/24:	\$ 2,269.61

- Week of August 25, 2024 -

<u>Undesignated</u> Tithes & Offerings -----	\$ 1,330.14
TOTAL RECEIVED FOR WEEK OF 08/25/24:	\$ 1,330.14

- Week of August 18, 2024 -

<u>Undesignated</u> Tithes & Offerings -----	\$ 1,715.17
Auditorium A/C Replacement Fund -----	\$ 150.00
TOTAL RECEIVED FOR WEEK OF 08/18/24:	\$ 1,865.17

- Week of August 11, 2024 -

<u>Undesignated</u> Tithes & Offerings -----	\$ 1,396.42
Auditorium A/C Replacement Fund -----	\$ 30.00
TOTAL RECEIVED FOR WEEK OF 08/11/24:	\$ 1,426.42

Average amount of Undesignated Offerings needed for church operating expenses EACH WEEK, as a minimum = \$ 1,600.00



LISTEN TO -

ABIDINGRADIO.COM



WHAT IT MEANS TO BE SAVED

1. Admit that you are a sinner.
2. Admit that God says all sins must be paid for.
3. Accept the fact that Christ took upon Himself the suffering necessary to pay for all your sins.
4. You must change your mind about sin and sinning (God calls this repentance).
5. By an act of your will, accept by faith the Lord Jesus Christ, Who can save you from the penalty of sin. Then, tell God about this in a simple prayer. Believe that God keeps His promise to save you, and thank Him for His salvation.



MARK YOUR CALENDAR NOW!

**DR. PHIL STRINGER
WILL BE WITH US
OCTOBER 27-30
PREACHING ON BIBLE
PROPHECY & END-TIME
EVENTS!**

Church Directory

Todd W. White -----	Pastor
Debra Carlton, Mickie Shatwell, Lois Mae Floyd -----	Pianists
Derek Quinnelly -----	Greeter
Kim Phillips; Shirley White/LeAnna White; Berdena Bergman/Debra Carlton; Daniel Avery/GiGi Avery; & Keith Shufelt -----	Teachers
Larry & Mary Byars -----	Outreach
Keith Shufelt -----	Men's Prayer Group
GinaMarie Shufelt -----	Ladies Bible Study/Flowers
Seth White -----	Sound/Video
Larry Byars, Derek Quinnelly, David Smith -----	Trustees

REMINDER



**THE EVER-PRESENT DANGER
OF NEO-ORTHODOXY**

by Evangelist David W. Cloud

Neo-orthodoxy, which was invented in the 20th century, should be called neo-liberalism because it is not orthodox or doctrinally sound. Neo-orthodoxy is no friend of the truth. It is just only subtle and deceptive and less forthright in its unbelief than the old liberalism.

Neo-orthodoxy is known as "crisis" or "dialectical" theology in Europe.

Some of the fathers and influencers of neo-orthodoxy are *Karl Barth* (1886-1968), *Emil Brunner* (1889-1965), *Dietrich Bonhoeffer* (1906-1945), and *Reinhold Niebuhr* (1893-1971).

NEO-ORTHODOXY'S HERESIES

Neo-orthodoxy generally accepts many heresies of the old liberalism such as these: The Bible contains historical and scientific errors; the Genesis account of the creation and fall is not literal; Moses did not write the Pentateuch but it was written hundreds of years later during the time of the kings; the prophet Isaiah did not write Isaiah; Daniel was not written by the prophet Daniel; there was no a global flood, etc.

J. Sidlow Baxter observed, "My own reading convinces me that the leaders of the 'Neo-Orthodoxy' assume, generally speaking, the results of the more radical 'Higher Criticism.' The Higher Critics argued. The Neo-Orthodox assume. The former attacked the historical facts of the Christian faith; the latter now by-pass them as not vitally necessary to Christian faith. ... the inner attitude of mind toward the Bible and the historical facts of Christianity and the miraculous is practically the same as that of the older Modernism" (Baxter, Explore the Book).

According to neo-orthodoxy, the Bible only becomes the Word of God as it is *experienced* by the hearer.

Karl Barth said, "*The Bible is God's Word to the extent that God causes it to be His Word, to the extent that he speaks through it*" (Church Dogmatics, Vol. 1, 1, p. 109).

Neo-orthodox theologian Donald Bloesch says, "*the Bible is the divinely prepared medium or channel of divine revelation rather than the revelation itself*" (Holy Scripture: Revelation, Inspiration & Interpretation, p. 18). Bloesch agrees with the Catholic mystic Bernard of Clairvaux that "*the Word of God is not primarily a book of general truths and principles but a transforming energy that brings light to the mind and power to the will*" (Holy Scripture, pp. 21, 22).

Neo-orthodoxy emphasizes that Jesus is known by a mystical encounter more than by the Bible.

"*Truth is not a book ... or a creed ... Truth is a person. And Jesus is His name. Christianity, therefore, is not fundamentally about following a book*" (Frank Viola and Leonard Sweet, Jesus Manifesto, 2010, p. 137). This book was recommended by Ed Stetzer, who was head of the research department of the Southern Baptist Convention's LifeWay company.

This view is heretical, since it is impossible to know Jesus apart from the revelation of Him in Scripture. We are warned of false christ (II Cor. 11:4), and Scripture is the only way to discern the true from the false. A proper view of Jesus requires an infallible revelation of Him in Scripture.

Neo-orthodoxy claims that human language is incapable of communicating absolute, unchanging, eternal, inerrant truth.

Consider *Eugene Nida* who had a great influence on Bible translation worldwide by his work with the American Bible Society and

(continued inside)

the United Bible Societies from 1943-1980. He wrote influential books and conferred with scores of translators on linguistic problems involving more than 200 different languages.

“... *God’s revelation involved limitations. ... Biblical revelation is not absolute and all divine revelation is essentially incarnational. ... The words are in a sense nothing in and of themselves. ... The word is void unless related to experience*” (Nida, Message and Mission, New York: Harper & Row, 1960, pp. 222-226).

This is neo-orthodoxy. The psalmist did not hold to Nida’s theories about the words of Scripture. He said, “***The words of the Lord are pure words...***” (*Psalm 12:6*). Throughout Scripture, it is the very words that are said to be important, not just the basic meaning. Three times we are told that “***man doth not live by bread only, but by EVERY WORD that proceedeth out of the mouth of the LORD doth man live***” (De. 8:3; Mt. 4:4; Lu. 4:4). The words of the Bible are something in and of themselves, regardless of whether they are related to anything else. The words of the Bible are intrinsically the eternal words of God.

Nida’s foundational error was the rejection of the fundamental doctrine of verbal, plenary inspiration. “*The languages of the Bible are subject to the same limitations as any other natural language*” (Nida, Theory and Practice, p. 7).

The idea that human language is incapable of communicating the infallible Word of God is contrary to what Scripture itself teaches. God created man’s language for the purpose of divine revelation. The prophets claimed to speak the Word of God in the words of God. Paul described this in the beautiful passage of I Corinthians 2:7-13. Here we have some fundamental teachings about the Scripture from the apostle of Jesus Christ. (1) Scripture is “the wisdom of God.” (2) Scripture communicates “the deep things of God.” (3) Scripture is the product of “the Spirit of God.” (4) Scripture is given “in the words... which the Holy Ghost teacheth.” The inspiration is verbal, not general.

NEO-ORTHODOXY DANGER

Neo-orthodoxy is very dangerous.

It is subtle. It hides its unbelief beneath obscure language and biblical terms that are given a heretical meaning (e.g., speaking of the “bodily resurrection” of Christ or the “second coming” or “the inspiration of Scripture” but not believing these doctrines in a biblical sense).

Neo-orthodoxy also hides its unbelief by contradictions. This deceives the gullible. For example, the “evangelical” theologian Donald Bloesch seems, at times, to be sound in his view of the Bible’s divine inspiration. He criticizes liberalism and even criticizes neo-orthodoxy. He praises orthodox creeds such as the Westminster Confession of Faith which says, “The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which, at the time of the writing of it, was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and, by His singular care and providence, kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical.” The

Westminster Confession calls Scripture “the Word of God” and “infallible truth.” But Bloesch doesn’t believe this. He says, “*God’s Word cannot be frozen in the pages of Scripture*” (Holy Scripture: Revelation, Inspiration & Interpretation, p. 67). He says the Scripture contains errors. He says, “[W]e need to recognize that not everything reported in the Bible may be in exact correspondence with historical and scientific fact as we know it today” (Holy Scripture, p. 37). He says that not every text of Scripture “can be shown to coincide exactly with objective history” (Holy Scripture, p. 112).

This reveals the great danger of neo-orthodoxy. A reviewer of Bloesch’s work warns, “Though Dr. Bloesch expresses a love for Christ and his written Word, and though some of what he says is true to the historical Reformed faith, his view of Scripture is false. If one takes the author’s ‘middle road’ view of the Word of God, which seems to the present writer to be virtually neo-orthodox, to its logical conclusion, one will find himself mired in skepticism” (W. Gary Crampton, “The Neo-orthodoxy of Donald Bloesch,” trinityfoundation.org).

The same can be said for neo-orthodoxy as a whole.

It is very dangerous.

KARL BARTH

“Those who ... assume that Barth developed a valid view of the Bible, God, Christ Jesus, the resurrection, truth, or salvation will be in for a sad delusionment if they are honest with themselves. He began his career with his [commentary on] Romans and concluded his academic career with his lectures which were later published as Evangelical Theology: An Introduction. In these volumes, and in every volume in the interim, his approach to the Scriptures is the same; a rejection of them as the Word of God” (Raymond Waugh, Baffling Karl Barth’s Neo-Orthodoxy).

Consider some quotations from Barth:

□ “THE WORD [FROM SCRIPTURE] WHICH ENTERS HUMAN EARS AND IS UTTERED BY HUMAN LIPS, IS THE WORD OF GOD--ONLY WHEN THE MIRACLE TAKES PLACE. OTHERWISE, IT IS JUST A HUMAN WORD LIKE ANY OTHER. ... What stands there, in the pages of the Bible, is the witness to the Word of God” (Barth, Romans).

□ “The prophets and apostles as such, even in their office ... were ... actually guilty of ERROR IN THEIR SPOKEN AND WRITTEN WORD” (Barth, Church Dogmatics).

□ “The assumption that Jesus is the Christ (1.4) is, in the strictest sense of the word, an assumption, void of any content that can be comprehended by us” (Barth, Romans, p. 36).

□ “THIS TOMB MAY PROVE TO BE DEFINITELY CLOSED OR AN EMPTY TOMB: IT IS REALLY A MATTER OF INDIFFERENCE” (Barth, The Resurrection of the Dead, p. 135).

Barth was considered for posts in the faculties of the schools at Halle and Freiißwald, but “his denial of the virgin birth in particular twice cost him a professorship” (Eberhard Busch, Karl Barth: His Life from Letters and Autobiographical Texts, p. 10)

At a luncheon in Washington D.C., May 25, 1960, Barth was

asked by *Christianity Today* editor Carl Henry if the virgin birth and the resurrection of Christ were events which occurred in a normal historical sense. Barth got “visibly angry” at this line of questioning. Barth mockingly replied, “Did you say Christianity Today or Christianity yesterday?” He said “***the resurrection of Jesus had significance only for His disciples***,” implying that it had no significance to the world. The religious editor of United Press International, Louis Cassels, said upon leaving, “We got Barth’s answer; it was ‘Nein’ [German word for ‘no’]” (Gordon H. Clark, Historiography--Secular and Religious, 1972).

Though Barth wrote a commentary on Romans, he was a philosopher rather than a Bible teacher. He spoke and wrote so obscurely it is difficult to know what he was saying. Barthian experts disagree among themselves as to the interpretation of his theology. It is this very obscurity that attracts those who fancy themselves to be intellectuals and scholars. Consider this excerpt from Barth’s writings:

“If you ask about God and if I am really to tell about him, dialectic is all that can be expected from me. ... Neither my affirmation nor my denial lays claim to being God’s truth. Neither one is more than a witness to that truth which stands in the center, between every Yes and No. And therefore I have never affirmed without denying and never denied without affirming, for neither affirmation nor denial can be final. If my witness to the final answer you are seeking does not satisfy you, I am sorry. It may be that my witness to it is not yet sufficiently clear, that is, that I have not limited the Yes by the No and the No by the Yes incisively enough to set aside all misunderstanding--incisively enough to let you see that nothing is left except that upon which the Yes and the No, and the No and the Yes, depend. But it may also be that your refusal of my answer arises from your not having really asked your question, from your not having asked about God--for otherwise we should understand each other” (Karl Barth, The Word of God and the Word of Man, Pilgrim Press, p. 209).

This is Barth, the “giant among theologians.” You say, I don’t understand the man. Neither does anyone else, if they would be honest. The Bible, on the other hand, comes to us with plain speech. The apostle Paul warned the puffed-up Corinthians that it is the devil who complicates the simplicity of Bible truth.

“But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ” (II Cor. 11:3).

Paul warned, “***Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ” (Col. 2:8).***

Barthianism is human philosophy rather than Bible-believing Christianity. It is rank heresy.

Beware of the Barths of this world AND of those who speak highly of them.

Barth’s Adultery: “In 1924 Georg Merz introduced Charlotte von Kirschbaum to Barth [she was 13 years younger]; she soon became a loyal assistant and joined his household in 1929. ... In September 1925 Barth stayed at the Bergli (a remote cottage)

again. This time he got to know Charlotte (‘Lollo’) von Kirschbaum more closely. ... Many people, even good friends, and not least his mother, took offense at the presence of ‘Lollo’ in Barth’s life, and later even in his home. There is no question that the intimacy of her relationship with him made particularly heavy demands on the patience of his wife Nelly. Now she had to retreat into the background. Nevertheless, she did not forsake her husband. ... However, it was very difficult for the three of them to live together. ... The result was that they bore a burden which caused them unspeakably deep suffering. Tensions arose which shook them to the core. To avoid these, at least to some extent, was one of the reasons why in future Barth and Charlotte von Kirschbaum regularly moved to the Bergli during the summer vacation.” (pp. 158, 164, 185-86).

DIETRICH BONHOEFFER

Like other Neo-Orthodox theologians, Bonhoeffer’s writings are obtuse and often contradictory. He did not speak with the clear voice of truth. For this reason, he can sometimes be cited on both sides of theological issues, but any man who speaks with such lack of clarity on the fundamental issues of the faith should be avoided as a dangerous spiritual guide.

The following list of some of Bonhoeffer’s heresies is from Don Jasmin’s *Fundamentalist Digest*:

1. He denied the verbal-plenary inspiration of Scripture, believing that the Bible is only a “witness” to the Word of God and becomes the Word of God only when it “speaks” to an individual; otherwise, it was simply the word of man (Testimony to Freedom, pp. 9, 104; Sanctorum Communio, p. 161).

2. He denied the biblical God, believing that the concept of God as a “supreme Being, absolute in power and goodness,” is a “spurious conception of transcendence,” and that “God as a working hypothesis in morals, politics, and science ... should be dropped, or as far as possible eliminated” (Letters and Papers from Prison, S.C.M. Press edition, Great Britain: Fontana Books, 1953, pp. 122, 164, 360).

3. He questioned the Virgin Birth (The Cost of Discipleship, p. 215).

4. He denied the deity of Christ, advocating that “Jesus Christ Today” is not a real person and being, but a “corporate presence” (Testimony to Freedom, pp. 75-76; Christ the Center, p. 58).

5. He denied the sinlessness of Christ’s human nature and further questioned the sinlessness of His earthly behavior (Christ the Center, pp. 108-109).

6. He denied the physical resurrection of Christ, believing that the bodily resurrection is in “the realm of ambiguity,” and that it was one of the “mythological” elements of Christianity that “must be interpreted in such a way as not to make religion a pre-condition of faith.” He also believed that such things as miracles and the ascension of Christ are “mythological conceptions” (Christ the Center, p. 112; Letters and Papers from Prison, S.C.M. Press edition, Great Britain: Fontana Books, 1953, pp. 93-94, 110).

7. He believed that Christ is not the only way to

God ([Testimony to Freedom](#), pp. 55-56).

8. He was an evolutionist ([No Rusty Swords](#), p. 143) and believed that the book of Genesis is scientifically naive and full of myths ([Creation and Fall: A Theological Interpretation of Genesis 1-3](#)).

9. He adhered to neo-orthodox theology and terminology concerning salvation ([Testimony to Freedom](#), p. 130), was a sacramentalist ([Life Together](#), p. 122; [The Way to Freedom](#), pp. 115, 153), believed in regenerational infant baptism ([Letters and Papers from Prison](#), Macmillan, pp. 142-143) as well as adult baptismal regeneration ([The Way to Freedom](#), p. 151), equated church membership with salvation (The Way to Freedom, p. 93), and denied a personal/individualistic salvation ([Letters and Papers from Prison](#), Macmillan, p. 156). Dr. G. Archer Weniger declared, “If there is wholesome food in a garbage can, then one can find some good things in Bonhoeffer, but if it be dangerous to expect to find nourishment in a garbage can, then Bonhoeffer must be totally rejected and repudiated as blasphemy. It is worse than garbage” ([FBF Information Bulletin](#), May 1977, p. 12).

NEO-ORTHODOXY AND EVANGELICALISM

Neo-orthodoxy has spread widely within evangelicalism. A great many evangelical theologians and writers are Neo-orthodox. This is one of the terrible dangers that are everywhere present in wishy-washy evangelicalism today.

“Since the 1960s, many evangelical seminaries and colleges, denominations and organizations have been infected by the prevailing fog of Neo-orthodoxy. Many sincere evangelicals, including many pastors and professors, are Neo-orthodox liberals in regard to Scripture and don’t even know there is anything wrong with their view. ... many evangelical seminaries and colleges sent their bright young scholars to European universities to get their doctorates. A large percentage of these young scholars were infected with liberal and Neo-orthodox views of the Bible; and then they returned to their evangelical schools to teach a Neo-orthodox view of the Bible (what they sincerely believed were the ‘latest, most scholarly’ views) to their students” (Jay Grimstead, “*How the International Council on Biblical Inerrancy Began*”).

In December 11, 1995, *Christianity Today* called Karl Barth “the giant of this century’s theologians.” Instead of labeling Barth the rank heretic he was, they largely praised him.

In 2006, Mark Devine, a professor at the Southern Baptist Convention’s Midwestern Baptist Seminary, praised the Neo-orthodox Dietrich Bonhoeffer in *Bonhoeffer Speaks Today*. It was sold by LifeWay Christian Stores and positively reviewed in the Baptist Press. While admitting that Bonhoeffer was not “an evangelical,” Devine claims that since Bonhoeffer “got many things right” he therefore “belongs to the entire Church” and should be given a hearing.

We could not disagree more strongly. By denying Christ’s virgin birth, miracles, bodily resurrection, and ascension, Bonhoeffer worshipped a false Christ and taught a false gospel. By denying the infallible inspiration of Holy Scripture, Bonhoeffer

destroyed the very foundation of the faith. He was, in fact, an unbeliever, and this unbelief perverted everything he did and wrote. To deny the infallible inspiration of Scripture alone is a “damnable heresy,” meaning that a truly saved person will not commit this sin. The Lord Jesus Christ quoted from every part of the Old Testament and upheld all of it as divinely inspired and wholly authoritative. He quoted even obscure and difficult passages and testified that “the scripture cannot be broken” (John 10:35), meaning the Scripture’s testimony is 100% true. We are not to sit at the feet of heretics to see how much we can learn from them; we are to separate from them because they are spiritually dangerous.

“Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple” (Rom. 16:17-18).

“Be not deceived: evil communications corrupt good manners” (I Cor. 15:33).

By rejecting biblical separation, which is the divine means of spiritual protection, evangelicalism opens itself to destructive influences. Though the Southern Baptist Convention claims that it has cleansed its seminaries of theological liberalism, unbelieving leaven is still present. The writings of unbelievers such as Kurt Aland, Bruce Metzger, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Karl Barth, and F.F. Bruce, to name a few, are available without warning in the seminary bookstores, are cited by the teachers, and are used in the classrooms, and are thus quietly spreading the leaven of unbelief.

NEWS OF INTEREST TO CHRISTIANS

☛ **COURT RULES IN FAVOR OF CHRISTIAN TEACHER FORCED OUT FOR REFUSING TO USE PREFERRED PRONOUNS** - The following is excerpted from “Federal court rules,” *Standing for Freedom*, Sept. 6, 2024:

“In a win for free expression and religious liberty, an Ohio school district is scolded for compelling a teacher --at the cost of her job--to say words and advance ideas that went against her deeply held religious beliefs. The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio Eastern Division last month ruled that a local school district violated the First Amendment rights of a Christian teacher when it forced her to use students’ preferred pronouns.

“Vivian Geraghty, who took a job in 2021 as a long-term substitute teacher at Jackson Memorial Middle School in Massillon, Ohio, resigned a year later after the school told her she had to address two transgender students by pronouns that didn’t line up with their biological sex. Geraghty, who is represented by Alliance Defending Freedom, argued in court filings that the use of pronouns that did not reflect the sex listed on the student’s birth certificate would require her to ‘embrace the concept of gender identity against her religious belief that God created two unchanging sexes, male and female.’ ... Officials with the Jackson Local School District then called Geraghty to a series of meetings,

leading up to the school’s principal asking for her resignation letter if she continued to refuse to address the students the way the school wanted her to. Judge Pamela Barker [wrote in] her decision that district officials had ‘compelled Geraghty to use the students’ preferred names and pronouns’ and, by doing so, required the teacher ‘to utter what was not in her mind about a question of political and religious significance.’”

☛ **MORE COMPANIES ABANDONING DEI** - DEI, which stands for **diversity, equity, and inclusion**, but actually shows favoritism toward select groups of people, is being abandoned by a growing number of American companies, including **John Deere, Harley Davidson, Lowe’s, and Tractor Supply**. This month **Ford Motor Company** CEO Jim Farley sent a letter to its employees stating that Ford does not utilize quotas in hiring, instead prioritizing its resources for business purposes. The letter also stated that the company will not comment on the polarizing issues of the day and will no longer participate in the Human Rights Campaign Corporate Equality Index, which is a survey used to gauge a company’s support for homosexual policies (“*Ford walks back ‘woke’ DEI policies*,” *Fox News*, Aug. 20, 2024). Lowe’s home improvement chain also announced that it is ending its participation in surveys for the Human Rights Campaign. Previously, the company had boasted of its support for homosexual rights and sponsorship of Gay Pride Month (“*Lowe’s drops some DEI policies*,” *Fox News*, Aug. 27, 2024).

☛ **UNITED METHODIST HOMOSEXUAL HERITAGE CENTER** - The United Methodist Church recently voted to lift its longstanding ban on “self-avowed practicing homosexuals” serving as clergy. Now it has announced a new **Center for LGBTQ+ United Methodist Heritage**.

The press release said, “Stories, songs, exhibits, and a special film screening are part of the festivities when the new Center for LGBTQ+ United Methodist Heritage holds its Kickoff Celebration on Wednesday, Oct. 23, at Craig Chapel on the Drew University campus.” Karen Oliveto, the first lesbian bishop, will be present. A documentary “tried to claim that homosexuality was not a sin in the Bible until translations added it in 1946” (“*United Methodist Church’s New LGBTQ Heritage Center*,” *PJMedia*, Sept. 4, 2024).

This is nonsense, of course, as the King James Bible of 1611 described same-sex relationships as an abomination, vile affections, unseemly, and a reprobate mind.

“Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is ABOMINATION” (Leviticus 18:22).

“For this cause God gave them up unto VILE AFFECTIONS: for even their women did change the natural use into that which is AGAINST NATURE: And likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, BURNED IN THEIR LUST one toward another; men with men working that which is UNSEEMLY, and receiving in themselves that recompence of their ERROR which was meet. And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to A REPROBATE MIND, to do those things which are NOT CONVENIENT” (Romans 1:26-28).

The same Bible prophesies of false Christians such as the United Methodists -

“But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways; by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of. ... Having eyes full of adultery, and that cannot cease from sin; beguiling unstable souls: an heart they have exercised with covetous practices; cursed children” (II Peter 2:1, 2, 14).

☛ **KARL MARX AND GOD** - Karl Marx, a chief father of Socialism, raged against God with the most frightful blasphemies. Consider some excerpts from his writings:

“I wish to avenge myself against the One who rules above” (Marx, cited from Richard Wurmbrand, [Marx and Satan](#), p. 12).

“I am great like God, I clothe myself in darkness like him” (Marx, a poem sent to his father on his 55th birthday).

Marx’s play *Oulanem* gloried in the destruction of the world. “If there is a something which devours, I’ll leap within it, though I bring the world to ruins--the world which bulks between me and the abyss I will smash to pieces with my enduring curses.” Marx considered religion “the opiate of the people” ([Contribution to Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy of Right](#), 1843).

Marx believed the very concept of God is a hindrance to human development. The Communist Manifesto announces a war to the death against absolute truth, religion, and morality: “Communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religion, and all morality.”

☛ **KARL MARX AND KAMALA HARRIS...SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT WORDS, SAME MESSAGE** - Karl Marx was the father of modern-day communism, a philosophy and form of government responsible for the despair, deprivation, and deaths of countless millions of people since the Russian Revolution in 1917.

One of Karl Marx’s many aphorisms addresses the social, educational, and fiscal disparities of classes; he believed the root of all evil was capitalism. Marx argued that the only solution was equity, a social construct that ensures equal outcomes, however low the common denominator must be set to achieve them. Only by abandoning capitalism and embracing equity can a society and its people, according to Karl Marx, “**move forward into a future unburdened by what has been.**”

Does that quote sound familiar? Surely you’ve heard the modernized version, one that avoids any attribution to Karl Marx: “**What can be... unburdened by what has been.**” Who has adopted those words as her wide a-Woke progressive mantra and spreads it at every opportunity?

That’s right... Kamala Harris, America’s very own Karl Marx.

Whoa! Is it possible Kamala Harris isn’t as vapid and intellectually shallow as she lets-on, could she be cloaking her Marxist message in words many people don’t understand? Her supporters clearly don’t, they’re unable to focus on anything beyond their overwhelming obsession with her gender and race,

or... perhaps, they just don't care. It's very possible the prospect of a socialist... or its ugly stepchild, communist America sounds great to Kamala Harris voters.

That distinct possibility aside, the rest of America mustn't be fooled by Kamala Harris; like Barack Obama's promise to "fundamentally change America," she could be hiding some very insidious intentions in her word-salad message. And, unless we understand what Karl Marx meant when he said, "*Move forward into a future unburdened by what has been*" and what Kamala Harris means when she fantasizes about "*What can be... unburdened by what has been,*" she'll continue to feed that message to the American public... until we choke. And when it comes to getting rid of communism... once it blocks our collective airway and starves us of freedom...and no Heimlich Maneuver ever invented will be able to remove it.

☛ **WINDS OF WAR LOOM AS ROGUE STATES SENSE U.S. WEAKNESS** - The world is entering a new more dangerous security phase; the winds of war which have been lashing parts of the planet for the past few years could well go to gale force and bring us to the verge of a global conflict. Though both the major land clashes in Ukraine and Gaza appear to be largely locked in bloody stalemate, these conflicts could easily escalate and spillover regionally.

Gen. Jack Keane a retired four star strategic analyst told Fox Business that the U.S. is "on a pathway to the third world war." He cited a recent Congressional Commission on National Defense Strategy report that the U.S. faces "the most serious" and the most challenging threats since 1945 including the potential for a "near-term major war."

He stated to Fox that "Russia, China, Iran and North Korea are working together collaborating, coordinating and truly helping each other." Gen. Keane asserted, "The fact is that they perceive the United States as being weak, and they're going to take advantage of it."

Similarly speaking in London, the chiefs of both the British MI6 and the CIA asserted that the international order "is under threat in a way we haven't seen since the Cold War." A BBC report cited that the intelligence chiefs stressed that Russia's war against Ukraine should be countered by continuing Western military support for Kyiv. Yet American CIA Chief William Burns conceded that "None of us should take lightly the risk of escalation."

Beyond Ukraine, they cite the rise of China as the main intelligence and geopolitical challenge of the century.

Against this backdrop there's a hidden hand stirring disinformation in the run-up to the American presidential elections. Iran as well as China are primarily engaged in sowing discord and confusion among U.S. voters. It's a classic tactic to play both sides against the middle. ■

OLD GEEZER

An old geezer became very bored in retirement and decided to open a medical clinic. He put a sign up outside that said: "*Dr. Geezer's clinic. Get your treatment for \$500. If not cured, get back*

\$1,000."

Doctor Young (who was positive that this old geezer didn't know beans about medicine) thought this would be a great opportunity to get \$1,000 so he went to Dr. Geezer's clinic.

Dr. Young: "Dr. Geezer, I have lost all taste in my mouth. Can you please help me?"

Dr. Geezer: "Nurse, please get 5 drops from the bottle from drawer 12 and put it in Dr. Young's mouth."

Dr. Young: "Aaagh! -- This is Gasoline!"

Dr. Geezer: "Congratulations! You've got your taste back. That will be \$500."

Dr. Young gets annoyed and goes back after a couple of days figuring to recover his money.

Dr. Young: "I have lost my memory, I cannot remember anything."

Dr. Geezer: "Nurse, please bring the bottle from drawer 12 and put 3 drops in the patient's mouth."

Dr. Young: "Oh, no you don't -- that's Gasoline!"

Dr. Geezer: "Congratulations! You've got your memory back. That will be \$500."

Dr. Young (now having lost \$1000) leaves angrily and comes back after several more days.

Dr. Young: "My eyesight has become weak -- I can hardly see anything!!!"

Dr. Geezer: "Well, I don't have any medicine for that, so here's \$1000 back." (giving him a \$10 bill)

Dr. Young: "But this is only \$10!"

Dr. Geezer: "Congratulations! You got your vision back! That will be \$500."

Moral of story -- Just because you're "Young" doesn't mean that you can outsmart an "old Geezer"...

DON'T ASSUME NUTHIN'...

A photographer for a national magazine was assigned to take pictures of a great forest fire. He was advised that a small plane would be waiting to fly him over the fire.

The photographer arrived at the airstrip just an hour before sundown. Sure enough, a small Cessna airplane was waiting. He jumped in with his equipment and shouted, "Let's go!" The tense man sitting in the pilot's seat swung the plane into the wind and soon they were in the air, though flying erratically.

"Fly over the north side of the fire," said the photographer, "and make several low-level passes." "Why?" asked the nervous pilot. "Because I'm going to take pictures!" yelled the photographer. "I'm a photographer, and photographers take pictures."

After a long pause, the "pilot" replied: "You mean, you're not my instructor?"

THE EARS STILL WORK...

After a long and serious operation, Lena ended up in a coma. Try as they might, the doctors just couldn't bring her out of it. When her husband Ralph came into the intensive care unit to see

her, the doctors gave him the bad news.

"We just can't wake her. It doesn't look good I'm afraid," the doctor told Ralph in a quiet somber voice.

Ralph looked at Lena and with a soft trembling voice said "But doctor, she's so young. She's only 45."

"37" came the weak reply from Lena.

BE YE KIND...

Two boys on the school playground were discussing a classmate. One of them remarked, "He's no good at sports." The other quickly responded, "Yes, but he always plays fair." The critical one added, "He isn't very smart in school either." His friend answered, "That may be true, but he studies hard." The boy with the mean tongue was becoming exasperated with the attitude of the other. "Well," he sneered, "did you ever notice how ragged his clothes are?" The other boy kindly replied, "Yes, but did you ever notice, they're always clean!" Every negative observation was countered by a positive one.

An excellent example for us to follow! Let's refrain from "evil speaking" and be "kind to one another" (Eph. 4:31,32). Rather than contributing to the spirit of criticism, let's be known as those who cancel it.

THE PICKLE JAR -



The pickle jar, as far back as I can remember, sat on the floor beside the dresser in my parents' bedroom. When he got ready for bed, Dad would empty his pockets and toss his coins into the jar. As a small boy, I was always fascinated at the sounds the coins made as they were dropped into the jar. They landed with a merry jingle when the jar was almost empty. Then the tones gradually muted to a dull thud as the jar was filled.

I used to squat on the floor in front of the jar to admire the copper and silver circles that glistened like a pirate's treasure when the sun poured through the bedroom window. When the jar was filled, Dad would sit at the kitchen table and roll the coins before taking them to the bank.

Taking the coins to the bank was always a big production. Stacked neatly in a small cardboard box, the coins were placed between Dad and me on the seat of his old truck.

Each and every time, as we drove to the bank, Dad would look at me hopefully. "Those coins are going to keep you out of the textile mill, son. You're going to do better than me. This old mill town's not going to hold you back."

Also, each and every time, as he slid the box of rolled coins across the counter at the bank toward the cashier, he would grin proudly. "These are for my son's college fund. He'll never work at the mill all his life like me."

We would always celebrate each deposit by stopping for an ice cream cone. I always got chocolate. Dad always got vanilla. When

the clerk at the ice cream parlor handed Dad his change, he would show me the few coins nestled in his palm. "When we get home, we'll start filling the jar again." He always let me drop the first coins into the empty jar. As they rattled around with a brief, happy jingle, we grinned at each other.

"You'll get to college on pennies, nickels, dimes and quarters," he said, "but you'll get there; I'll see to that."

No matter how rough things got at home, Dad continued to doggedly drop his coins into the jar. Even the summer when Dad got laid off from the mill, and Mama had to serve dried beans several times a week, not a single dime was taken from the jar.

To the contrary, as Dad looked across the table at me, pouring ketchup over my beans to make them more palatable, he became more determined than ever to make a way out for me "When you finish college, Son," he told me, his eyes glistening, "you'll never have to eat beans again - unless you want to."

The years passed, and I finished college and took a job in another town. Once, while visiting my parents, I used the phone in their bedroom and noticed that the pickle jar was gone. It had served its purpose and had been removed.

A lump rose in my throat as I stared at the spot beside the dresser where the jar had always stood. My dad was a man of few words: he never lectured me on the values of determination, perseverance, and faith. The pickle jar had taught me all these virtues far more eloquently than the most flowery of words could have done.

When I married, I told my wife Susan about the significant part the lowly pickle jar had played in my life as a boy. In my mind, it defined, more than anything else, how much my dad had loved me.

The first Christmas after our daughter Jessica was born, we spent the holiday with my parents. After dinner, Mom and Dad sat next to each other on the sofa, taking turns cuddling their first grandchild. Jessica began to whimper softly, and Susan took her from Dad's arms. "She probably needs to be changed," she said, carrying the baby into my parents' bedroom to diaper her. When Susan came back into the living room, there was a strange mist in her eyes.

She handed Jessica back to Dad before taking my hand and leading me into the room. "Look," she said softly, her eyes directing me to a spot on the floor beside the dresser.

To my amazement, there, as if it had never been removed, stood the old pickle jar, the bottom already covered with coins. I walked over to the pickle jar, dug down into my pocket, and pulled out a fistful of coins. With a gamut of emotions choking me, I dropped the coins into the jar. I looked up and saw that dad, carrying Jessica, had slipped quietly into the room. Our eyes locked, and I knew he was feeling the same emotions I felt.

Neither one of us could speak.

Sometimes we are so busy adding up our troubles that we forget to count our blessings. Never underestimate the power of your actions. With one small gesture you can change a person's life, for better or for worse. ■