

Compassion... for Whom?

So many Christians claim to have compassion? But, DO they? To my mind they have the IDEA of compassion, because everyone tells them they ought to have it. But, who is this compassion shown to?

Many times I have come across supposed 'compassion' where none should exist, a compassion for unrepentant sinners who do the most foul things. Is this true compassion? I don't think so - it is self-delusion and emotional hype.

The relationship we have with the Lord is a legal one, but few understand this. As our relationship is a legal one, we cannot say or do what is against His laws. His word is law. This means we have a responsibility to think, say and do what is right. And that includes showing compassion ONLY for those God directs us to, not to all and sundry!

In law there are activities recognised to be crimes, and the same law applies a penalty for crime. And if God applies a penalty to certain crimes, we have no business at all to show compassion for the 'criminal'.

The crime itself, the legislation concerning it, a judge's judgment, and any mercy, are all separate elements within the law. And certain 'crimes' may NOT be treated with compassion or shown mercy.

I know in advance that some readers will be angry with my words, but that doesn't matter. What matters is God and His requirements. Our responses to crimes against God (sins) are bound not by our personal emotions, but solely by God's demands. Indeed, our personal responses are completely irrelevant... unless they are within the legal framework given by the Lord.

What this means is that if God condemns a person or action, we may not show compassion or refuse to condemn. If our compassion is inherent in the sin spoken against, then all is well... but not many

Christians understand the difference between the 'crime' (sin) and our judgments concerning it. These failures to act in a godly manner abound and cause very big problems.

Sin is never allowed by God, and is always condemned. If there is room for compassion, then we can show it. But, not otherwise. Examples of sins we may not show compassion for? First degree murder, adultery, rejection of the Gospel, harming of children, homosexuality, and so on. We know this because God says so! But, many replace God's judgment with their own, wreaking havoc in the churches.

We may not show compassion for those whom God hates. To show compassion in these cases is itself sin.

I am particularly aware of a certain man with a well-known ministry. He has a peculiar, unbiblical, take on homosexuality. He says we should show compassion for those young people caught in the homosexual snare, if they want to come out of it. Not quite! (See later notes).

The first requirement is not compassion, but reality – is that person born again and saved? In which case we can show compassion. But, if all he or she wants is freedom from bad emotions and ties to homosexuality – this is not our scene. No Christian can legitimately counsel an unsaved person. This is because the counsel falls on deaf ears and a dead spirit.

Some will continue to give counsel even when there is a continuous falling back into the sin. What this shows me is the person has not repented and **WANTS** the desires to continue. Do I trust the person who says they do not commit their bodies to actual physical contact with homosexuals? Frankly, no I do not! This is because homosexuals are known liars and deceivers. So, beware of showing compassion for the wrong people!

On some occasions I have been compassionate towards those who have been brought up in sin, where parents know nothing of God and curse, steal, swear, take drugs... but, even when the unfortunate children grow up the same, God does not give us freedom to make their own sin an excuse. No, God's law still applies, and we must not falter.

At other times I might have a lump in my throat because I know someone needs a dramatic change of life or circumstances if they are to make it as decent human beings. I can see their struggle and the awful future they will otherwise have. Even then, I must make very sure I don't act out of pity alone. At all times I must represent God properly and fully, without the sentiment that can cause many Christians to make serious errors of judgment about others.

The Old Man Who Isn't

The UK's Channel Four put out a programme: "The First Brit: Secrets of the 10,000 Year Old Man". How many were duped? The premises were built upon computer modelling. It is a fact that computer model results can be easily altered by the user of the programming. A tweak this way and numbers show one thing, a tweak the other way and the same numbers produce entirely different results. This statistics game is played by almost everybody with an axe to grind!

I found the programme interesting, but because I know the score with use of models, I could see past the errors. Furthermore, as it is all based on models, which are just academic guesses, the 'results' produced can easily be challenged! Anyway...

A main 'result' is that this 10,000 year old fossilised man was said to have had dark skin and blue eyes; an unusual combination. But, for Christians this is a mish-mash of ideas, because no fossilised man can be found older than about 4000 years – because that was when the Flood took place. Any men caught in the Flood would have been completely crushed and those buried before that would have been turned to slurry!

Okay, so the age is wrong. But, another deduction seems correct. Indeed, it fits scripture. The findings suggest this 'first man' (no way to prove that of course) had his origin in the Middle East. With this I totally agree, because God created Adam and Eve in the broad Middle Eastern region. The blood lines continued thus to the Flood, 'funnelled' back into the world after the Flood, by Noah's family. The Tower of Babel incident caused people to scatter widely. From these came nations and different languages... but ALL were of the same ancestry.

So, if the model is correct and the man found was dark skinned, it makes sense. It is my view from scriptural study that the main colour of early mankind was a kind of mahogany-brown

('Red' in Adam's case). The black-skinned and white-skinned people who came along later are deviances from this original colour. In itself this rejects the evolution idea that man originated closer to mid-southern Africa (which does not agree with biblical data, e.g. river names).

All of us, then, come from Middle Eastern ancestry and that this set of bones is suggested to have had dark skin is compatible with scripture. Pity the researchers didn't know this – it would have saved a lot of time and effort!

Billy Graham

As expected, the death of Billy Graham in February led to lots of flowery praise from churchdom! The adulation continues as if he were a sound preacher.

I would remind readers that in certain times and areas he was a turncoat who did not help the cause of Christ. And his refusal to argue the corner of Russian Christians was really noticeable at the time.

Was he a Christian? Frankly, I don't know, but I would urge people not to get caught up in the lovey-dovey stuff! I never saw much in his ministry or his message. As a popular saying would put it, he was *"all mouth and no trousers"*.

Marking Men

Biblically, men are to be 'marked' for two main reasons – because they must be avoided for teaching error, or they should be followed for teaching truth.

"Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright: for the end of that man is peace." (Psalm 37:37)

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." (Romans 16:17).

It is a matter of sadness that we have told **Stephen Green of [Christian Voice](#)** , that we have marked him as one who teaches grave error concerning homosexuality. But, it seems he doesn't care, though his error is so blatant and obvious!

For those who have missed the reason for our deep concern... he teaches that homosexual thoughts are NOT sin. This leads to a number of other serious errors, but the basic error is blasphemy against the Lord, because it aligns with the homosexual idea of God 'making them that way'. For this reason we urge readers not to take his ministry materials and, if led, to tell him he is wrong, which he definitely is.

His teaching is contrary to the direct warning given by Jesus Christ, Who said that the thought and the deed are equally guilt-worthy and sinful, to be condemned.

We tried several times to privately counsel Stephen but instead of humbly acknowledging his sin he delved even deeper into it and excused his attitude and wrongness with what I can only call a fumbling, erroneous example of illogic and unbiblical semantic rambling. He is certainly ignorant of the truth concerning this heinous sin.

Though we pressed him with scripture he could not see the error in what he is teaching! This is very serious for one who has a ministry. Is his charismatic background part of the problem we wonder?

If Stephen repents and recants, and advises his followers he has committed a grave, sinful error, then we can count it a joy, and will tell you. But, thus far, he is resolute in his ignorance and sin. So, take great care.

We did not wish to speak out in this way, but God's word is the key, NOT the feelings or ministry of men. As far as we are concerned his error in this one topic alone is so grave as to warrant marking him as one to be avoided. HE IS WRONG! If his followers can't see the error, then it shows their shared ignorance and preference for error.

Update: Stephen rewrote the piece we complained to him about. But, his argument remains

exactly the same, if not worse, for he now says **'Being homosexual' not a sin.** He says "s
uffering from same-sex attraction is not a sin".
.. and it is 'pathological'. In other words, inborn! He adds: "being that way inclined is not a sin". He confuses temptation and desires, though we have said repeatedly temptation is not sin. The rest of his short rewrite is mixed up and will confuse ordinary readers, because he neither defines things properly nor gives a cogent argument.

He goes on to say *"having same-sex desires is not an abomination"*. **OF COURSE THEY ARE!** Here Stephen is giving perverse sexual desires the green light, though God says otherwise.

He adds, *"Nor is any individual homosexual an abomination"*. After which he plays again with semantics by saying "That is, not until their doing becomes their being". Plus:
"There comes a point where your day-to-day sinful activity defines you."

This is a ridiculous and inept statement to make! At WHAT point does this daily sin define us? It is when we allow temptation to become a DESIRE. This is when our thoughts are of sin and urge us to commit outward and inward acts of sin. Desire is at the root of it all... but Stephen does not appear to grasp the awful error in his thinking. And if you listen to his 'Nano-Sermons' you will find a strong opposition to homosexual 'activity'... but he does not mention the wicked desires that led to these activities. The difference is subtle.

He thus continues to mislead others and excuses homosexual desires. In this he plainly rejects what Christ said about the thought being as guilty as the act. Stephen is now entrenching himself in a very sinful way by subtly encouraging homosexual desires. We warn readers to be very aware of this. We hate having to write about it, but God's word and honour come first.

Ghosts are NOT Dead People

The incredulity of mankind is sometimes amusing. There are now many TV series being shown on ghosts and allied beings. But, none of them portrays the truth. This is because they see it all as 'paranormal' or 'supernatural', and not as spiritual deception. The differences are great.

In one recent programme (I only saw the trailer), one 'investigator' said to the ghosts in a

building *“We are not here to harm you”* and *“speak, or touch one of us...”*

The plain fact is that ghosts are NOT dead people who cannot find rest! Ghosts are malevolent spirits, demons. And, they are far more powerful than humans. So, to tell them you won't harm them must be the source of much evil mirth amongst Satan's 'boys'! (Sorry, ladies – there are no female demons).

ALL demons are malevolent. Their sole task is to deceive and mislead human beings, using the havoc they produce to dishonour the Lord.

Being spirits, they are powerful and deceptive, appearing at times as partial bodies, or speaking in odd voices, or shifting objects. I have witnessed these things. The idea is to make people believe ghosts are disembodied spirits of the dead. Countless humans make a living from pretending they can communicate with dead relatives, and demons oblige.

They've been around since the beginning of time and tend to stay in a locality if they can find a person to live in. They saw and heard old Uncle Dave, or Aunty Maud when they were alive, and can mimic their voices and tell you all about what they did in their lifetimes. This then hooks the living relatives, who then believe in communicating with the dead!

Demons can even manipulate future events very simply, so making clairvoyants and mediums appear to be accurate. The aim is very simple – to take people away from truth and God, and to enter into dealings with demons. And if the person seems too keen, they can enter him or her, possessing them.

So, friends, do not be taken in by demons, no matter what name they have, or what they do. They are cursed by God and will never know peace. One day they will be cast into hell forever, and those they deceived will join them... including many who Christians thought were sound leaders of men and Bible teachers! Remember – ghosts are malevolent demons. They are not here to comfort us!

“And the soul that turneth after such as have familiar spirits, and after wizards, to go a

whoring after them, I will even set my face against that soul, and will cut him off from among his people.” (Lev. 20:6)

An Important Policy Statement

People always see or read or hear what they want to hear. And this failing is certainly found in abundance in some of our readers. For this reason we have prepared a policy statement, a very important one. It will appear on our website.

Already, we have changed what we do. Other things will follow. But, the reason for our statement follows certain opposition to our ministry that is very telling and which causes us to make our statement.

Look at our website in a few days and you can read it. I would advise ALL readers that our ministry is unique. We don't seek subscribers or money. We merely say what God wants us to say. Yet, some think we speak personally and with hatred! Read the Policy Statement!

Be Challenged!

A reader kindly sent me a challenging book. It says things similar to what we say at BTM, but goes even farther. The first sections were hard to read straight-off because the content is 'angry', so I found it difficult to take in – I prefer a more academic style. Then, it began to 'level off' and is more readable.

Frankly, what the author says is mainly sound and all Christians (though he won't accept even the word 'Christians') ought to be rocked out of their complacency! I am used to the author's kind of thinking, but many are not, because they prefer comfort and softness.

However, if you want your cage to be rattled, try this book! I am only part-way through reading it, and I have a few minor differences of opinion over some statements, but the author has generally got it right! [*“The Truth Which Sets Free”* by Peter Dunstan.](#) Publ Destiner Press. Go on – get your thinking cap on!!

I must also say that I question certain parts. For example, he straightaway uses the term 'goats', but does not define what is meant by the term, so readers might be puzzled by it. Nor does he appear to allow that many Christians (ekklesia) are both confused and ignorant of what scripture means... not all are deliberately being sinful.

I am only part-way through the book, but already have counted a number of references to George Fox, who he portrays in a good way. Fox is often named by many to be the real founder of Quakerism, but he also said that EVERY man has God's light within. This was an error. (See my articles on Quakerism and Fox).

So, read his book if you want a jolly good test of your own spirit and thoughts. His main argument appears to be that we should not call ourselves 'the Church', but 'ekklesia'*. I refer to this myself in other writings, but you must decide for yourself if he is absolutely correct... or if it is over the top. It is good to have someone who writes and thinks 'outside the box', because it causes us to rethink habitual beliefs and what we consider to be spiritual certainties.

(*If a car manual refers to a product as a 'car' are we wrong or sinful to refer to it as a 'vehicle'? Can we use both words?).

For ourselves, we ALWAYS define 'church' as 'only those who are saved'. So, whilst this is not strictly 'ekklesia' it is another definition of what 'church' could be. Thus, the difference is in the word used. Why do we at BTM use 'church'? Simply because everyone knows the word. I have an article that uses the correct word, ekklesia – but few seem able to understand its significance, hence a 'half-way-house' of defining 'church' as 'only those who are saved'. Is this sinful? Think about it.

© February 2018

---oOo---

{loadposition btm_address}