

HUMANISM IN THE MODERN CHURCH. Arnold Kennedy.

INTRODUCTION.

Without realizing it, most churches today have fallen to the ways of humanism, and biblically the humanistic mind is in a sharp adversary state against the ways of God. There can be no excuse for the modern position of the churches because we are told, "*Wherefore thou art without excuse, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest dost practise the same things. And we know that the judgment of God is according to truth against them that practise such things*" -(Romans 2:1-2).

Churches may speak against humanism when they are actually practicing humanism themselves. One of the prime features of humanism is universalism, and universalism in one form or another is the popular church teaching today. This is not at all new and we have to be aware that we can easily become adversaries to God by going along with the humanist position. The Bible does not teach universalism, even if the churches try to justify themselves by misusing verses to promote their position, they are wrong in doing so.

To look into this, we must first define our terms. According to Webster's dictionary, "*humanism includes having an individualistic and critical spirit with an emphasis upon secular concerns. Further to this, it includes an attitude, or way of life centred on human interests or values; a philosophy that usually rejects supernaturalism and stresses an individual's dignity and worth and capacity*". This definition ignores man's sinfulness and man's being deserving only of God's judgement. This dictionary definition is the picture of most churches. Towards the end of this paper we will make some comparisons between churches, which are outwardly different but inwardly are all humanistic.

"CHOSEN GOD" OR "CHOSEN PEOPLE"?

How could we say with any certainty that widespread humanism can be found throughout all Christian churches today? Well consider this. All religions have one thing in common and that is they tend to carry the thought that people can choose their own God. But, this idea is not found throughout the Bible. Jesus lost all His followers (except the apostles) when He told them that following Him was not like all the other religions of the world in which the people choose their own god. Some people will choose Baal or Molech as their god, others will choose a totem pole, a rock, Mary, Allah, Mohammed, Buddha, Lilieth or the Lord Maitreya. But with Christianity, God chooses the people He will have follow Him and be His people. All religions of the world are based upon a "*chosen god*" concept. But real Biblical Christianity, like Hebraism, is based upon a "*chosen people*" concept. As Jesus put it, "*Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you*".

Yet Christianity today, just like the first followers of Jesus, finds this "*chosen people*" concept to be horrible and offensive. This is why we can say that most Christians today have fallen to the ways of humanism, and as said above, the humanistic mind is in sharp conflict with the ways of God. Humanism cannot allow any "*chosen people*" concept. The very fact that churches hate and disallow any "*chosen people*" principle shows that they are they are in a clear variance with Jesus.

John 6:64-65 *But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who it was that should betray him. And he said, For this cause have I said unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it be given unto him of the Father.*

How did Jesus say this group of people was betraying him? He said He was being betrayed because of their "*chosen god*" concept. These people Jesus was talking with did not want to believe the "*except it be given unto him of my father*". We see this same betrayal when we hear popular church talk about "accepting Jesus into your heart", "choose Christ" and "whosever will may come" spoken in the "*chosen god*" manner that is indicative of universalism. The latter verse above when used this way is really lying, since "whosoever" refers only to the "whosoever" of the context, that is, it is the "whosoever" amongst those being addressed. Likewise that world that God "so loved" is the world (*kosmos*) that Jesus *was* addressing, and this involved no other *kosmos* of peoples. The churches are betraying Jesus by saying what He says in the verse above is not true at this present time. Churches love their lie and make it their platform. This lie is the standard church and seminary teaching.

We should consider more about those making such lies and their ultimate destination.

Revelation 22:15 *Without are the dogs, and the sorcerers, and the fornicators, and the murderers, and the idolaters, and every one that loveth and maketh a lie.*

Churches seem to be all confederate today in agreeing together about this particular lie. What was God's advice to Isaiah about this?

Isaiah 8:11-12 *For the LORD spake thus to me with a strong hand, and instructed me that I should not walk in the way of this people, saying, Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid.*

To continue with the "*chosen god*" concept to any degree is to be one who "*maketh a lie*" and such then therefore continue to offend God. Yet it is hard to find any church that is not offending God. To continue fellowship with those who make a lie is to finish up with those people in a place described as being "without" the City of God –[Rev. 22:15]. They are deluded if they think otherwise

2 Thessalonians 2:10-11.....*Because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie.*

Most Christians, (or should we say "Churchgoers"), today think that what they call "*coming to Jesus*" is some voluntary act that they can undertake on their own under their own conditions and also without the pain of being "*crucified with him Him*"-[Rom.6:6]. Jesus' followers had the same idea as that was the common conception of Judaism - (Babylonian). Their desire was to eat of the bread of life, but they did not understand it was not entirely up to them. Jesus told them that only those God gives to Jesus could partake of the bread of life. Jesus said:

John 6:37 *All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.*

John 6:43-44 *Jesus therefore answered and said unto them, Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day.*

These would-be followers of that day murmured. All the churches are all still murmuring just as the Pharisees did so long ago! The churches are a pretty hard lot when it comes to anyone touching their "*chosen god*" belief. They strenuously resist any attempt to point out *God's "chosen People"* choice. It is impossible to change the bulk of people in the churches. They close ranks, being unwilling to stand alone. What does Jude say about such murmurers?

Jude 16 *These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage.*

Their murmuring and complaining is against God. What are their "own lusts"? Are their mouths agreeing with God does their speech make them adversaries (satans) to God? We can read on about

them in the book of Jude even if the churches do not. We now might be beginning to see the problem in the churches of today? This is a major matter.

Only those people that God draws or gives to Jesus would become true believers and followers of Jesus. Obviously God did not want or intend for all people on the planet to be Jesus' sheep. We can read a lot about "election" and "the elect" if we want to, but this is not ever a sermon topic unless it is bent in some way. This bending is humanism! Election is not based upon behaviour –[Rom. 9:11].

Romans 9:18 *Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.*

Churches together with other racial and cultures believe in universalism, but this is contrary to the Biblical basis of election. What other races do, say, profess or manifest cannot change the basis of God's choice.

THE BREAD OF LIFE.

Going back to the matter of eating the Bread of Life we have to appreciate that the Judean nation where Jesus was speaking was a racial melting pot with mostly similar religious beliefs. Jesus pointed this out, even saying some He addressed were "*from above*" and some were "*from beneath*". Jesus was speaking about origins here. Some followed Him because they had seen His miracles. They did not believe Him about who could become His disciples; indeed, some were incapable of hearing Him. Jesus had said of these religious people, "*even because ye cannot hear my word*" –[John 8:43]. When Jesus faced them with the "*chosen people*" fact in talking about who could eat of the Bread of Life they said, "*This is a hard saying, who can hear it*". All churches still find it a hard saying where the word "hard" in the Greek has the meaning of "offensive" and "intolerable".

John 6:66-67 *From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him. Then said Jesus unto the twelve Will ye also go away?*

The eating of the Bread of Life is not for everyone. The eating and drinking of the spiritual flesh and blood of Jesus does not take place through the medium of faith, as commonly thought and taught. Christians inaccurately imagine that if one believes he gets the Spirit, but Jesus said if God gives, or has given one, the Spirit he has the ability to believe. Faith is the result of having this Spirit; it is not the catalyst that causes God to give this spiritual quickening. Like being "*born from above*", that is, from an origin in the past, it is something God originates –[1 Peter 1:3]. Thus one cannot be a believer in Jesus and have the anointing in him unless God has chosen to give him His Spirit.

Remember this:

John 6:44 *No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him:*

No, not a single one! This message was so offensive and preposterous to Jesus' own followers of the day that many deserted Him at that time. The same message is odious and outrageous to all established churches today. Because of this, they have denied the Lord Jesus Christ and replaced Him with "another Christ".

THE SO-CALLED "GREAT COMMISSION".

Scripture makes it plain that the Gospel was not intended for everyone. Jesus often spoke in parables so certain people would not understand (Matt. 13:11; Mark 4:11,12; Luke 8:10). Jesus sent out disciples telling them that some would believe and some would not. Why? Because some were chosen or led by God to believe and others were not. We also are told that there were certain cities and provinces in Asia that the Holy Spirit prevented Paul and Silas from going to in order to proclaim the Gospel of the Kingdom-(Acts 16:6,7). This is another indication that the Kingdom Gospel was not common to all people. Paul told the Israelite Philippians "*that unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ*" ... to believe on him -(Phil. 1: 29); that is certain others are not included.

Being given to believe is an initiative by God who gives the inclination and ability to believe. Jesus told Peter to “*feed my sheep*”-(John 21:16,17) – the “sheep” being Israel through the Bible. Jesus did not say Peter was to feed people symbolised as goats, dogs or the people described as “beasts”, although certain other races may have some benefits in association with Israel when keeping the laws of Israel.

Genesis starts the biblical pattern about a specific race of people, with other peoples mentioned only as they impinge upon this lineage, which leads up to Israel. From thence Israel remains ‘chosen’ until the end of the Revelation of John. Obviously, if Israelites were and are the ‘chosen’ people, then all other peoples must be the ‘un-chosen’, even today. Common sense as well as direct statements lead us to the conclusion that Jesus' great commission was designed to reach Israelites, and there is no contrary indication, even if it appears on the surface that this might be so. Jesus said, “*other sheep I have, which are not of this fold,*” (that is, not in the Judean fold), which He would bring to Himself-(John 10:16). The “other sheep” were the Israelites dispersed outside of Judea, in Samaria, Galilee and elsewhere. Jesus was going to bring these other sheep to Him by having His disciples proclaim the Word among all nations in which they were dispersed. The churches call this “the Great Commission”, a phrase the churches love to use to falsely apply this to mean every race.

That reaching Israelites was the objective of Jesus' “great commission” can be further understood by considering what Jesus said. The followers at that time were eager to learn God's ways, as they asked Jesus, “*What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?*”-v28). Jesus told them that the work of God was that they believe in Christ -(v.29). When they asked for a sign that they might believe, Jesus told them about the “*bread from heaven*” which if they eat would give them life (v.33). They thus asked Jesus to give them this bread so they could eat it, but He told them:

John 6:35 *And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.*

Outside of the context of all Scripture, this might seem to be a universal offer, and the churches snatch at this idea to support their wrong conception. The churches like to discount the, “*Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you*”-[John 15:16]- where the tense is in the past, and not grammatically as the churches like to insist in order to try to make it an isolated happening of that day which no longer applies. So this still applies today. Then the churches try to say things such as the phrase, “*neither Jew nor Greek*” means all races are now included, yet they cannot offer any explanation how the work “Greek” (speaking) could include a Maori or an Eskimo!

Although the intent of the “great commission” was to reach Israelites, why did Jesus use words that appeared to be so general or universal in nature? Or did translators write in this appearance of generalisation since that was their belief? Did Jesus with these verses have His disciples and others to go to people that were non-Israelites? The answer appears to be “Yes”, but it is actually “No”. It is specifically “No” when Jesus said to His disciples, “*But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*”. They were to go to no others. It is “No” because Israel was scattered amongst non-Israelites as a punishment. Thus the disciples had to go amongst other nations to reach the “sheep” dispersed amongst those nations. The disciples did not necessarily know who they all were - they were to shake the dust of their feet when the word could not be heard. For many centuries the House of Israel migrated from Caucasia after the Assyrian captivity and became scattered throughout other nations as was prophesied, and at the time of Jesus were mixed amongst those nations. Most were not known as Israelites or descendants of Abraham; instead they were known by other names, which can be accurately traced. We will not go into these names here except to say that what we commonly call Caucasians today are the same Israelite peoples.

The command of Jesus to preach to all nations appears on the surface to be general or universal, but it is not for the purpose of converting all people and races, but so as to convert all Israelites, no matter where they lived or by what name they were called, or among whom they were dispersed. Jesus specified Israelites in His commission when He said in Matthew 10:6-7, "*But go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. And as ye go, preach saying 'The kingdom of heaven is at hand'*". Jesus had just told them not to go to certain other peoples. The Kingdom of Heaven did not concern other peoples than Israelites. God is always "*The God of Israel*" through Scripture. Paul said, "*For the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain*" in Acts 28:20. Paul never expanded this limitation to Israel and neither did the apostle Peter.

The fact that the majority of Israelites in dispersion had lost track of their heritage and identity as Israelites made no difference. The disciples did not know in all cases who were the sheep (Israelites) and who were the goats. They did not need to know. What have been the results of the "great commission? The Caucasian/Celtic of Europe have embraced and adopted real Christianity or Christian values, simply because the prophets declared, speaking specifically of Israelites:

Hebrews 8:10 *For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people:*

The words "a people" is in the singular where the Greek word *laos* (people) has the meaning, "*a people, people group, tribe, nation, all those who are of the same stock and language*" according to the Strong's lexicon. The churches deny that this people are expressly given as being a singular people and they have attempted to portray Israel as now being a multi-racial "church" claiming that "the church" is now the singular entity. There is no way a multi-racial church could be of one language and racial stock. The full Bible message has been ignored or rejected by all other non-Israelite races through history, and the belief some have followed has been a bastardised concoction, which uses Biblical words to give the appearance of being a Christian belief. The New Covenant is instrumental in gathering the "sheep" only to the Father. The familiar message is about the Shepherd seeking His lost sheep, and sheep only.

These early European sheep had followed pagan ways and had pagan gods during their prophesied migration to the West just like most people on the planet. But when they heard the word of God in the Gospel form they quickly forsook their pagan ways and gods and accepted this true Gospel. Although the Gospel has been preached to every nation and race since the first century, the white, European people are the only ones who have responded to any degree nationally. As Jesus said - "*I am the good shepherd and know sheep, and am known of mine..... My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me*"-[John 10: 14,27). Only the sheep, Israelites, would hear and follow Jesus. We have to again recall that Jesus did in fact say there were those who "*cannot hear my words*"-[John 8].

Missionaries have attempted unsuccessfully to bring what they think the "Gospel" is, and their definition of what "Christian" is, in many lands and to many peoples. What they have produced are "Rice Christians" who are on the make materially through making the right sounding noises and using the right Biblical words. When the missionary is gone it is not long before the "rice Christians" revert to their original culture. In many countries, the people follow a corrupted form of Catholicism that is entrenched in superstitions and pagan traditions, many of which were introduced by Spanish Jews. It is not real Christianity at all even if the churches like to include them (including Roman Catholics) under the umbrella of so-called "Christianity". We find many races finding an emotional fulfilment in being under this umbrella. Two factors influence them. Firstly there may be the solemnity or appearance of authority, the priestly garb and impressive buildings in traditional settings that draw them. For others it may be the emotions and the shouting,

dancing, and laughing that attracts them in non-traditional settings. When the latter are found to be using biblical language, they are driven to do so by materialistic desires or emotional stimuli. Because they are drawn this way, they easily become one with the churches and the one-world church. But God's people are spiritually driven and are drawn by God - these are commanded to come out of the world-system - or perish!

It is ironic that those with real simple trust in Jesus today do not realise that they, as white European people, are Israelites racially and physically, and that is why they are Christians and believers. Very few are taught that belief in Jesus is based upon the "*chosen people*" concept and not just a matter of personal choice concept alone. Jesus said that there will be those who will have chosen Him, who call Him "Lord" and make an effort to do good works in His name, but Jesus will say to them, "*I never knew You* -[Matt. 7:23]- where "never" means "never at any time". Those Jesus said He "knew" in the New Testament were those "foreknown" in the Old Testament, that is, they are Israelites.

Religions that are based upon a "*chosen god*" concept allow for Universalism since "*whosoever*" wishes to be involved may do so in their view. Christian universality since the first century has written volumes trying to reconcile the Bible to support their view. But the real faith based upon a "*chosen people*" concept is exclusive. It is not adaptable to universalism, that is, it is not adaptable to church humanism. Jesus started His ministry with the Kingdom of Heaven. Jesus finished on the same subject, namely the restoration of the Kingdom to Israel. A church of any kind as known today could never have the characteristics of a kingdom, namely a King, a subject people, a territory, and perhaps above, the laws of that kingdom. The churches deny the Laws of that kingdom and therefore the churches are humanistic.

WHERE DOES THE CORRUPTION ORIGINATE FROM?

Jude says it creeps in through people.

Jude 3-5 Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

Once again we see that there are those who "deny our *Lord Jesus Christ*". How do they deny Him? By denying that "the faith" was once (for all time) delivered to the saints only. By biblical definition, the "saints" (*hagios*) are Israel. The churches deny Jesus by saying that the faith is delivered to everyone of every race. But Jesus did not say so and neither do any of the prophets. The covenant God made with Israel was not made with any other people, we are told.

Psalm 148:14 He also exalteth the horn of his people, the praise of all his saints; even of the children of Israel, a people near unto him. Praise ye the LORD.

The churches deny this by saying the people near to God are those of any race who believe. Jesus, the prophets and apostles do not say this at all. The covenant God made with Israel was not made with any other peoples. How possibly could any but Israel be redeemed (bought back for a price) who had not originally been God's people? How could any people have a "new covenant" that had not first had an "old covenant"?

The claim that God (who changes not) has changed His mind is the point that humanism has entered into the churches. It makes no difference whether the church is a jean-clad, clap-happy lot in flip-flops or whether that church is extremely conservative with woman having to wear hats and the men folk wearing Sunday suits and carrying back Bibles. It is the belief factor that is the issue. Webster's dictionary definition of humanism includes having an individualistic and critical spirit

with an emphasis upon secular concerns. It is the “human interests” that rejects God and what God says. What God says is replaced with what man says. Over the centuries great and sometimes complex volumes have been written to try to force Scripture to fit their belief but the tomes written will not stand up to the light because they are written from the humanistic viewpoint.

THE BIBLE IS DIFFERENT FROM ALL OTHER 'HOLY BOOKS'.

All religions have two main points, which unify each. Firstly there is a basic view of God and secondly there is some value system. Each seeks to confine their view of each within some "holy book". All of these books teach universalism except the Bible. All the others present the "chosen god" concept.

It is safe to say that all the churches have moved away from the biblical "chosen people" presentation and have adopted the "chosen god" of universalism. With this they have had to adopt their own meaning for “all the world” which no longer has the right meaning of all the world of the context that usually is Israel. So they go out to all races, as did the Pharisees of old. Of these Jesus had said:

Matthew 23:15: *Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves.*

Doing likewise the churches are teaching humanism. When they teach and preach making noises against humanism in society, this is done solely on ethics alone, the underlying "chosen god" humanism being left intact. In doing this they are found to be against anyone who will not agree with them. Organised religion was against the message of the apostles, as it is today

Acts 4:15-20 But when they had commanded them to go aside out of the council, they conferred among themselves, Saying, What shall we do to these men? For that indeed a notable miracle hath been done by them is manifest to all them that dwell in Jerusalem; and we cannot deny it. But that it spread no further among the people, let us straitly threaten them, that they speak henceforth to no man in this name. And they called them, and commanded them not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus. But Peter and John answered and said unto them, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye. For we cannot but speak the things which we have seen and heard.

Then they resorted to violence. The time will come when churches will think they are doing God a favour by killing Israelite believers, Jesus has told us. In terms of world government, political correctness, race relations and human rights, those who accept the message of the Kingdom of Heaven and the racial message of the Bible are destined for persecution, both by Church and State.

SALT AND LIGHT.

Salt and light are two things the churches do not demonstrate in society. Salt gives taste and light makes things easier to see. Could we possibly say that the churches have any effect upon society at large today? And why do the churches not speak out upon the issues of the day as salt and light in the community? It is because churches and governments are in mutual agreement in promoting a program of humanism. They agree together about the Law of man. We see this in the shared accord about multi-culturism and racial intermarriage, both of which are unbiblical. Some churches even extend abomination in supporting inter-faith activity.

True, there are a few public church statements made on matters such as abortion, but these are centred upon “human interests or values and secular concerns”. We may hear churches stressing an individual’s dignity, worth and capacity in a way that falls within the definition of humanism. One of the things that is missing is that man is deserving of God’s judgement. Another thing missing is emphasis upon the price Jesus paid for the redemption of His people, and how repentance from transgression of God’s Law fits into this. The churches in general subscribe to a

social gospel that does not relate to the Law of God or the Kingdom of Heaven, a kingdom that will be restored to Israel.

It is very evident that society does not have any respect for church people of any flavour. Within the church environment there is little gravity or trace of the expressiveness and wisdom Jesus presented as He walked amongst men. There is nothing attractive in the formal conservative churches, nor is there favour in the sight of society in the clap-happy lot. Consider why! It is because humanism is operating in the churches outside what the New Testament terms “*the commandments of God*”. Churches actually teach that these commandments are done away with, and in this regard we should clearly note that none will partake of the tree of life.

Revelation 22:14 *Blessed are they **that do his commandments**, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city*

The reason why the churches do not find favour in society is obvious.

*Proverbs 3:1-6 My son, forget not my law; but let thine heart keep my commandments: For length of days, and long life, and peace, shall they add to thee. Let not mercy and truth forsake thee: bind them about thy neck; write them upon the table of thine heart: So shalt thou **find favour and good understanding** in the sight of God and man. Trust in the LORD with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths.*

Yes, this does speak about finding favour with man and this does relate to keeping the law of God. This passage goes on to tell about not leaning to our own understanding, which is precisely what humanism is about. Churches may quote this and then replace the Law of God with church dogma or church standards.

Jesus found favour also as He obeyed.

Luke 2:52 *And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and **in favour with** God and man.*

Likewise believers, after Pentecost, had an effect upon government, and of the common people we read:

Acts 5:13-14 NASB *But none of the rest dared to associate with them; however, the people held them in **high esteem**. And all the more believers in the Lord, multitudes of men and women, were constantly added to their number.*

As there is no high esteem and favour with the common people today, something different must be being presented by the churches. Once the church turned the world upside-down. [Acts 17:6 “*These men who have upset the world have come here also*”]. But today churches turn people off, so much so that they are all in decline. There are no multitudes being added to the church any more.

But, those who found favour with God as the prophets, disciples and apostles did, did not find favour with the religious establishment. They were classed as being dissenters. We can read of Jesus, “*And **the common people heard him gladly**. And he said unto them in his doctrine, Beware of the scribes*”-[Mark 12:37]. But the church authorities of that day (the Scribes) would not listen to Jesus. Today’s church scribes likewise will not listen.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC, JEWISH AND PROTESTANT SYSTEMS.

Webster’s Dictionary definition of humanism points out that the emphasis of humanism was upon secular concerns. The word “secular” is normally used in contrast to the word “sacred”, where

the first refers to man and man's laws with the second referring to God and God's laws. Could we rightly say that these three systems are more concerned with man's laws than God's laws?

1. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC SYSTEM.

The following quotation establishes the Roman Catholic position in regard to the law of God.

“The Pope has power to change times, to abrogate laws, and to dispense with all things, **even the precepts of Christ**”-[*Deretal, de Tranlatic Episcop. Cap*].

This one claim establishes that this system considers the law of man, (i.e. the Pope), is above the precepts of Christ. There are many similar statements from this system. Thus this system is openly the epitome of humanism.

2. THE JEWISH SYSTEM.

This system relates essentially to the interpretations found in the Jewish Talmud.

[a] "*The teachings of the Talmud stand above all others*" and

[b] "*The Talmud is "the beating heart of Jewry"*". Rabbi Bokser.

[c] "*Judaism is not the religion of the Hebrew Bible*", and

[d] "*The modern Jew is the product of the Talmud*". Rabbi Isaac M. Wise.

The Talmud reverses both Old and New Testament teachings. So-called "Jewish Law" is what Jesus called "*the commandments of men*" and thus all Christians should be aware that there is absolutely no scope forever using the phrase, "*Jewish Law*". Jesus makes a distinction between the Law of Moses and what He calls, "your law", i.e. the law of the Jews. Talmudic Judaism is therefore another face of humanism.

3. THE PROTESTANT SYSTEM.

One presentation of this system is an emphasis that the law of God is done away with. Grace and law are supposed to be totally opposed each other rather than being in harmony. Protestants effectively reject what the New Testament calls "The Commandments of God" and that any keeping of the Law has any bearing in having any right to partake of the Tree of Life.

Rev 22.14 *Blessed are they that **do his commandments**, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city*

All these systems are in opposition to each other over issues, which are humanistic. They present differing forms of humanism, which reject the Laws of the Kingdom of Heaven and the message, "*Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*".

WHAT SHOULD WE DO?s

It is worth pondering what Paul advises Timothy.

2 Timothy 4:1-4 *I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom; Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; And they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables*

We go on to find an imperative associated with this, "*Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: **from such turn away***". This does not say, "Stay with them and try to change them", but in the wording of the NASB, "**avoid them**". Do we need to ask why? Paul confirms the Old Testament (as always) saying:

Romans 3:13-16, Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness:

Their feet are swift to shed blood: Destruction and misery are in their ways: And the way of peace have they not known: There is no fear of God before their eyes.

James tells us their tongue "*is an unruly evil full of poison*". The whole doctrine of the "*chosen god*" in any form is a poison, as is any part of humanism! From such we must turn away because humanism includes an attitude, or way of life centred on human interests or values; a philosophy that rejects God and His commandments, stressing an individual's dignity, worth and capacity instead, based upon the commandments of man.