

Changing the Rules

Isaiah 55:8, 9

“For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD. (9) For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.”

How precious is this promise that reassures us that God is far better than anything we can desire or even contemplate! It is easy to understand, that if God did not have a better moral character than anything human beings can imagine, then humanity has a serious problem.

Sadly, some people don't seem to believe Isaiah's promise. They appear to suppose that God is only as moral as a sinful human being.

Can any sinful person, angel or other creature, be more moral than God? Of course not, but the theory that God commanded the murder of babies results in the inevitable conclusion being drawn, that God is not as moral as some sinful human beings - because many human beings, (despite their sinful natures), would not justify, sanction or condone the murder of babies!

Many secular people consider that violently killing a baby, rather than being an act of love, is a heinous action and one action that many people would refuse to commit. The reason that even secular people are repelled by such a crime is because ***God put within humanity an enmity towards such sinful and heinous acts.***

Gen.3.15

And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.

How can anyone adore and respect a god who commands atrocious crimes against babies?

In an attempt to harmonise certain Bible verses , a common defense 'for God's violent actions,' is often proffered. It is suggested that "divine" violence and the accompanying atrocities, are justified as God's '***loving and merciful***' act.

Advocates of this theory reason that Canaanite pagan children would have been subjected to a life of sin anyway and so God ***mercifully*** ordered their destruction so that they wouldn't sin or wouldn't have to suffer so much from their pagan parents' sinful ways.

But such logic is flawed. Would any Christian attempt to justify ***Satan's*** actions by claiming that he was acting in merciful love toward the Son of God when in fact, Satan was attempting to murder Christ? Compare Christ and the Canaanite babies. Christ was innocent of personal sin; so too were the Canaanite babies innocent of personal sin. They had not reached the age of reason. Both Canaanite babies and Christ were tortured. God supposedly commanded men to torture and murder of the Canaanite babies, while Satan inspired men to torture and murder the Son of God.

Can we really believe that Satan performed his murderous act upon Christ in hatred, but that God performed similar acts of murder, but in a merciful loving way on the Canaanite babies? The end result of both actions was the same. Innocent beings suffered dreadfully and died.

Do God and Satan perform the same actions? Are God and Satan both 'destroyers?' Isn't there a divine law against destroying? Yes, "thou shalt not kill." Why can't God's people kill? - Answer - because God doesn't kill, because it is not loving to do something to someone else that you wouldn't like done to yourself.

Continuing the thought that God supposedly ordered the annihilation of babies: If the view is accepted that God destroys people, we must further ask, "Is it also God's practice to destroy 'people,' BEFORE they sin? - before they even reach the age where they can reason and distinguish right from wrong?" Does God kill people before they sin, so that they won't be able to sin later, when they have the choice to sin?

If God behaves in this pre-emptive manner, one must wonder why God didn't command a **holy** person to massacre Adolph Hitler as a baby. Such theology ensures that God's destruction of Adolph Hitler would be considered a merciful act; an act necessary to prevent Hitler from sinning - when he destroyed thousands of Jewish babies.

Furthermore, the argument (that God's atrocious command to murder babies is actually love in action), is also flawed because **such a 'loving' act does not fulfill God's own Biblical definition of true love.**

Jesus said that all the laws in Scripture were founded on two principles - supreme love for God; and secondly, unselfish love our fellow human beings.

Matt.22.37

*Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. 38 This is the first and great commandment. 39 And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. 40 On these two commandments hang **all** the law and the prophets.*

Jesus further simplified the second principle by stating that loving our 'neighbours' was the same concept as 'do unto others, the things you would like done to yourself.'

Matthew 7:12

“Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: *for this is the law and the prophets.*”

Notice that Christ says, if we are acting out of love, we will WANT others to treat us the way, that we treat them. If we are acting out of love, we will WANT others to treat us in the same way as we are treating them.

If true Christianity is about 'doing to others what we would WANT done to ourselves,' how can we even contemplate the concept that we could 'lovingly' kill someone else's baby - with a sword - because the baby's parents hold different religious beliefs? Such logic was the rule during the years of papal inquisition and apparently some religious adherents maintain this practice even today, but shouldn't Christians differ from the worldly religions and follow Christ's example?

Christ said the second 'great' law is completely represented by this principle of love to our neighbours - we should only do to others, that which we would WANT them to do to us.

Would the followers of God - at any stage of history - **have WANTED** God to send a **holy** person to violently murder their baby with a sword? Hardly! Most Christians **KNOW** (because God gave them enmity against sin) that killing is wrong, because it violates God's holy 10 commandment law of love - a law that was given to protect human beings - including the babies of pagans. Jesus said "ONLY do unto others the same things that you WANT them to do to you." Jesus made the principle crystal clear and so simple that a child could understand it!

But theologians promote the concept that murderous **forceful** action was commanded by God through Moses, Joshua and Samuel, and that God ordered murder and genocide to be performed against the pagans in Canaan (eg. 1 Samuel 15).

Ellen White's comments, in Signs of the Times, 6 May, 1897 are difficult to harmonise with that position. She states:

"Force is the last resort of every false religion."

Can a human being be more moral than God? No. Sin is sin. Killing babies is wrong whether criminals, Moslems, papists or Christians perform it. According to Scriptures, Satan inspires murder; therefore it can be deduced that a satanic spirit inspires all infanticide regardless of whether such murders occur - during religious inquisitions, in Rwanda, in India, in Iraq, or even in Canaan.

Would any sane person **like** such horrific acts of mutilation performed on himself/herself or on their children? Hardly. It would be most parents' worst nightmare to have their child brutalised and murdered.

God's people need to be very clear in their understanding of the following questions:
Would the One True God order His people to murder babies?
Can we pretend that these violent murders were demonstrations of 'love'?

Consider God's own principle. He says that we should ONLY do unto others as we WANT them to do to us. The Son of God said that these were His Father's principles, so we can be assured that this is also, exactly how the Father thinks and acts.

John.14.10

*Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in me? **the words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself:** but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the works.*

Would the Father of All Life condone destructive actions? Consider the facts:

If God desired that other children should be murdered, don't His own principles (do unto others as you would **prefer** them to do to you) **insist** that He would **desire** such an action to be performed upon Himself? (i.e that His own Son should be likewise tortured and murdered?)

Logically we have to ask the next obvious question: "Was having His own infant Son brutalised and murdered, an action that the Father desired?" If so, then God was acting within the principles of love when He commanded (supposedly) that the Israelites murder pagan babies?

However, the gospels reveal that God ***did not want*** His Son to be murdered.

But we do know who DID WANT to murder infants. It was Satan. When ***Satan*** attempted to kill the infant Jesus (through Herod), God sent the angel Gabriel to warn Joseph to hurry and take both mother and child to Egypt (Matthew 2:12-14).

So if the Father did not ***WANT*** His own infant innocent Son to be murdered with a sword - then, under His own definition of love - He is not justified in commanding the murder of anyone else's innocent sons. If the action was not just, then God did not perform it, for to perform an unjust action is to commit sin.

Wasn't it ***Satan's*** idea to victimise the Son of God? Because of the Father's protection, the devil was unable to kill Christ while He was an infant, however when the divine protection was removed in His adult years, Satan wasted no opportunity to vent his wrath on the Son of God.

Didn't ***Satan*** have Christ tortured, whipped, abused, and violently murdered? ***Wasn't it Satan's desire to have these atrocities performed on God's Son? Yes! God foresaw the heinous events planned by Satan. God predicted what tortures that Satan would inflict upon His Son, but God never planned that His Son should be butchered, any more than a sane parent would plan the murder of their own children.***

Neither the Father, nor the Son, nor any of their true followers would want such heinous actions performed on themselves or on their children. Jesus' words ought to be enough to settle the matter.

Matt.25.40

[B][I]And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

Will we crucify Christ afresh by claiming that His loving and sinless character is polluted by accusing Him of murdering those whom He gave His life to save?

If this dreadful position is taken by God's 'followers' - Christians - one shudders to think what witness this sends to the secular world.