

## **If God Commands Genocide .....what Does the Devil Command?**

1. What was Satan's number one accusation against God? That the law of God could not be kept by sinful humanity. That the law was unjust. That the Law-giver was at fault for having such a faulty law.

Signs of the Times, 16 January, 1896

*“Satan declared that it was impossible for the sons and daughters of Adam to keep the law of God, and thus charged upon God a lack of wisdom and love. If they could not keep the law, then there was fault with the Lawgiver. Men who are under the control of Satan repeat these accusations against God, in asserting that men can not keep the law of God.”*

Ellen White, Signs of the Times, 5 February, 1894

*“At the time when sin had become a science, when the hostility of man was most violent against heaven, when rebellion struck its roots deep into the human heart, when vice was consecrated as a part of religion, when **Satan exulted in the idea that he had led men to such a state of evil that God would destroy the world, Jesus was sent into the world, not to condemn it, but, amazing grace! to save the world. The unfallen worlds watched with intense interest to see Jehovah arise and sweep away the inhabitants of the earth, and Satan boasted that if God did do this, he would complete his plans and secure for himself the allegiance of unfallen worlds. He had arguments ready by which to cast blame upon God,** and to spread his rebellion to the world's above; but **at this crisis, instead of destroying the world, God sent his Son to save it.** The apostle caught a glimpse of the plan, and he kindled into inspiration upon the great theme. Language cannot express his conception, but ever falls below the reality. John exclaims: 'Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God; **therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.'** Before the coming of Christ to the world evidences abundant had been given that God loved the human race. But in the gift of Christ to a race so undeserving was demonstrated the love of God beyond all dispute. **This gift outweighed all else, showed that his love could not be measured.** We have no line to measure it, no plummet by which to sound its depths, no chain by which to encompass it, no standard with which to compare it. All we can say is that "God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Jesus said, 'Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life.' He gave his life for the sheep. **The only-begotten Son of God accepts all the liabilities that fall upon the transgressor of the law, vindicates its unchangeable and holy character. The death of Christ removes every argument that Satan could bring against the precepts of Jehovah. Satan has declared that men could not enter the kingdom of heaven unless the law was abolished and a way devised by which transgressors could be reinstated into the favor of God, and made heirs of heaven. He made the claim that the law must be changed, that the reins of government must be slackened in heaven, that sin must be tolerated, and sinners pitied and saved in their sins.** But every such plea was cast aside when Christ died as a substitute for the sinner. **He who was made equal with God** bore the sin of the transgressor, and thereby made a channel whereby the love of God could be communicated to a fallen world, and his grace and power imparted to those who came to Christ in penitence for their sin.”*

If the worst possible time did not provoke God to destroy the world, is there ever a time which is evil enough to require that God put aside the principles of His holy law? According to Ellen White, at the worst possible time of rebellion and confusion, when everyone including the inhabitants of unfallen worlds expected God to destroy everyone on the earth, God responded in love by saving the world, and not by destroying it.

2. **Are you willing to destroy faith in the Father's love and in the love of Jesus Christ for sinners, by retaining the belief that the Old Testament commands to kill heretics, were inspired by God?** It is not my intention to destroy faith in any of the words which have proceeded from the mouth of God. However, I do need to be sure just which words have actually originated with God and make a distinction between those words and those which have only been SAID to have originated with God. Jesus Himself demonstrated this problem. Should we deny His testimony in favour of the Old Testament sayings which contradict Christ's sayings and personal testimony? Does your faith in the claim that ALL the Old Testament writings are the word of God, exceed your faith that Jesus Himself is the "word of God made audible? Revelation 19:13 "And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God." Christ is the spirit / character of God. Ellen White states in the Desire of Ages, p 19 "By coming to dwell with us, Jesus was to reveal God both to men and to angels. He was the Word of God,--God's thought made audible." This cannot be said for Moses, Joshua, Elijah, David or any of the prophets and certainly not ALL the writings in the Bible which were repeatedly edited over the centuries. Only the Son of God is the Word of God according to the Bible and to Ellen White. He alone is God's thought made audible. By retaining the idea that all writings in the Old Testament, which have been assumed to have been inspired by God, are in fact inspired, on the basis of that traditional belief - is to place tradition over the example of Jesus Christ. The standard given us to differentiate that which is divine from that which is not divine, is clear. It is the 10 commandments which embody the character of God Himself. Anything that does not harmonise with the law of God – the character of God – does not have its origin with God – but with His enemy Satan or Satan's agents. What is preventing God's people from examining all the writings which are claimed to be 'sacred' in order to ascertain which align with the sacred standard; the law of God and which fall short of that perfect standard and are simply the traditions of men – as Isaiah 8:20 advises? The standard given us to differentiate that which is divine from that which is not divine, is clear. It is the 10 commandments which embody the character of God Himself. Anything that does not harmonise with the law of God – the character of God – does not have its origin with God – but with His enemy Satan or Satan's agents. The Christian's faith is supposed to be placed in Jesus – not in a book. Does not a God of love draw all men unto Him?
3. **Who shall we believe – Jesus or the words attributed to Moses?** Jesus said to the Jews that they **had heard it said** that they should perform retributive violence –eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound and stripe for stripe” (Exodus 21:24-25) but that **He** told them to love their enemies, to pray for them, to forgive them (Matt 5). Where had the people 'heard' the instructions of retributive violence? From the Mosaic law. (Christ did not state that Moses actually wrote those words, but that the people had heard those words which were incidentally recorded in the Mosaic record as being divinely spoken and given to Moses). Who's advice should a Christian follow? Christ's instructions – which are spirit and life - or the Old Testament instruction? Obviously one set of instructions are in harmony with the

moral standard of God – the 10 commandments – and the other instructions are not in harmony with the 10 commandments. Christ's words harmonise with the great moral standard which reflects and embodies His character. The OT instructions follow a familiar, pagan standard which was also practiced by heathen countries eg Islamic Law (Sharia) under the Taliban regime. The law of retaliation (lex talionis) is carried over to Islam. The Qur'an (Koran), *Suram (chapter) 5:45 states: "And We ordained therein for them: Life for life, eye for eye, nose for nose, ear for ear, tooth for tooth and wounds equal for equal. But if anyone remits the retaliation by way of charity, it shall be for him an expiation. And whosoever does not judge by that which Allah has revealed, such are the Zalimun (polytheists and wrongdoers...)"*  
[http://www.americanthinker.com/articles\\_print.php?article\\_id=4671](http://www.americanthinker.com/articles_print.php?article_id=4671)

4. On what basis do the Jews claim that the present day passages of retaliatory laws were given to Moses by God? On what evidence can they sustain that claim? Tradition – and nothing but tradition. Those retaliatory laws do not harmonise with the 10 commandments. If we are to accept that somehow those laws of violent retaliation DO harmonise with the 10 commandments and exhibit the love of Christ and demonstrate His instructions in the New Testament to love one's neighbour and enemies, then we must consider the suggestion that Mohammand was also inspired by the One True God and His Son Jesus. But is this correct? Obviously not, for it is the spirit of antichrist which would purposely injure and maim one of God's children – or His enemies. I must therefore, apply the advice of Jesus Christ to my life. What do I do with the Mosaic instruction to 'fight fire with fire?' Since it is so out of harmony with the law of love, of which Jesus said, "Hang ALL the law and the prophets," I am left with no other conclusion that to consider it as being non-genuine. I imagine such evil instruction was added to God's words – a situation about which Ellen White speaks. It seems likely that this was done for political gain by the Jewish leaders. If the Roman Catholics thought it a clever strategy to add 1 John 5:7,8 to the New Testament to support their doctrine of the trinity, isn't it conceivable that the Jewish leaders saw political value in adding to the true words of the prophets in their day? This was a problem in Isaiah's day and he instructed the people how to tell whether the prophets were actually speaking the words of God or whether they were just making a false claim of being in reception of a divine message (Isaiah 8). The same deceptive strategy (of pretending one is a prophet of God) was utilised many times in 'theocracies' eg. the Egyptian reign of the female pharaoh Hatshepsut - she ruled for 15 years by claiming that the gods made a special divine rule to permit a female to hold the office of pharaoh. In the OT, many times God was given the credit for authorising heinous crimes – which just happened to be the sinful behaviour that the Israelites wished to perform anyway. (See section in Objects re the Amalekites).
5. Did the life of Jesus demonstrate perfectly to humanity, the completeness of the Father's character? – yes. John 14:9-11 "Jesus saith unto him, **Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me**, Philip (David, Sherlene)? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Show us the Father? (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. (11) Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else **believe me for the very works' sake**." (In other words, Jesus might have been saying, "if you can't see that I'm the divine Son of God by my character, then at least believe it because of the good works you see me doing. Those works reflect the Father's character.")

6. Did the life of Jesus show humanity how to live – perfectly – in every sphere of interaction with our neighbours – or was Christ's example somehow faulty?
7. Should humanity follow exactly in Jesus' ways? Ellen White states that 'when the character of Christ is reproduced perfectly in His people, then He will come.'
8. Didn't Jesus say that **His** words are "spirit and they are life?" Jesus is referring to "eternal life" (John 6:63). If some of the words **attributed** to Moses contradict those spoken by Jesus, which words are most likely to be at fault?
9. Was there ever a time when God says it is legal for any being in the entire universe to break even one of the precepts of His law? Did Jesus mention any exceptions? James certainly didn't. James 2:10 "“For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all.”"
10. Is there any occasion where perhaps we might apply the same elasticity as is applied to the 6<sup>th</sup> commandment, to the 4<sup>th</sup> commandment or the 7<sup>th</sup> commandment? Is it legal, on a special occasion - 'when God commands it' - to keep Sunday holy instead of the 7<sup>th</sup> day which is expressly stated in the 10 commandments? Or is there an occasion – when God commands it – for us to commit adultery in defiance of the prohibition placed upon such immorality in the 10 commandments? Such a suggestion is outrageous. We KNOW that God will not change His law on the Sabbath for it is everlasting. We KNOW that God will not permit adultery – ever. But aren't all 10 commandments permanently binding upon all humanity? Why do Christians suppose that God's law is weak in one area and that even non-trinitarians and SDAs can accept that God is flexible regarding the 6<sup>th</sup> commandment and condones the condemnation and killing of those He came to save – even of the babies?
11. It is common for so-called theocracies to employ the death penalty to “solve” a “heretic problem” and to commit genocide. eg. Hitler claimed that god was instructing him also in his programme to rid the world of Jews. The Muslims claim that Allah told them through the holy prophet Mohammed, and it is written down in their holy book – every word which is inspired – to kill heretics for the glory of god. Was the Israelite 'theocracy' any different to Islamic theocracies operating today? Both annihilated heretics, committed genocide and employed the death penalty even on their own society's members. Is one system 'godly' and the other satanic? How can that be? Jesus said, “By their fruits ye shall know them.” The fruit of both theocracies condone genocide. In contrast, the fruit of the spirit of God is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance – against such there is no law. But there is a law against genocide and torture. It is the 6<sup>th</sup> commandment of the moral law of God.
12. Could the problem be in the interpretation of the 6<sup>th</sup> commandment? Is it sometimes 'okay' (i.e. legal and loving) to kill our heretical neighbour or our heretical enemy? Some believe that God commanded, “thou shalt not murder” but permitted *certain, designated, holy* people to do it legally – saying that God commanded such a heinous action. The 6<sup>th</sup> commandment is interpreted to mean, “You can kill bad people (heretics) when it is necessary.” If such instructions were really given to the Israelites by the One True God – to kill the heretics in Canaan because their 'cup of iniquity was full' – then wouldn't we expect God, who never changes, to order the 144000 to destroy the pagans whose probation will be then closed in the last days? No. Why not? Because this would not be in keeping with the instructions of gentle Jesus. In the garden of Gethsemane, when death at the hands of heretics confronted them, Jesus told Peter to put away his sword and to trust the Father to protect them. Peace and love to even His enemies - this was ever the example given by the Son of God – even when His life depended upon it. This is faith.

13. What is impossible with man is possible with God. Even during the worst time of trouble the world has ever known, the 144000 are not going to encounter such 'impossible' circumstances that will NECESSITATE the taking of life. God will be their defence. Could there ever be any situation worse than the time of trouble? Would this dreadful time necessitate killings by God's people? Or will the saints pray the prayer of Jesus – Father, my life is in Your hands. Into thy hands I commend my spirit. If you permit me to be killed by commandment-breakers, then I accept it in the faith of Jesus?
14. If God says that 'legalised murder' or killing of unrepentant sinners is His standard of law, then the Australian government would appear to be more moral than God. Australia outlawed the inhumane death laws in 1972. If a faulty human government is able to deal with criminals without murdering them, shouldn't the most powerful Governor of the universe be able to deal with violent sinners within the boundaries of His holy, infallible, unchangeable law of love – or would some accuse God that His law is faulty and that His laws must be altered in certain circumstances? Such was the accusation of Lucifer.
15. Does God does resort to using the devils weapons and does He break His own law – have a total change of character? If it is true that sin brings forth death, then why should God be blamed for that reaction? Sinners will destroy themselves for it is sin that brings forth death – of itself – not God who brings forth death. EJ Waggoner (commenting on) Romans, p 99, 100 says: "*Romans 8:6. 'The sting of death is sin.' 1 Cor. 15:56. There could be no death if there were no sin. Sin carries death in its bosom. **So it was not an arbitrary act on the part of God that death came upon men because of sin. It could not possibly be otherwise.** Note the justice here. Death passed upon all men, 'for that all have sinned.' 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; ....Ezek.18:20.'* **And this is also a necessary consequence of the fact that sin contains death in it, and that death can not come in any way than by sin.** (100) *Everything that came through Adam's fall is undone in Christ; or, better still, all that was lost in Adam is restored in Christ.*"
16. If God 'legalised murder,' by condoning killing in some special circumstances, then it would appear that He has watered down His immutable law to permit in certain cases, the very act He has outlawed. Did God mean, "You will not murder anyone in anger, but if you are not angry and you think it is necessary, you can end this person's probation and kill him as long as you yourself are not angry?"
17. It is impossible to murder someone without killing them. But is it possible to **deliberately** kill someone without murdering them? We are told by the legal profession that murder is intentional and often has (selfish) anger attached to it. Can a person intentionally, with pre-meditation - kill a heretic and their children – and it not be considered murder?
18. Jesus stated in Matt 5 that to even be angry with a person is to break the 6<sup>th</sup> commandment in the mind/heart. The Israelites were supposedly instructed by Moses, via God, that they were to kill heretics and their children, without mercy (Deut 7:2; 13:8). Can a sinful, human being or a saint perform a pre-meditated killing of a heretic - or a baby - without any trace of anger, unkindness, without thoughts of self-righteousness, without also any thoughts of mercy or regret? Can a saint who carries out such an action remain sinless – with a clear conscience? Would such an act bring joy and richness in their spiritual relationship with God? Or would they wonder how a god of love could command something so horrifying as the murder of a baby?

19. If it is accepted that in the OT, God is saying that we must not accidentally kill someone, but we can do it intentionally if we decide it is absolutely necessary, then why can't this rule apply to the 144000 in the last days when the wicked will be demon-possessed? I suggest that this doctrine of 'necessary murders' reveal tremendous lack of faith in God's power to reform sinners and to protect His children against the wicked. The Israelites suffered from lack of faith, but the 144000 will not falter in faith and Christ will reproduce the Father's character in their lives. The Father's name/law/character will be in the forehead of the redeemed. They will be saved by faith in the loving character of the Father and will keep the loving laws of His government.
20. Is Jesus our perfect example? If so, where did Jesus give an example of legalised killing in His ministry? Even though serious threats were made to take Christ's life (and the crucifixion would have been considered an extreme threat), Christ Himself did not consider it an act of love or of righteousness to protect Himself. He refused to perform a 'necessary murder' of His enemies. He would not authorise the use of physical violence even if self-defence. The Messianic prophecy assured us that there was no violence in Him (Isaiah 53:9).
21. Christ told Peter not to consider physical violence (Matt 26:52). "Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." Was Christ's prophecy incorrect? Are there exceptions to Christ's prediction that all who take the sword will perish with the sword?
22. In Luke's gospel, when Jesus was arrested in the Garden of Gethsemane, the disciples even asked Him, if they should use the sword against their enemies in self defence? (Luke 22:49) Christ answered, "Suffer ye thus far." Put up even with this. Do not retaliate even though it has come to violence on their part. Was Christ's example consistent?
23. Christ had the perfect opportunity to advocate self-defence and to set humanity an example by physically attacking his enemies – by praying for His Father to send down fire to consume them. His enemies' probation was over - at least Judas Iscariot's was over – and Jesus could have put Judas "out of his misery" and killed him quickly IF such actions were in harmony with the divine manner of dealing with unrepentant sinners. However, the example Christ set was not "to fight fire with fire" or to retaliate with violence or even to act in self-defence. In all situations of personal danger, Christ submitted to His Father's will and trusted that the Father would protect Him. He instructed the disciples that He could ask His Father to send angels to hide Him or to make a way through the middle of the mob – just as His Father had done many times before to ensure the safety of His Son. Was this an example of love or stupidity? Of faith or faithlessness?
24. Can law-**breaking** somehow become legalised law-**keeping**? Or in the same manner, can **legal** actions be **illegal** or considered to be law-**breaking**?
25. If God's law commands, "Thou shalt NOT kill" are there exceptions whereby this law can be annulled? (eg. For the special situation concerning heretics?)
26. If the law is a transcript of **God's** character, then whose character does law-breaking demonstrate? If not committing adultery and not committing murder honour God, who is honoured when sinners commit fornication and murder?
27. Jesus predicted there would be a time when supposed "Christians" would kill God's real people, (whom they supposed were heretics) thinking they were honouring God. But they did these things because they didn't KNOW the Father, nor His Son. John 16:2, 3 "They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service. (3) And these things will they do unto you, because they have not known the Father, nor me." Romans 8:9 states that, "if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His." What is the

spirit of Christ? Gal 5:22, 23. "The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, against such there is no law." Does Christ's spirit ever change? Does He ever bring forth the works of the flesh?

28. What does Paul say are the fruit of the spirit of Satan? Gal.5.19-21 "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, (20) Idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, (21) Envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Shouldn't there be a section inserted in Paul's statement that reassures us that SOME evil doers will be in heaven? Perhaps Paul is required to say, "Those who do these evil works can, under certain circumstances, enter heaven, but on the condition that they they only sin and break God's law when it is 'necessary' - for example, the ancient Israelites who murdered men, women, children and infants; kidnapped women; raped them; and pillaged 'under God's express command'?"
29. Does the spirit of Jesus does change? Hebrews 13:8 "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever."
30. Can any evil gift come from God? James 1:17 "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."
31. Can God, the Author of Goodness bring forth the works of the flesh? Matthew 7:18 "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Luke 6:43 "For a good tree bringeth not forth corrupt fruit; neither doth a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." James 3:12 "Can the fig tree, my brethren, bear olive berries? either a vine, figs? so can no fountain both yield salt water and fresh."
32. Does God only think good thoughts toward humanity? Jeremiah 29:11 "For I know the thoughts that I think toward you, saith the LORD, thoughts of peace, and not of evil, to give you an expected end."
33. Is God is of one loving mind and spirit or does He have a 'bad, evil' side to His character?
34. Did Jesus only demonstrate the 'good, nice, kind, merciful' side of God's character? If so, He didn't really give humanity a true representation of His Father and He lied when He told Philip that He had shown him and us, the Father (John 14:8-10).
35. Does God participate in evil? If the violent aspects which are attributed to God in the Old Testament were valid and accurate descriptions of His character, then those same traits would have to have been demonstrated in Christ's life, because He came to show us the Father. Violent traits simply are not evidence in the life of Jesus Christ for according to the Messianic prophecy "there was no violence in Him" (Isaiah 53:9).
36. Were the perceptions of the prophets always correct? eg In the book of Jeremiah It is written many times" Thus saith Lord I will bring evil upon you." Does God bring evil upon us? Or is it just **human** to blame God when things go wrong? (as did Adam and Eve in the garden of Eden). Isn't our reality exactly perceived, the way we believe it?
37. Jewish mentality, beliefs and perceptions of God, as recorded in the OT, have caused millions of people throughout history to reject God on this very subject point – that God commands some people to kill other people, including babies. Yet like the OT Jews, Christianity today refuses to see that you cannot harmonise the old with the new. You must be born again and understand that the Son came to show us the Father. Why? Because the OT scribes and editors who put the oral laws to print, and formed the OT, gave a distorted view of God's character. If they already

had given a perfect portrayal of God's character, why did Jesus tell these men who could recite the Torah, that they didn't know His Father nor Him? (John 8:19).

38. If you thought God told you to stone someone to death today for breaking the Sabbath etc, would you stone the person? If your answer is 'no', why not? A true Christian would base their response on, not the OT death penalty law, but on the example and teachings of Jesus because He upheld the principles of love in the 10 commandments. The only person who we have authority to kill, is the old self. If anyone should be stoned, it is self. Jesus taught us, "Judge not, pull the log out of your own eye, he who has never sinned can cast the first stone" (Matt 7:1-5; John 8:7). The words of Jesus Christ are the audible words of God. Rev.19.13 "And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God."
39. It is obvious that Jesus disapproved or refused to sanction the Old Testament record in 2 Kings chapter 1, when Elijah supposedly called down fire from heaven to consume Ahab's soldiers. When the disciples wanted to call down fire from heaven to consume those who insulted Jesus by refusing Him hospitality. They referred to this OT story. Jesus refused to comment on the story, but rebuked the disciples, telling them, "Ye know not what spirit ye are of" (Luke 9:53). The way the events were recorded were not reflective or in harmony with the character life and teachings of Jesus, but of pagan gods and their attributes. Which person demonstrated that God's spirit motivated them – the violent spirit attributed to Elijah or the peaceful spirit of Jesus?
40. The wicked have and will be destroyed but not the way the majority perceive. Would God kill or destroy those for whom He was willing to die? John 10:15; Luke.9.56 "For the Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them."
41. Jesus said that it was lawful to do good, but evil to destroy. Luke.6.9 'Then said Jesus unto them, I will ask you one thing; Is it lawful on the sabbath days to do good, or to do evil? to save life, or to destroy it?' Who is the destroyer? It is Apollyon – which is Satan - Rev 9:11. Who was a murderer from the beginning? John 8:44 Satan. Who is endeavouring to force people to break God's law? Satan. Why would Christians assist Satan by saying that sometimes, God's law can be set aside, in exceptional circumstances when it is necessary that heretics and pagans be exterminated?