

BEHAVIOUR: FREUD OUT – DEVILS OUT–GENETICS IN ?

By

Arnold Kennedy

Published by:

Christian Identity Ministries

PO Box 146

Cardwell QLD 4849

Australia

Email: hr_cim@bigpond.com

BEHAVIOUR: FREUD OUT – DEVILS OUT—GENETICS IN ?

Arnold Kennedy

FOREWORD.

Since last century, people like Sigmund Freud have led us to believe that behaviour patterns in people were almost entirely the product of external circumstances and environmental surroundings. Today we are being told something different in that genetic causes are now said to play a large part in determining behaviour. It is said that at least one half of human behaviour can be accounted for by DNA. The talk now is about humans being “hard-wired” and of people being “at the mercy of their chromosomes”. There is now an obvious clash between environment and biology on this issue of behaviour.

Environment, biology and culture are all supposed to allocate causes for behaviour that are chiefly outside of personal choices. So, if people behave in a certain way it is popular to allocate causes to any of the following factors:

1. Circumstances and environmental surroundings.
2. Genetic (“It’s in their genes”).
3. DNA change through heart transplants, blood transfusions, etc.
4. The sub-conscious.
5. Imagination.
6. Physical senses - (e.g. smell can create a desire to eat).
7. Peer pressure, and what nearly everyone else in the group does.
8. The Media.
9. Wrong doctrine.
10. Humanistic Laws.
11. Diet, food, alcohol and drugs.
12. Demons (A religious idea).

Some people claim that some of these can drive them uncontrollably, so much so that they have no control over their choices as to how they behave. Certainly they all can apply pressure in choice making, but they can only affect our choices if we allow them to. If our hearts are not steadfast as Joseph’s was with Potiphar’s wife, we will make bad choices about how we behave.

What we intake into our bodies removes our ability to choose! But hunger, thirst and fear can influence rational thought, and alcohol and drugs can wreck choice making altogether. Where we read in Proverbs, 20:1, “*Strong drink is raging*” the word “raging” in Hebrew carries the meaning “confusion” and “being out of control”. That is the mental ability to choose is taken away. When we read in 2 Timothy 1:7, “*For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind*” we can see why alcohol and drugs can be seen as working against that “sound mind” and thus against God. Anyone who allows his mind to be controlled by alcohol, drugs, wrong thoughts and desires, wrong doctrines, bad environments, fantasies and such, will behave badly, and is actively working against God as an adversary (a satan).

IMAGINATION AND BEHAVIOUR.

Imagination can also influence rational thought, and thus drive people to bad behaviour. Some of our false teachers teach that people should visualise things, have positive thoughts, and then supposedly what they have visualised will come to pass. The word “imagination” comes from having an image of something, something that is not a present reality. “Imagination” is used as a symbol of having evil thoughts. In Hebrew, the word *yester* that is translated as “imagination”, is about graven images, something we are commanded to avoid bowing down to. Another Hebrew word so translated is *machashabah* which is about thoughts, or the mind. In the Greek we have *dialogismos* which Thayer’s Lexicon gives as, “*The thinking of a man deliberating with himself*”, and also “*a deliberate questioning*”. Another word translated as “imagination” is *logismos* which is about having reasoning thoughts which are contrary or hostile to the Word of God. This evil mind capability is something that is part of our free will, and the evidence of the fall of man is apparent today as

it was in the time of Genesis 8:21 where we read, "...the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth". Through the Bible we find Israel acting in the manner of Jeremiah 16:12, "And ye have done worse than your fathers; for, behold, ye walk every one after the imagination of his evil heart, that they may not hearken unto me". Thus, without a "new heart" (new mind) we cannot overcome what has been bred into us from the beginning. Any Bible teacher who will not admit to this is one of those Peter refers to in 2 Peter 2:1, "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies". A heresy is a false doctrine that captures **the mind**. Please note this matter of "the mind", because it comes to the fore over and over again as we consider human behaviour.

So, unless regenerated by God, underneath remains what we are as people, that is, what has been bred into us. Every other religion and culture therefore is contrary to Word of the God of Israel. Of necessity this then applies to much of so-called Christianity. Where we read above, "For God hath not given us the spirit of fear; but of power, and of love, and of a sound mind" this concerns "us", that is the "us" of the one race being addressed. The modern humanistic mind wants to deny any suggestion of racial behavioural patterns and mental processes, but the matter remains a fact. In a given society, it is apparent that the more the racial mixture, the more the confused patterns of behaviour, and the more the cultural problems. Modern geneticists have opposed the humanistic view saying that any idea of racial equality, or uniformity, is a complete myth, so in this they are approaching the Biblical view. Now we will consider briefly some of the viewpoints people have on various factors affecting behaviour.

BIOLOGY AND BEHAVIOUR.

People argue on an emotional basis that there is no biological basis for race and racial behavioural differences. They claim that the physical characteristics of people are the consequence of geographic locations and that these have developed from a group having a small gene pool in their isolation; this is said to have allowed dominant genes to become concentrated. Such concentrations are supposed to produce physical characteristics and with that, genetic dispositions in what are within their definitions of "race".

There has been much research for over two decades focussing on the differences between the three major racial groupings, commonly termed Orientals-(East Asians/Mongoloids), whites-(Europeans/Caucasoids) and blacks-(Africans/Negroids). What has been found is that in brain size, intelligence, temperament, sexual behaviour, fertility, growth rate, life span, crime and family stability, Orientals fall at one end of the spectrum, Blacks fall at the other end and Whites fall in between. On average, Orientals are slower to mature, less fertile and less sexually active, and have larger brains and higher IQ scores. Blacks are at the opposite end in each of these areas. Whites fall in the middle, often close to Orientals. That the same three-way racial pattern occurs repeatedly on some 60 different biological and behavioural variables is profoundly interesting and shows that race is more than "just skin deep." (Source: World Health Organisation).

In the United States, Orientals are seen as a "model minority." They have fewer divorces, out-of-wedlock births and reports of child abuse than whites. More Orientals graduate from college and fewer go to prison. Blacks, on the other hand, are 12 percent of the U.S. population but make up 50 percent of the prison population. Some believe the Asian figures are low because less are caught. The racial pattern of crime in the United States is not due to local conditions such as "white racism." The same pattern is found worldwide. Interpol yearbooks show the rate of violent crime (murder, rape and serious assault) is three times lower in East Asian and Pacific Rim countries than in African and Caribbean countries. Whites in European countries are intermediate. (Source: Interpol).

Genes play a big part in athletic ability, brain size, IQ and personality. Trans-racial adoption studies, where infants of one race are adopted and reared by parents of a different race, provide some of the strongest evidence. Oriental children, even if malnourished before being adopted by white parents, go on to have IQs above the white average. Black infants adopted into middle-class white families end up with IQs lower than the white average. What are the implications of this research? One is that we should stop blaming white racism for all

society's problems. If blacks are good at certain sports and Orientals do well in schools, it cannot be because each group is trying to "overcome the prejudice of white society," because each group shows the same pattern of strengths and weaknesses in their countries of origin.

Sometimes those who argue that race is just a social construct, (because the human-genome project shows people share roughly 99 percent of their genes in common) claim there are no races. This is nonsense. Human genes are 98 percent similar to chimpanzee genes and 90 percent similar to those in mice, which is why these species make good laboratory animals. But no one claims that mice, chimpanzees and humans are nearly the same! That would be laughable. Similarly, although men and women are genetically 99 percent the same, it is foolish to believe that gender is just a "social construction."

GENETIC MEASURES

Much confusion arises because there are several sets of genetic measures. A much more realistic story comes from looking at the 3.1 billion base pairs that make up the 30,000 genes. People differ in one out of every 1,000 of these base pairs. Each change in a base pair can alter a gene. Technically, base-pair differences are called single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). The 99 percent figure is based on DNA sequences that do not differ between people or even most mammals. These can give the impression that human groups and chimpanzees are almost identical, because these genetic codes are similar for internal organs, eyes, hands and so on. Though humans and mice look very different, any anatomy student can tell you that even their internal bone structures are very similar.

The Feb. 23 issue of "Science" magazine reported that 2.8 million single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) were already being sold by Celera Genomics to scientists trying to crack the code of human behaviour. Note carefully that this includes behavioural genes and not just physical attributes. Base-pair differences are important and single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) clump together in races. Just one change in the base pair for hemoglobin, for example, causes sickle-cell anaemia, from which many blacks suffer. Other base-pair differences affect IQ, aggression and mental illness. Again note this separates behaviour from physical effects, although here is a behind-the-scene connection. The 3.1 billion base pairs provide plenty of room for large racial differences. If races did not exist, we would not find the same racial patterns all around the world and over time. **The scientific evidence shows that the politically correct mantra that claims "race is just skin-deep", is a case of deep denial.**

HEART TRANSPLANTS AND BLOOD TRANSFUSIONS.

There is a steady trickle of reports coming through that claim people who have had such things as organ transplants and blood transfusions, have a change in personality (and hence behaviour). These changes are observable facts, but the author is unaware of any DNA tests that would confirm this medically.

SCIENCE ATTACKS FREUD.

What we are witnessing today an intrusion into Freudian thought, this time from science. Geneticists are telling us that, just as people have inbuilt medical pre-conditions, there are also inbuilt behavioural pre-conditions. For instance, homosexuals are said to be that way because their genes preset their behaviour patterns. It is again claimed that bad behaviour is not anyone's personal fault because they have no choice. So it is becoming popular to accept genetic, biological and organic excuses for behaviour. As homosexuals do not conceive children, if their homosexuality was inherited and totally genetic they would have all died out by now.

Following a US\$20 million investigation, it was concluded that aggressive behaviour was linked to genetic causation. So now we find ourselves in a position where it is claimed to be politically correct to allocate homosexual behaviour to genetic disposition, but not to allocate crime and racism to the same disposition. To be able to sort this out we have to ignore what is considered to be politically correct. If medical predispositions are linked to genetics, then it is hard to escape that crime and racial behaviour might also be linked to genetics in some way. A predisposition to behave in a certain way does not insist that this is the sole factor in how a person behaves. Other things such as the behaviour of others, social

acceptance, lust and pride can act as triggers. But it must be asked whether, as a result of biology, men are compelled to carry out crimes such as aggression, violence, murder, robbery or rape. When people do these things, as well as other things, what it shows is that they are not under the authority of the Law of God. Few in Christian denominations or groups will place themselves under the authority of God; in fact most teach it is not required where this authority has any reference to the everlasting and unchanging Law of God. The Bible teaches that when we do wrong we are “without excuse”-(Romans 1:20). Choice remains!

THE DISCREDITED FREUDIAN STANDPOINT.

Freud put forward the idea that the reason we think and behave the way we do is because, that as children, we experience what he called psychosexual stages of growth. As a result, we supposedly incorporate our early human history into our unconscious. Freud taught that our childhood then sets what we do and how we will behave later in life. According to Freud, the reason we do what we do, and think what we think, is because we are psychically determined to do so. Thus, in his view no one is responsible for what they do, that is, it is that our upbringing and environment makes us all victims. Freud was thus suggesting wrongly that choice is never an issue.

When we talk about rational thought, we are talking about the mind. The Bible has a lot to say about the mind, and links this back to what happened in the Garden of Eden.

2 Cor. 11:3 *But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so **your minds** should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.* Here we find that the Freudian lie is nothing new. Temptation does not force us to misbehave. Eve was tempted, so she said, “It was not my fault”. Freud upheld the daisy-chain idea of fault where Adam blamed Eve, and Eve blamed the serpent. Neither accepted that the fault lay solely in their wrong choice. So popular psychology today is based upon a wrong premise, and this is the language used in education and society today. But how was the mind corrupted (passive voice)? This passage says it is by wrong teaching. In this passage “minds” = *noema* which Thayer gives as “mental perceptions”. Mental perceptions are created by what we are taught. They are not the effect of external “demons”. The word “mental” brings us back to the “mind” again. Choices are what we make with the “mind”. The word translated as “simplicity” in the verse above is *haplotes*, which Thayer gives as, “*singleness, sincerity, and mental honesty, and “one who is free from pretence and dissimulation”*. Wrong doctrine corrupts our minds! Perhaps it is even more serious than this since the word “corrupts” = *phtheiro* carries the meaning of destruction.

THE BIBLE’S VIEW OF RACIAL BEHAVIOUR.

This is different to the popular view or definitions. In the Bible, each race is described as stemming from its own “father”, e.g.,

Gen 19:37 - the same is the father of the Moabites

Gen 19:38 - the same is the father of the children of Ammon

In the history of Biblical races, there are differing characteristics that come from each “father” that carry on in their descendants. The Bible does not tell us specifically how one father’s offspring came to have particular behavioural traits, but there are indications that it is a matter of “spirit”. Where we read, “*visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation*”-[Numbers 14:18]-the word “visiting” = *paqad* seems to indicate that in some way the children are affected by what that “father” did. We will see how the matter of “spirit” may well be located within the genes. This then would confirm the matter of behavioural genes.

When it comes to Biblical Israel (nothing to do with the State of Israel or ‘The Jews’), we find Jehovah is described in the Bible as being, “*The Father of Israel*”, so there are characteristics of God inbuilt in this race from conception. They alone, as God’s children, have the inbuilt ability of spirit to “hear” what God has to say or demand of them. Jesus confirmed that there were those non-Israelite leaders in the Judean nation who could not “hear” His words -(See John 8). According to the humanistic outlook, true Israel (certain of the white races) are the only people against whom charges of being racist are being levelled today. In this, all the other races are ultimately against this one people which suggests that all other races are of a different “spirit”.

WHAT CHURCHES USE TO TRY TO CONTRADICT THIS.

There are a small group of Biblical verses that seem to many to contradict this, so a quick look at these will clarify the matter. Where we read about God being the God of all men, the “all men” means “all men” of the context; so “all men” in this case means “*all men of Israel*”. This is a simple matter of correct word usage. For the few who do stop to think about the Bible, they come to see that it is about the one “chosen” people of Israel, as lineal descendants of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob/Israel, and that other peoples are mentioned only as they have a connection with Israel. Thinkers will quickly see that the promises and covenants made by God to Israel could not possibly be fulfilled in any different peoples. Paul does confirm in whom these promises are fulfilled in Acts 13:32-33, “*And we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children*”. There is absolutely no valid proof of any later change from “their children” (genetically) in what is commonly called the New Testament Age. It can be demonstrated that “The Church” is ‘called out’ of Israelites who believe. Paul called the people he addressed, “*men of Israel*”, right into this post-Pentecost age. It is politically incorrect today to even hint one race is different from another, but it is politically correct at the same time to treat “The Jews” as being a special race. The Bible does give the reason for this exception; a reason which is about the descendents of Esau seeking to regain what their progenitor sold, by falsely presenting themselves as Israel. When the Bible speaks about a “Chosen race”, it follows that every other race must be correspondingly be “unchosen”. This is not confusion on God’s part. Is not failure to agree with God that makes man (and churches) so confused? A major cause of confusion is the wrong concept that “The Jews” are the “Israel” of the Bible, in this case.

When the Bible talks about Israel (not “The Jews” most of whom have Esau as their “father” according to Encyclopaedia Judaica) as the chosen race, this race was commanded not to wed any other race. This was in order that the characteristics of their “Father” would remain in them undiluted. There is a genetic factor here. This can be seen in why Noah was saved: he was “*pure in his generations* (genes)”. Where there had been racial intermarriage, the divorce of foreign wives (and children) was (and is) Biblically mandatory, (Please see Ezra chapter 9, Nehemiah 13:23-30 and 2 Cor. 6:16 where the Greek word translated as “touch” has to do with physical/sexual contact with certain people). The reason was because Israel was genetically different from other races and was required to stay that way (“*without spot*”, or foreign genes).

Deut. 7:6 For thou art an holy people unto the LORD thy God: the LORD thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are upon the face of the earth.

The Hebrew word for “people” here carries the meaning of one family group, from one “father”. If this one race is a “holy” = separate race, then they must be different from all other races. We must keep in mind that this matter of racial choice is something God did, a matter that mixed-race denominations disagree with. Of course they do! Their pastors would not have employment otherwise.

Genetic “profiling” and genetic “fingerprinting” are accepted today as being reliable and accurate. Racial genes are identifiable. The Bible supports modern genetic discoveries in that races have important genetic differences, and that these differences affect behaviour. In fact, when we consider the matter of Adamites and Pre-Adamites, the Bible tells of how God continually sought to keep the Adamic line genetically pure, by removing or destroying mixed-race offspring. In the end, God’s purpose for Israel as a separated people will be climaxed in the City of God, with all the other races being, “outside of the city”. This is a full genetic separation, but not on genetics alone. Believing God is the other factor in those “chosen” (*eklektos*) from amongst the “called” (*kletos*) to become the Church.

Although all races have much in common in the human genome, there are differences that matter. Everything, even life itself, is regulated from a biological viewpoint by the information contained in the genetic code. God chose to “put a difference” between Israel and other races -(Exodus 11:12), and the word translated as “difference” means, “*to be distinct, marked out, be separated, be distinguished*”. It is interesting that the phrase “marked out” is used because this is so descriptive of what are called “genetic markers” which are used to distinguish one person/one race from another, in many different ways. Genetic

markers are found within the genome, and they are used to give information about genetic relatedness of individuals within populations. When we start to recognize this, we can begin to understand verses such as:

1 John 3:9 *Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.*

This sin has to do with "seed", and refers to God's children as "seed" that are "born of God" as their "Father". (This is in the perfect tense, that is, it is an action completed in the past. It is in the passive voice, that is, it is something done by God, not man. This is not about sinning in the active voice which is a different matter).

The writer recently saw an interesting program on Sky Discovery entitled, "Sin and Science" which was about "sinful" behaviour patterns ("the seven deadly sins") that can be passed on from previous generations within the DNA of a family or a race. The claim was made that behaviour genes could be identified. It was "sins of the fathers" material from a scientific point of view, but it was demonstrated how valid this is, and how succeeding generations within a family group can have the same behavioural problems. Regardless of other possible causes, triggers and behavioural influences, there are then hereditary dispositions that are purely genetic and racial. Christians and atheists alike have been conditioned to believe that races do not have genetic dispositions that condition different racial behaviours. In fact, a study of Judeo-"Christian" web sites on the Internet show an inordinate attempt is made to insist that all men came from one Adam, and that all are exactly the same in the sense of all being of one race. Because of traditional beliefs, Church people just refuse to accept modern genetics discoveries of things that have been in place since God ordained it so, after the man of Genesis Two "fell" in the Garden of Eden. Popular key church nonsense arguments are suppositions, such as:

"Adam must have been mid-brown in order to have had both white and brown people as descendants".

A quick look at passages like Ezekiel 31 show "Pharaoh, King of Egypt", "The Assyrian", three mentions of "the Garden of God", and "the Trees of Eden", as all co-existing. This confirms that the formation of the Garden of Eden came into existence when the Assyrian and the Egyptians already existed. This does not relate to the original creation of Genesis chapter one. Please see Appendix A.

"Eve was the mother of all living" –Gen.3:20.

This does not mean what they think. These are those of Genesis Two who are living in the sense of having had breathed into them "the breath of lives" (is plural). Those created in Genesis One did not have "the breath of Lives", and thus were not "living" with this "breath". Please see Appendix B.

"All people are made of one blood".

This ignores the second part of this verse in Acts 17, which confirms what is said elsewhere about God setting boundaries for the races. In the majority of Bible manuscript texts, the word "blood" is not even there. Please see Appendix C.

"All people are the same and what applies to one applies to every race".

But "all" "everyone", "whosoever" and such words are confined to the context people only, in the manner as found in both Hebrew and Greek usage and grammar. Please see Appendix D.

So what we have to think through is whether or not differing races have different genetic markers that affect behaviour. When one race says of another, "*They are different to us*", this is about behaviour, but the humanist will insist that this is a matter of conditioning and environment. So why do different races within one environment tend to live in ghettos? Is it conditioning (culture) only, or do genetics and corresponding group behaviour come into it? There is an observable fact that, regardless of continent, the darker races tend towards "*the bottom of the heap*" economically. We see governments giving extravagant financial help to try to change this; we have to admit that this suggests that these races are in some way inferior in the economic area. In terms of prison population, the darker races tend towards "*the top of the heap*". The darker races are superior in sporting activities (and crime). In

speaking like this about racial differences, there is no suggestion of racial hatred. But it is a simple and obvious truth that we cannot change genes with money. Tolstoy once said;

"Shallow ideas can be assimilated. Ideas that require people to reorganise their picture of the world provoke hostility. I know that most men, including those at ease with problems of the greatest complexity, can seldom accept even the simplest and most obvious truth if it be such as would oblige them to admit the falsity of conclusion which they have delighted in explaining to colleagues, which they proudly taught to others, and which they have woven, thread by thread, into the fabric of their lives."

Today, to the humanist mind, racism seems to be one of the worst sins. But is not giving financial help to one race above others itself racist? When we start talking like this we are nearing the two opposing views that colour almost everyone's views of things like education, politics, philosophy, law, racism and religion. These two views are essentially Nationalism and Internationalism. The latter view includes the "Brotherhood of Man" idea that pre-supposes all people are brothers who are the same in God's (or man's) sight, in all ways. This idea is taught to children at Sunday school in the words, *"Red and Yellow, Black and White, all are precious in His sight, Jesus loves the little children of the world"*. The Bible does not teach this in the way it is presented!

Because the "brotherhood of man" idea is the standard teaching of churches, it is almost universally accepted. Not only is this the teaching of the churches, it is the dogma of World Government, Socialism, the Roman Catholic Church and the New Age. (This would include the media that is controlled by one or another of them). Thus people are being pre-conditioned to think one thing from at least six major ideologies, each of which oppose the Law of God. It is very hard for a pre-conditioned person to come to think differently from their long-held beliefs, especially when they are hammered with it from every side. As Tolstoy said, it is *"woven, thread by thread, into the fabric of their lives"*. Note again that this is in the "mind", because we will continually have to return to this matter of the mind.

FORCED BELIEFS.

Addressing his Bilderberg colleagues, Colin Powell is recorded as saying that he would strive for racial harmony. What does 'racial harmony' really mean to the Bilderbergers? It is, *"To help promote the goals of racial mongrelisation"*. The expression, "New World Order" has become "The New World (Racial) Order". At a Bilderberger conference it was said, *"In the years ahead, as whites, African-Americans and Asian-Americans marry and bear children, racial distinctions will blissfully blur. As the biological process proceeds, the public will come more and more to accept a world without borders where the nation state will become a relic of history"*. But in view of the 3.1 billion "base pairs" mentioned earlier this would take a very long time, and the biological process will not proceed apace because like groups tend towards some sort of ghetto living. There are conspiracy-theory ideas that it will become illegal for whites to marry whites under full world government, and we must ask why Powell went on to speak about *'right wing extremists'*, and that, *"These pockets of resistance to social justice are a problem and must be dealt with seriously"*. It is a reasonable conclusion that an attempt is being made to utterly water down the racial characteristics of God's children. The very use of the word "mongrel" is admitting racial "breeds" exist in the New World Order's mind, (when it suits them). Popular ideas of "social justice" are not God's ideas.

Since that time, there have been new discoveries about the human genome. There have been discoveries about genetic behavioural traits between races. On one hand it is politically correct to insist that "race" is something that cannot be defined, and yet they can talk about racial distinctions such as genetic fingerprinting for race, at the same time. Knowing that the politically correct outlook is against the Bible's view of "race", we can expect to see a lot more of confused and contradictory statements coming from information sources. This is confusion, but we read, *"God is not the author of confusion"*. God chose one race to be His children. It is from these children (*teknon*) those of them believing become sons (*huios*) of God.

DOES BIBLE TEACHING SUPPORT DNA RELATED BEHAVIOUR?

There are statements, such as the following one from the Ten Commandments, which seem to uphold this.

Exodus 20:5 For I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

This does not mean to say God cannot reverse this when He shows kindness and mercy to the repentant offspring of the Israelite fathers.

From the New Testament, we read.

Acts 2:39 For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off.

The point is, both the blessings and punishments that happened to “the fathers” are passed on to their children. The mechanism whereby this happens is not outlined. They are things determined by God that we just cannot change. One thing for sure about this is that “the human condition” does not arise from Freudian concepts. The Bible teaches that His people have the sin problem right from conception.

Psalms 51:5 Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.

The word “shapen” in Hebrew is *chuw*, a word that carries the meaning of “to twist, to whirl”, which is something that is seen in the DNA helix.

The New Testament confirms this in regard to His children (in context).

Rom. 5:12 Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:

So in no way is what is inborn genetically, learned behaviour on its own as Freud taught. This does not mean that we have no choice to follow, or not to follow, the innate tendencies. Right from the beginning of the Bible we find this one great issue pointed out to us, and that is that every one of us has to bear the outcome of wrong choices. Always obedience (believing God) brings blessings and disobedience (unbelief in what God commands) brings curses. Where Freud may have been partly right is that outside circumstances and environment may influence our choices, that is, they act upon what is already there, but they are not the prime causes. This is where Bible teachings tell us to choose our associations well. Israel was told to keep separate from other races because of the bad influence the other races (and their gods) would have on them in their minds, their children and Israel's relationship with their God. Israel would come to defile their separation racially because of what started in their minds.

SO CALLED “DEMON POSSESSION”.

Uncontrolled behaviour is claimed religiously to be “demon possession”. There are over 100 New Testament references variously translated as “demons” and “devils”, but we have to question whether these are translation creations, and whether or not there are such beings. Today we hear the word “demonised” which is used about a person who is “driven” to behave in a certain way. It is not uncommon to hear talk about peoples' demons, but they are states of mind that arise from wrong beliefs and consequent actions that are contrary to the Word of God. The New Testament tells over and over how Jesus relieved those who were supposed to be demon possessed but what the people were relieved of were their sicknesses and afflictions in mind and body. Many Christians believe a tradition that the evil in this world is due to angels that revolted against God, and that the 'devil' of the New Testament is also a 'fallen angel' - although the Bible never says so. Therefore the two mentions of "*angels that sinned*" in 2 Peter and Jude, which are unique in the whole Bible, have become popular as evidence for supposed belief in a supernatural devil and demons. But Jude 6 tells us they are "*reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day*". So, are the fallen angels chained, or not? If chained how could they exercise evil power over people? This does not mean “good” angels cannot appear in varying forms. Tradition and translations have made this matter into one of complexity and contradiction, but there is a principle established that the “Almighty” is just that; He is almighty. The religious concept of duality where a good God is fighting a personal lesser god is simply not Biblical. Asking questions is one way to help to overcome wrong ideas.

The following are just a small selection.

1. When did Satan fall from heaven? Christians are often very sure that Satan did fall but very unsure if asked to answer exactly when. The usual answer is that it was in the Garden of Eden, but thousands of years after Eden, Satan still apparently serving as an obedient courtier in the heavenly court in Job 1. So when did Satan fall, if he "fell" at all?
2. 2 Samuel 24:1 records that God tempted David, but 1 Chronicles 21:1 says that it was Satan. How can these both be correct?
3. In Exodus 4:11 God tells Moses that He is the one who makes men mute, but in Luke 11:14 muteness appears to be caused by a demon. Did God lie to Moses?
4. In Isaiah 45:7 God says that "*I form the light and create darkness, I bring prosperity and create disaster, I the Lord do all these things*". This is in opposition to dualistic Babylonian belief in two gods : one god of good, and one god of evil - the Babylonians' Satan. So who was right - Isaiah, or the priests of Babylon?
5. In Psalm 78:49 God sent a band of "evil angels" against Egypt. In some modern Bible versions this has been changed to "destroying angels" but it is "evil angels" in the older Bibles such as the English King James, and original Hebrew. Do evil angels obey God?
6. Hebrews 2:14 "*Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil*". The tense of "destroy" is aorist, or something that is true for all time. The way the verse is translated tells us that the Devil (personalized) would now be dead, and thus not actively deceiving people.
7. There are many Scriptures that show what has the power of death is sin, not a personal devil, e.g.
 - Romans 5:12. Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned*".
 - Romans 5:21. That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.*
 - Romans 6:23. For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord came also the resurrection of the dead.*
 - 1 Corinthians 15:56. The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law.*
8. There are many verses which show the originator of sin is not a personal devil but man's nature, or 'his flesh'. The Book of Romans deals with sin, its origin and the solution.
 - James 1:15. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.*
 - Mark 7:15-23. And he saith unto them, Are ye so without understanding also? Do ye not perceive, that whatsoever thing from without entereth into the man, it cannot defile him; Because it entereth not into his heart, but into the belly, and goeth out into the draught, purging all meats?*
 - And he said, That which cometh out of the man, that defileth the man. For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, Thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: All these evil things come from within, and defile the man.*
 - Jeremiah 17:9 The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?*
 - Ecclesiastes 9:3 This is an evil among all things that are done under the sun, that there is one event unto all: yea, also the heart of the sons of men is full of evil, and madness is in their heart while they live, and after that they go to the dead.*
9. The battle is between the flesh and the spirit, not against a personal devil.
 - Romans 7:18-21 For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I*

find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.

Romans 8:6-7. For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.

1 John 2:16. Because the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.

Galatians 5:17. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.

1 John 2:16. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world.

“It is “flesh” that can be tempted, and it is “flesh” that responds, one way or another. Everyone has the very same ability to sin because we all have that one thing in common, “flesh”. Do we need some demons to sit on our shoulders to tell us to submit to them? Hardly. We can do it all by ourselves! James says it is our lusts that war in our members, and says, “Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts”. Is it then “our lusts” or “demon lusts”? Eve was tempted by her own lusts, in the words of 2 John 2:16 with, “*the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life*”. We have the same choices, “*Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof*”, and also to, “*make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof*”. In this passage, we read, “*There is one lawgiver, who is able to save and to destroy*”. Regardless of interpretations of phrases like, “The Devil”, it is God, the ONE lawgiver, who determines the consequence of choosing obedience or disobedience to His Law. What then does, “*resist the devil*” mean? It is simply the opposite of, “*submit yourselves therefore to God*”. It is blaming exterior beings for wrong behaviour, rather than choice, that is wrong. Where does the “flesh” operate? It is **in the mind**”. From thence, the mind affects the body. Where are demons said to operate? In the body and in the mind.

“Devils” are those who manifest the flesh in disobedience; those who have made a wrong choice in the matter of “sin unto death” and “obedience unto righteousness”-[Romans 6:16]. The “serpent” represents the false accuser, and those who manifest the flesh and sin are “*of the devil*”, or “*the seed of the serpent*”. Likewise groups of people manifesting sin are termed “the devil” or “satan”. The terms are used of governments, e.g. the Roman government in Rev. 2:10 and 2:13. (There are many who would agree that modern politicians are “devils”!)

RELIGIONS AND THEIR DEVILS.

The major religions of the world hold to some concept that there are “demons” which bring bad luck, sickness and affliction, and traditional Christianity is one with them. Neither Freudian concepts nor genetic dispositions deal with, or consider, what is commonly but wrongly termed “demon possession” and how this relates to behaviour. This is a subject that is so coloured by religious translations based on traditions that it is hard to be objective about it without a close inspection of the Greek Scriptures. That “demon possession” is an affectation of the mind is clear since after Jesus dealt with the illness, that person was found “clothed and in his right mind” afterwards. Strong’s Concordance, reference 1139, has a comment about “demons” and where the translators’ concepts came from.

“In the NT, these are persons, afflicted with especially severe diseases, either bodily or mentally, (such as paralysis, blindness, deafness, loss of speech, epilepsy, melancholy, insanity, etc.) whose bodies in the opinion of the Jews demons had entered, and so held possession of them as not only to afflict them with ills, but also to dethrone the reason and take its place themselves; accordingly the possessed were wont to express the mind and consciousness of the demons dwelling in them; and their cure was thought to require the expulsion of the demons”.

Thayer's lexicon agrees about "*the opinion of the Jews*" as do others. We will see this origin also from classical Greek further on. We have to wonder why Mr. Strong wrote this way about demons (devils), since the Bible appears to assume their existence, that is, from the way beliefs have been written into translations. What Mr. Strong called "*The opinion of the Jews*" that has bound the denominations for so long need not bind us. The New Testaments tell us about taking heed to such Jewish myths in Titus 1:14. The Roman Catholic Church holds the same teaching to create fear and ability to control people. She is the "*mother of abominations*" in doctrine, so we must be careful not to be bound by her doctrines. She is the one that teaches, "*Obey the Church...the Church has the power to change the precepts of Christ!*"

The traditional doctrines only seem to be well grounded and beyond dispute. People will say, "See, it is in my Bible". Well it is there but only if we do not consider Biblical symbolism or personalisation, as translators often have done and have written in a manufactured blame for wrong behaviour. There is much more to this, and perhaps we should look just a little into translations, and see if this is really well grounded. Maybe Mr. Strong was aware of something other than the traditional meanings put upon words from Jewish Talmudic myths. We will look at a few points before we examine the personalising of demons.

Demons are supposed to have great strength. Most people have experienced some event when they have experienced unusual strength. For example, think about where a car has rolled over pinning a person underneath. A man lifts up the car, something he could not normally do. Was he then demon possessed, or did the emergency do something in his mind that enabled him to have the strength? Was *pneuma* active in the same way as it was when *ruwach* moved strongman Samson to do exceptional things, when he was upset or in danger?

Now, we must look at passages which are parables, because we are told, in *Matt. 13:33* "*All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude **IN PARABLES**; and without a parable spake he not unto them*", and also in *Mark 3:23* "*And he called them unto him, and said unto them **IN PARABLES**, How can Satan cast out Satan*". It is "normal" to try to use these passages to prove the existence of demons. Jesus was using the word "Satan" in parable form.

Matthew 12:27-29 *And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house.*

Luke 11:15-26 *But some of them said, He casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils. And others, tempting him, sought of him a sign from heaven. But he, knowing their thoughts, said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and a house divided against a house falleth. If Satan also be divided against himself, how shall his kingdom stand? because ye say that I cast out devils through Beelzebub. And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges. But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you. When a strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace: But when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils. He that is not with me is against me: and he that gathereth not with me scattereth. When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking rest; and finding none, he saith, I will return unto my house whence I came out. And when he cometh, he findeth it swept and garnished. Then goeth he, and taketh to him seven other spirits more wicked than himself; and they enter in, and dwell there: and the last state of that man is worse than the first.*

The idea of a prince over devils was an idea of Judaism (and most religions). If we wanted to we could say Jesus was confirming this, but He was not because it is a parable. We can read what we believe into these passages if we do not accept the parable status, but

we will not be right. No doubt all the "if"s in these passages can be seen. Each "if" is not about a literal fact. The passages are about all that is in opposition as being in opposition as being adversary to God's word. The issue is about being "*he that is not with me is against me*". Note that this is entirely in the singular, whereas the supposed 'devils' are plural. We have discussed the meaning of "unclean spirit" before, as it related to "foul breath" as this refers to wrong doctrine or statements. Note this too is singular. The truth of God's word is stronger than any armour of lies and is able to bind the one using that armour. In the words of Luther's hymn, "A word shall quickly slay him", (where the "Him" is a personalisation). The strong man's house is the refuge of lies. The stronger (man) is the Truth. But if the truth is not continued in, the deception will return seven times deeper, and the worse position is for that person to become "without remedy". The seven other worse spirits symbolise this in the parable.

In the passages in Luke 8 and Mark 8 about "Legion", we must note how personification is commonly used in Scripture. For example: death is personified as "reigning" (Rom. 5:14), sin as a "person", (Rom. 7:11), and riches as a "master", (Matt. 6:24). Likewise demons are such a personification or representation. Jesus knew the Jews' belief in demons and as far as they were concerned the devils entered into the swine when the swine ran into the sea. The swine, as unclean animals, should not have been kept, and Jesus disposed of them. The multitude of wrong thoughts in Legion's mind left him according to the word of Jesus, and after the miraculous cure by Jesus, Legion is described as "*clothed and in his right mind.*" (Mark 5:15). "Right mind" = *sophroneo*, a word we will approach later. This implies that his affliction was insanity and not the influence of devils as beings. (The request that the unclean spirits enter the swine is characteristic of people who have experiences some sort of madness and who fear the return of the insanity, believing that they have previously been attacked by something external—they fear the thoughts of their minds). Madness has many manifestations such as "hearing voices", seeing ghosts and '*things that go bang in the night*', speaking with different voices, talking to imaginary persons, multiple personalities and such like. Such are usually explained away by attributing them to personal demons. Insanity comes from sin and sin is madness! The ability of the mind to create illusions must not be discounted; **witness our weird dreams!**

Consider these points:

1. If a surgeon excises a tumour, does he cut out a demon?
2. Can pills, manipulation or surgical operations cast out demons?
3. If a person takes a placebo and recovers from a sickness, does the placebo cast out a demon?
4. If a person is counselled and becomes free from fear as a result of that counsel, did a demon leave him or her?
5. If a person has an ailment due to environment, if that person gets better when placed in a clean environment, was the original environment demonic?

The latter shows the place of the mind in healing, whether or not the cause is psychosomatic. These things are significant, for if indeed the ailments were due to demon possession, as some suggest, how can the patient's recovery through medicine, surgery and therapy be explained?

Although the narratives appear to indicate that the "spirits" cried out, it is clear that the vocalisation of the sounds came from the demoniac. This is implied in the shift of pronouns in Mark 5:7, 9: "*What have I to do with thee?*" "*I adjure thee by God that thou torment me not.*" "*My name is Legion: for we are many.*" People are trying to take things literally that perhaps God never intended. There is a deeper symbolical and spiritual meaning present. Many passages of Scripture have **a different context of meaning, than what many people are looking for in the Bible.** God may have a completely different picture in mind, something vastly greater and infinitely more precious than what many believers are trying to figure out. What makes things hard to figure out are the beliefs translators have written in to their translations, thus influencing multitudes. Let us consider just one case where the solution is simply a matter of grammar.

In 1 John 3:12 we read about a happening in Genesis, "*Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother.*". Following Talmudic-Jewish traditions, some like to use this verse to wrongly say that, "*the Devil had sexual intercourse with Eve*", but this is just one

more verse where translators have made an adjective into a noun. The word that is translated as, "the wicked one" is an adjective, which tells us that it was Cain himself who was evil. Why? We are told it was, "*Because his own works were evil*". It was Cain's works, not the work of "the Devil". Where did the evil originate? It was in Cain's mind. This is the same picture as that found in the New Testament.

*Col 1:20 And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies **in your mind** by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled.*

*Titus 1:15-16 Unto the pure all things are pure: but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even their **mind and conscience** is defiled. They profess that they know God; but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate.*

A lexicon meaning gives "conscience" as being about, "*distinguishing between what is morally good and bad, prompting to do the former and shun the latter, commending one, condemning the other*". Once again, we are back to the mind. This is the same story as in Phillipians 3:15-19 about being "thus minded". We make our behavioural choices with our minds.

PNEUMA. (SPIRIT).

A brief comment is necessary to introduce this subject. Although it is a popular teaching that "demons are fallen angels", we must take note of what the Bible says about their whereabouts:

2 Peter 2:4 For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment;

The correct grammar of this passage tells us that as fast as angels sin, they are being chained! So fallen angels cannot be demons! Angelic beings are never demons.

In the following verse, *daimonizomai* ("possessed with devils" – masculine) is a verb and what are cast out are "spirits" = *pneuma* which is a neuter noun. *Pneuma* is what Jesus cast out of people, this verse says, not "devils".

Matt.8:14-16 And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, he saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever. And he ouched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose, and ministered unto them. When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick".

Pneuma occurs 385 times in the received text and is translated and used in many different ways. *Pneuma* is a dual symbol that is dependant upon context and it is neuter (neither male nor female) in gender. Because it is neuter in gender, it cannot refer to a personality as a "he".

Pneuma corresponds to the Hebrew *ruach*, and this word in the originals has no connotation of a life apart from the body. When Paul said, "*For God is my witness whom I serve in my spirit*", he was talking about his life functions. In symbolic form, "spirit" is about doctrines, good or bad. For instance in the first sentence of the verse below, "spirit" is what false prophets teach.

1 John 4:1, Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world. Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

What are people taught with? It is with words. What do words affect? They affect the mind. Matthew 8 above then goes on to align "spirits" with sicknesses or weakness – "*That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses*". In the Greek of this passage, "infirmities" = *astheneia*. The meaning of the noun *asthenema*, referred to in Romans 15:1 ("*We then that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please ourselves*") concerns "error arising

from weakness of mind' –[Thayer]. We should ask how the "mind" comes into this and if choice is involved. When we go back to the Isaiah passage this is quoted from, we find that in the Hebrew it is quoted from, we have *choliy* translated as "sickness" and *mak'ob* that is mental pain. Here we have the mind again. In Hebrews 4:15 we read about Jesus being, "touched with the feeling of our infirmities". Was Jesus touched by *asthensia* = infirmities or by devils? Or did He feel what people were suffering? Paul said he gloried in infirmities (*astheneia*), but did Paul glory in devils?

In the Gospels, there are eleven references to "unclean spirits". What does this phrase mean? We know that "spirit" means "breath", so "unclean spirit" signifies "foul breath", and it follows on that this actually refers to false doctrines. "Foul breath" symbolises words in opposition to God's breath. The casting out of unclean spirits is symbolic of the removal of belief in false doctrines which opinions "tear" or "torment" the person who holds wrong beliefs. It is false doctrine, which drives men mad, as opposed to the peace, and sanity that is the product of God's doctrine (words). Legion, and others, were "possessed", that is, they were "owned" by the deceitful principles of the anti-christ's doctrine. Legion's mind was full of wrong thoughts that led to violent actions. After Jesus healed him he was in his right mind, where "right mind" = *sophroneo* = "self control with ability to make choices about curbing one's passions".

We can see the power of lying (counterfeit) words to bring us into submission to the words of men, rather than to the words of God. When Jesus healed with His words, He was correcting wrong beliefs that occupied the mind. Only by hearing and understanding His Word can we be made free from the effect wrong words (beliefs and doctrines). In the symbolism of the unclean spirits' speech, we see that false doctrines debate with God Himself as to the truth of His Word, just as today, those who are in error resist God's truth.

We can see that "unclean spirits" are symbolic in verses like:

Rev. 16:13 *And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles....".*

They come out of the mouth; they are words! The word "prophet" shows the words have to do with doctrine. They work miracles (*semeion*) – words have a powerful effect on the mind, and what is in the mind induces behaviour. This is so controlling that it is symbolised in Ephesians 2:2 as "The prince of the power of the air", and the verse qualifies this phrase as "the spirit" = *pneuma*, "that now worketh in the children of disobedience". Can we really blame "demons", or are we to blame the words of false prophets? In Elijah's day the ratio of true prophets to false prophets was 1:450, to which we might add Jezebel's prophets. In the days of 1 Kings 22, it was 1: all the others.

In the Old Testament, we again see the relationship between the words of prophets and the symbol "unclean spirit".

Zech. 13:2 *And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the LORD of hosts, that I will cut off the names of the idols out of the land, and they shall no more be remembered: and also I will cause the prophets and the unclean spirit to pass out of the land.*

What "works" in such people? It is *pneuma*, the "spirit that now works in the children of disobedience". It fulfils the "desires of the flesh and the mind". The mind is where this works.

Eph. 2:1-3 *And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins: Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.*

Early in the book of Genesis, in the Garden of Eden, it was a matter of “Word” against “word”. It was God-Word against Serpent-word. Or put another way, it was doctrine against doctrine. In the Matthew passage above we read, “*He healed them with His word*”. In the healing passage in Luke 4:32 we read, “*And they were astonished at his doctrine: for his word was with power*”. Again and again the healing has to do with right doctrine. “His Word” is right doctrine. This is exactly the pattern of the Old Testament:

*Ps 107:19 Then they cry unto the LORD in their trouble, and he saveth them out of their distresses. He sent **his word**, and healed them, and delivered them from their destructions.*

As soon as one speaks out against “Jewish (Talmudic) myths” there is opposition to what translators have written in. One opposition is the claim that the etymology of the word *diamonion* from classical Greek was used there to describe spirit beings of a higher order than humans, and that the word describes what the writers of the New Testament saw, encountered, and battled against. If this did come from classical Greek usage, is there any reason we should be influenced by the religious beliefs of ancient Greece? If the demon concept arose from a source like that then it must be suspect. We have not seen any centaurs yet, either! Next one is accused of being a Sadducee, and Acts 23 is quoted, as follows:

Acts 23:8 For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, nor an angel, nor a spirit (NASB which reads clearer than the KJV).

But really, in this passage it is “an angel” and “a spirit”, both of which are masculine and singular, so the passage is about something else than what it appears, that is, it is about masculine spirits as an idea from the ancient Greeks. “Spirit” and “spirits” are normally neuter in gender in the Bible, not masculine! Also, “spirit” as a neuter noun is part of the neuter adjective it is associated with. Even “holy spirit” is never a “He” being neuter, both in adjective and noun. Without any doubt, most people will find this statement difficult because they have been taught what is called, “The Doctrine Of The Holy Spirit”. But it has to be faced that the phrase, “The Holy Spirit” occurs only twice in the NT-KJV. Likewise, “The Spirit of truth” (4 times) has no article in the Greek; neither does “The Spirit of God” (12 times). Not a single reference in Greek is masculine! Every single reference to “spirit” is neuter, and so cannot refer to a “he” as a person. So what we have is a false doctrine created by translators by writing in words that are not there. If we say, “holy spirit” refers to a person, likewise “contrite spirit” must refer to a person, and “humble spirit” must refer to a person, because language usage are identical. Thus we can see what is referred to is what a person is in character and personality. If we consider the phrase, “therefore take heed to your spirit” as found in Malachi 2:15, we can start to understand.

There is a host of verses like Amos 3:6 (“*shall there be evil in a city, and the LORD hath not done it?*”), that tell a different story altogether than demons being the makers of sickness and disaster. God is always sovereign! He says in Isaiah 45:7, “*I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and create evil: I the LORD do all these things*”. Yes, all of them.

THE MIND.

We have seen so far that the mind, and what affects it, plays a large part in how a person behaves. In what part of the human does *pneuma* dwell? Could it reside within the chromosomes? When we have talked about “mind” we have not talked about the mind as *nous*, we have talked about the mind as *sophronismos*. This is something mental. Remember Legion?

*Mark 5:15 (And Luke 8:35).And they come to Jesus, and see him that was possessed with the devil, and had the legion,sitting, and clothed, and in his right mind (= **sophroneo**): and they were afraid.*

*2 Cor 5:13 For whether we be beside ourselves, it is to God: or whether we be sober (= **sophroneo**)....*

*1 Peter 4:7 But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore sober (= **sophroneo**), and watch unto prayer.*

In these things we see reference to the mind. Now, we can try to blame things such as schizophrenia and madness of any degree onto spirits or demons, but the following three

verses indicate where this sort of mind comes from. It comes from God, as a consequence of wrong choices people, or their parents, have made.

*Romans 1:28-32 And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a **reprobate mind**, to do those things which are not convenient; Being filled with all unrighteousness, fornication, wickedness, covetousness, maliciousness; full of envy, murder, debate, deceit, malignity; whisperers, Backbiters, haters of God, despiteful, proud, boasters, inventors of evil things, disobedient to parents, Without understanding, covenantbreakers, without natural affection, implacable, unmerciful: Who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.*

If God gives such over to a reprobate mind, how could little imps be doing it? In the verse above, "retain" carries the meaning of "wearing like clothing". Not keeping in mind (like always wearing clothes) the ethical things (*epignosis*) of God produces aberrant and deviant behaviour of many kinds. People become "filled" with it, even if they know that they will be judged by God for it -(See Romans 1:32). In the next three verses, the word for "mind is *nous*, that is they lose the faculty of perceiving divine things, of recognizing goodness and of hating evil. GOD HAS TAKEN IT AWAY –BEWARE!

Again we have shown to us how minds become reprobate.

*2 Tim. 3:8 Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth: men of **corrupt minds**, reprobate concerning the faith.*

The mind is defiled by unbelief.

*Titus 1:15unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure; but even **their mind** and conscience is defiled. They profess that they know God; but in works they deny him, being abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate.*

DEVILS ARE NOT GIVEN AS CAUSES OF SICKNESS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

We have already touched on this matter and it is repeated that in the Old Testament there is no hint of behaviour modification being attributed to demons (devils) in the way translators have brought it into the New Testament. Nor does the Old Testament have any prophecy about such to come. So there can never be any New Testament fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy in this regard. The "devils" = *saiyr* are the false gods Israel worshipped. What we find in the Old Testament is much mention of people with such as a 'sorrowful spirit', a "humble spirit", a "broken spirit", a "vexed spirit", a "hasty spirit", a "heavy spirit", a "contrite spirit", a "steadfast spirit" and so on. These are all things of the attitude of mind. The words "spirit" and "ghost" are all *ruwach* and all correspond with the New Testament *pneuma*. This tells us that the both Testaments agree, as we would expect. All these emotions are felt in our spirits, and they are not caused by a multitude of little imps running about, (unless the imps are thoughts in the mind). What we have is a multitude of thoughts that need controlling by believing God. Obviously, when we read verses like, "He that hath no rule over his own spirit is like a city that is broken down, and without walls", we have the ability to overcome our feelings ourselves by yielding to the sound mind God gives. In this sense it is God who does it through His Word. Responsibility always comes back to **the mind**, and believing what God says. Translators have made "The Holy Spirit" or "The Holy Ghost" into a personality by referring to this as "He". "Holy" is a neuter adjective and "spirit" in a neuter noun, just as "humble spirit", "broken spirit" are.

Regarding devils trembling, it is the people holding the doctrines that tremble. The context of this passage in James indicates a concern for the relationship between faith and works. (vs. 14-18). The demoniacs or demon possessed persons had sufficient sanity to acknowledge "trembling", that Jesus was the Son of God, but this faith was not demonstrated in acceptable works. The Gadarene demoniacs were, for example, "exceeding fierce, so that no man might pass by that way". (Matt. 8:28). Unless believers to whom James addressed his epistle, demonstrated their faith in appropriate works, their professions of faith were in effect no better than those of a demoniac.

Regarding "doctrines of devils", from the prime verb it might be translated, "doctrines about devils". People who hold doctrines about devils are speaking lies in hypocrisy. "Seducing" is about being led into error. Error starts **in the mind**.

Regarding Jude 9 about Moses contending about the body of Moses (who God had buried), this is complex without considering the parallel in Zechariah 3 where Moses's body is a symbol of the High Priest's office. This is well beyond the scope of this paper.

All the questions about such as Jesus being tempted by the devil simply do not indicate a personal devil entity. When we remember that Jesus was tempted in all points as we are, are we ever confronted by the appearance of a visible devil who stands before us talking?

The "*Prince of the power of the air*" is shown to be "sin" in Ephesians 2:2-3. It is the "spirit" which "*now works in the children of disobedience*". The "*prince of this world*" had no place in Jesus. Likewise, every "proof" about a personal devil" can be discounted by those with perception.

HOW TO SURVIVE – AND BE BLEST.

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: *Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man*"-(Eccl. 12:13). This is the only safe pathway for God's children. To walk on that path is a choice God's people have to make.

Prov. 4:20 *"My son, attend to my words; incline thine ear unto my sayings. Let them not depart from thine eyes; keep them in the midst of thine heart. For they are life unto those that find them, and health to all their flesh. Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life. Put away from thee a froward mouth, and perverse lips put far from thee. Let thine eyes look right on, and let thine eyelids look straight before thee. Ponder the path of thy feet, and let all thy ways be established. Turn not to the right hand nor to the left: remove thy foot from evil.*

"Attending", "keeping" and "pondering" are things we do with our minds. In the end, doing this gives the right to 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.*

In the interval between life and death there is the opportunity for forgiveness, restoration and peace, and being put back on the pathway that leads to eternal life. As Joshua told the nation:

Joshua 30:19, *"I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing: therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live".*

Being put back on the path never means we can "*continue in sin that grace may abound*", even if churches may want to claim this in their false doctrine.

Jesus gave us the beatitudes that express what attitude of mind we should have. He said,

Matt 5:3-8 *"Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers".*

Settle this matter once and for all whether or not we have our mental choices, or whether we are at the mercy of demons?

What gets into our minds and "shakes" us?

2 Thess 2:2 *That ye be not soon shaken **in mind**, or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand.*

“**Shaken**” = *saleuo* which is about tottering from one position to another.

“**Mind**” here = *nous* which is about the faculties of perceiving and understanding and those of feeling, judging, determining. It involves the power of considering and judging soberly, calmly and impartially.

“**Spirit**” = “Ghost” = *pneuma*, as touched upon above.

“**Word**” = *logos*, as that which is spoken.

“**Letter**” = *epistole*, as that which is written.

So we have these four things to consider. Being “shaken” is in the passive voice, that is, the consequences of not being mindful to watch, are inevitable. Interestingly, nothing at all is said about being influenced by demons. Our choice remains.

THE MIND AGAIN.

Now we come to another word for “mind” = *phroneo* that means “*to have understanding; be wise; think about it*”. The “mind” that was in Christ Jesus is the attitude and action required of all of God’s people.

*Phil 2:5-“Let **this mind** be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*

Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. For it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.

Do all things without murmurings and disputings: That ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world; Holding forth the word of life.....”.

In our hearts we know we cannot say that demon activity stops us having a right mind. “Let”, as in “*let this mind be in you*”, means “*to have understanding, to be wise, and to think about it*”. As this is of the mind, and of our free choice, demons as beings, do not come into it. Neither do other supposed causes of bad behaviour, such as the sub-conscious, the “id” or the “ego”, or anything else with a fancy name. These are not the prime movers. Yes, we have schizophrenia, people born blind and the medical conditions, at birth or later. We have, “*The iniquities of the fathers are visited upon the children*”, but who visits the parents’ iniquities on the children?” Yes God does, not demons.

Some foods are supposed to cause hyperactivity, or such as schizophrenic behaviour, but does anyone ask whether or not such people are preconditioned by eating unclean food, or by excess or unwise diet, or by straight disobedience to God’s commandments? For those with a “sound mind”, Jesus said, “*They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them*”. There is much more to what we think of as physical causes of behaviour.

God has ordained blessings and curses in regard to keeping His Law. Is it not strange that God’s curses cover all the things we are told religiously are demon activity? Is not attributing the works of God to demons, blasphemy? God is totally sovereign and is not in competition with any lesser gods. It is when we become adversaries (satans) to God, we have to face the curses from God.

In the Old Testament we have charmers, wizards and such that defile with familiar spirits. How they do it is by words. They play mind games with words. Isaiah 8:19 goes on to say, “*To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them*”. It is all about speaking and talking -words...words...words. And

wizards are dealt with, with words. As with Samuel and Saul, “Then Saul fell straightway all along on the earth, and was sore afraid, **because of the words of Samuel**: and there was no strength in him. And, with Simon the sorcerer, Paul corrected Simon’s doctrine with right doctrine, that is, with words. People can be terrified through words as Israel was when Rabshakeh spoke on behalf of the King of Assyria outside the walls of Jerusalem.(See 2 Kings 19). God told Hezekiah, “Thus saith the LORD, Be not afraid of **the words** which thou hast heard”. Why? Because the enemy’s demon gods were “no gods”. Their words are to be ignored!

What is in our hearts is what comes out of our mouths. We can become bound by our words and expressions of wrong belief in demons.

-Death and life are in the power **of the tongue**.

-That which cometh **out of the mouth**, this defileth a man.

-But those things **which proceed out of the mouth** come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. for out of the heart evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.

They do not come from demons. What is symbolised as the dragon, “that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan” deceived the nations with words “out of the mouth”. So when we read of demons speaking, is this translator-speak, “demon speak” or the person concerned speaking? It is well worthwhile checking the grammar in such passages.

In the end, what will we be judged by? It is our doctrine!

Matt. 12:38 That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned”.

Psalm 37, The mouth of the righteous speaketh wisdom, and his tongue talketh of judgment. The law of his God is in his heart; none of his steps shall slide”.

Does the average churchgoer have “the Law of God in his heart”. No, because they are told “it is done away with”. Does he really care about doctrine? No, because he is taught it is not important! People are demonised by lying lips, where being “demonised” is the effect of wrong doctrine. They behave accordingly. But then, they are not all God’s children, are they?

The verses quoted in this paper are addressed to God’s chosen race who are those begotten at conception “from above”, that is, from an origin in the past as the seed of Abraham. Not even severe provocation should affect the behaviour of those of God’s children who have become “sons of God”. These know God as “The Almighty”, and that vengeance belongs to Him. Of these the following applies:

Psalm 119:165 Great peace have they which love thy law: and nothing shall offend them.

Nothing? Yes nothing! These are they who can say, “LORD, I have hoped for thy salvation, and done thy commandments”. What do these do every day about their minds? They renew their minds. Here we have the “mind” once again.

*Romans 12:3, And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of **your mind**, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.*

And, why do God’s people want to obey Him when they are redeemed? It is because they love Him because of His kindness and grace to them.

Of course, Jesus is able by His Word to heal any part of anyone of His children, for any behavioural problem, any “sins of the fathers”, etc., when He says to His children, “And a new spirit will I put within you”. The condition is repentance and faith in Jesus’ sacrifice. Repentance is in regard to God’s Law; this is demonstrated in “Go and sin no more”; that is, transgress the Law no more. Healing is by believing what God says and not by any “faith” religious magic - no Benny Hinn or Kenneth Copeland casting out demons. If someone gets excited by a false rumour, would that be a demon thrilling him? Or would it be just the words and the effect of those words on the mind?

CONCLUSION.

In his presidential address to the British Association for the Advancement of Science, William Bateson, the English biologist who first coined the term "genetics," made this startling admission: "*Descent used to be described in terms of blood. **Truer notions of genetic physiology are given by the Hebrew expression 'seed.'** If we say he is 'of the seed of Abraham,' we feel something of the **permanence and indestructibility** of that germ which can be divided and scattered among nations, but remains recognizable in type and characteristic after 4,000 years*" From the same source we read, "***That there might be a link between genetics and faith in Jesus Christ is something that has yet to be fully explored***".

No doubt the genetic connection will be explored. But then, if the connection between genetics and faith is found to be fully valid, is this really a new thought? Jesus said, "*Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain*"-(John 15:16). God wants the Israel seed to remain. On what basis is this choosing made? It is on the basis of "fruit" (*karpos*), that is what comes from "seed" (*sperma*). This of course takes us back to the "seed of Abraham" and a factor that is genetic! There is just one particular people on earth who have a unique belief in the sanctity of life and the sanctity of property. In these things we find a connection between genetics and behaviour. These are realities that have traditionally been ignored by both the religious and the secular world. The secular world is now starting to acknowledge the connection through genetic research, and this may be a step towards fulfilling Hosea's prophecy, "*Afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the LORD their God, and David their king; and shall fear the LORD and His goodness in the latter days*".

Are we then nothing but spiritual machines? Are we to think of humans just in terms of neurological systems and computational devices, that is, are we 'hard wired'? There is talk today that we shall be able to scan our brains, upload them onto a computer, and thereafter continue our lives as virtual persons running as programs on machines. What's more, these computer intelligences will be conditionally immortal, depending for their continued existence only on the ability of hardware to run the relevant software. This Bible does not present us with any idea of ever having such a zombie type of existence. There is no suggestion of a technological fix for furnishing our brains with the proper mental state so that we behave properly. What the Bible presents is change based upon mercy and grace, where our longing for freedom and immortality comes from the Presence of God, something a machine can never know. Regardless of genetic pre-dispositions, knowledge of the Truth as is in Jesus Christ provides motivation for change in behaviour. This is a matter of free will and choice whereby those who are born as "children" (*teknon*) of Israel can become "sons" (*huios*) of the resurrection. The greatest motivation for behavioural change is appreciation for forgiveness. It is a change brought about by LOVE for the One who took the punishment in the transgressor's place.

APPENDIX A.

[From the introduction of "*When was the Garden of Eden?*" by Arnold Kennedy].

Without a thought, most people would answer by saying, "*Why? At the beginning of course*". By "the beginning" they mean something like, "*At the beginning of the Bible*" as if it had something to do with the first man on earth. Well, that only seems right since we find what is commonly called the garden of Eden in the second chapter of Genesis. But few people know that "Eden" occurs elsewhere in the Bible, and that it occurs concurrently with the Assyrian empire in the Ezekiel 31-32 passage. As this is so it immediately calls for a re-think of what we have believed, that is, that the Garden of Eden could not have been "at the beginning". When we take a good look we must conclude that the people created by the Elohim in Genesis 1 are different in many ways those people formed by Jehovah-Elohim as presented from Genesis 2:4 on. This is why the "Brotherhood of Man" doctrine of the humanists, together with those seduced by them, is not Biblical. Before we look at this further, let us consider the first part of these chapters to get a starting point, noting that the things that are emphasised are concurrent.

Ezek. 31:1 "And it came to pass in the eleventh year, in the third month, in the first day of the month, that the word of the LORD came unto me, saying, Son of man, speak unto **Pharaoh king of Egypt**, and to his multitude; Whom art thou like in thy greatness? Behold, **the Assyrian** was a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches, and with a shadowing shroud, and of an high stature; and his top was among the thick boughs. The waters made him great, the deep set him up on high with her rivers running round about his plants, and sent out her little rivers unto all the trees of the field. Therefore his height was exalted above all the trees of the field, and his boughs were multiplied, and his branches became long because of the multitude of waters, when he shot forth. All the fowls of heaven made their nests in his boughs, and under his branches did all the beasts of the field bring forth their young, and under his shadow dwelt all great nations. Thus was he fair in his greatness, in the length of his branches: for his root was by great waters. The cedars **in the garden of God** could not hide him: the fir trees were not like his boughs, and the chesnut trees were not like his branches; nor any tree **in the garden of God** was like unto him in his beauty. I have made him fair by the multitude of his branches: so that **all the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God**, envied him".

Without going into all the meanings of the Biblical symbols of trees, what this means of course is that "Eden" of chapter 2 of Genesis is about something different from what we find in Genesis chapter 1, and that "Eden" was long after Genesis chapter 1. Theologians have muddied the waters claiming that Genesis 1 and Genesis 2 must have been written by different people because the two chapters are not consistent. That they are inconsistent is true, but it is their claim that the two chapters are different accounts of the same event is what is not true. If they were an account of the same event, whatever would they do with the above account of Ezekiel? To clear this up, it is necessary to make some comparisons between Genesis 1 and 2, since they reveal two different orders of origin at two different times. This is confirmed by the different words in Hebrew used for "man" where we can find both kinds contrasted within the one verse in places in the Bible. In Genesis 1 pre-Adamic man is "created" [Heb], and in Genesis 2 Adamic man is "formed" [Heb] separately. [Note: These terms "pre-Adamic" and "Adamic" are not strictly precise but for convenience are used to identify and separate the two peoples].

A critical examination of Genesis Chapter 1 and Genesis Chapter 2 reveals that not only did these **different men** arise at **different times**, but they were also made with **different purposes** in mind and to fulfil **different functions**. Paul confirms this when speaking of how the Potter made **different vessels** for **different purposes**. On the pages which follow, the orders of creation as shown in Genesis 1 and 2 are compared. All extracts are from the King James Version.

If, in spite of the clarity of Genesis 1 and 2, we have been led to believe a different story, then we need to ask ourselves a simple question. What else concerning the Bible have we also misunderstood? Genesis is the bottom line and if we have got the bottom line wrong in our own mind, all else above it is suspect. In the light of what we have discovered above, Genesis 1 and 2 become most revelatory and perfectly in alignment with archaeological and scientific knowledge. But this is not all. The remaining events described in the Bible thereafter take on a whole new dimension and reveal answers that are not in line with religious traditions.

APPENDIX B. **EVE - THE MOTHER OF ALL LIVING?**

[From the introduction of "When was the Garden of Eden" by Arnold Kennedy].

Many point to Genesis 3:20, which states: "And Adam called his wife's name Eve; because she was the mother of all living". as the primary evidence that Adam and Eve were the parents of 'everybody'. But let us examine this statement and its positioning in Genesis a little more closely. The name "Eve" means "life". This is the first place in the books of Genesis that we hear that "the woman" has now been named "Eve"; a name not given by Jehovah but by Adam himself. But look at the positioning of this verse in the narrative! Are we seriously to believe that in between the Lord God's statement of the punishments Adam and the woman were to receive - (verses 17, 18 and 19) and their being "clothed" and expelled from Eden (verses 21, 22, 23 and 24), that Adam turned to his wife and said (verse 20), "Oh by the way, I am naming you Eve because you are the mother of all living,"

From the sequences there is no way Genesis 2 could be a re-run of Genesis 1. On a weight of evidence basis, there is more to say that Adam [as we use the word] was the first man with the Spirit of God, but not the first biological man. In other words, God took one man either from Genesis 1, [some think from "space"], and breathed into him the breath of life. *"And man became a living soul"*-[Genesis 2:7]. The word "became" is consistently used in a manner showing the subject became something that it had not been before. Eve was the "mother" of all living with God's breath, not of the others. This indicates that there are those with the Spirit, and those "having not the Spirit"-Jude v19. The latter is the "natural man" who *"cannot receive the things of God"*-[1 Cor.2:14], but he may become very religious. What we believe about these issues in Genesis conditions what we believe right through the Bible.

APPENDIX C. "OF ONE BLOOD".

The word "blood", Greek ' *haimatos* ', as in the Stephens' text and the King James' Version, is omitted by practically all authorities. Bullinger states, *"The texts omit "blood"*, and Scofield agrees with, *"Blood" is not in the best manuscripts.*" Four of the six editors of the Stephens' text (A.V.) omit the word. It is also omitted by the following: Westcott and Hort, Panin, the Concordant Version, the Diaglott, Douay Version, the Vulgate, Revised Version, the Nestle text & the Revised Standard Version, and by Ferrar Fenton. Moffatt has *"from a common origin"*. Clearly then the consensus of opinion among authorities is that the word "blood" should be omitted as not being in the original manuscript.

APPENDIX D. **ARE "ALL", "EVERY", ETC. LIMITED EXPRESSIONS?**

In other words, does "all" usually mean "all of everything" or "all of that part being spoken about". Does *"all the world"* mean all the planet, or just all of that part of the planet being spoken about? A look through Young's Analytical Concordance will show how these words are used. This will give an indication without having to go into the Greek. Being certain on this topic is well worth the time involved researching lexicons to specify the meanings of the words used. The words for *"all"*, *"every"* etc. are often singular, NOT plural. Thus they refer to :

- "all" the one [group],
- or "the whole" of the class,
- or "the entire" of the class.

To grasp the use of *"all"* in Greek and Hebrew, consider Deut 28:10: *"And all the peoples of the earth shall see that thou art called by the name of Jehovah, and they shall be afraid of you"*. Here, *"all the peoples of the earth"* does NOT include Israel. In the same way, *"go ye into all the world"* is NOT inclusive of every race. Failure to understand this is the source of error in the modern popular teaching.

Jesus says that it is not given for everyone to hear or to understand. Speaking to His disciples about the Edomite leadership of the Judean nation He said, *"Because it is given unto you to understand the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given"*-[Matt.13:11]. Immediately we have just one exception like this then *"every"* and *"all"* cannot include that exception, or the other exceptions. If an exception is made about the Edomites who cannot find repentance, or of those tares about which Jesus said, *"Leave them alone"*, then these cannot be part of the *"all"* being addressed. Jesus did not preach to certain peoples, as we have seen. Jesus said He was sent to Israel and to save *"His people"* from their sins. Are we to be wiser than Jesus?