

# Avoid The Satanic Trap Of Unbiblical Ethics

## Popular non-Christian approaches to morals and ethics

In the 1700's, 1800's, 1900's and 2000's in Britain, the United States, Australia and Western European countries, most non-churchgoers followed moral or ethical principles which were based on one or more of the following unbiblical worldly philosophies:

- *situational ethics*. This will be explained fully later in Chapter "Situational Ethics" and Chapter "A Modern False Understanding of the Attitudes of the Pharisees, Jesus and Paul".
- the idea that our *human mind* is the source of our knowing right and wrong.
- the belief that our experiences of life provide us with *commonsense* which enables us to determine what is right and wrong.
- the idea that our *conscience* has an inbuilt sense of right and wrong which in many cases can be different to the commands of the Bible. For example, someone may say, "My conscience allows me to look at pornographic movies without feeling guilty."
- the belief that *the ends justifies the means*. This philosophy of expediency teaches that we are justified doing evil if the results of our evil action are good. Putting this evil philosophy into practice, Adolf Hitler murdered millions of Jews, Poles, Russians, handicapped people and others to supposedly achieve the good ends of making all Germans more prosperous, secure and happy. Two examples of ends-justifies-the-means philosophies are called utilitarianism and pragmatism. These are explained next.
- the idea that right and wrong is determined on the basis of whether an action in the judgement of humans results in more good than evil. This philosophy is called *utilitarianism* and was begun by the English writers Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806-73).

One of the means by which the unbiblical philosophy of utilitarianism became accepted among many in the Church in Britain in the early and mid 1900's was through the strong influence of Professor Henry Sidgwick, the Knightbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy at Cambridge University.<sup>1</sup> Sidgwick (1873-1958) was utilitarianism's clearest spokesman.<sup>2</sup> He influenced thousands of Anglican ministers who trained at Cambridge.

- the belief that something is right if its practical results are judged as good after being studied through experiments, observation and logical thinking. This philosophy is called *pragmatism* and was extremely popular in American universities and among many compromising liberal American Protestants in the 1800's and 1900's. Pragmatism opposes the idea of absolute right, absolute wrong and absolute truth and is closely related to utilitarianism.

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Jonsen and S. Toulmin, "The Abuse of Casuistry", Uni of California Press, 1988, pages 279-281.

<sup>2</sup> Walter Elwell, "Evangelical Dictionary of Theology", Baker, Grand Rapids, 1984, page 1131.

- the idea that something is right if it produces supposedly good results for a *minority* group regardless of whether the means of achieving this is good or evil. For example, to supposedly make them happy and feel appreciated many governments permit the homosexual minority to spread their lying evil propaganda among impressionable heterosexual youth that homosexuality is normal and genetically determined. This is another ends-justifies-the-means philosophy.
- the belief that something is right if it makes a human happy and gives him pleasure and wrong if it makes him unhappy or suffer in any way. For example, the modern easy divorce philosophy says that those who are not totally happy for any reason in their marriages have the right to be divorced.
- the philosophy that all people have a *right* to have what they regard as their *needs* fulfilled. This is regardless of whether God regards their so-called rights or needs as evil and not really rights or needs. For example, those wanting to abort babies or practice homosexuality argue this way.
- the evolution-based theory that because humans are only *animals*, we should follow animal practices in relation to having multiple sex partners, exposing our nudity in public, stealing what we “need” and so on.
- the humanistic “*if it feels good, do it*” philosophy of the psychologist Carl Rogers. Many following this evil philosophy would say if taking heroin, cocaine or marijuana or having sex outside of marriage feels good, do it. Rogers practiced what he preached. He had an adulterous affair when his wife was dying of cancer.<sup>3</sup>

Because many churchgoers in the 1700’s, 1800’s and 1900’s were influenced much by the media, the education system and non-Christian relatives and friends, these churchgoers sinfully mixed one or more of the above evil philosophies with the moral teachings of the Bible when they were considering what is right and wrong.

## Throughout church history

Throughout the history of the Church, the majority of churchgoers have determined their moral or ethical standards on the basis of mixtures of Bible verses with:

1. the above types of unbiblical ethical philosophies and/or
2. man-made unbiblical rules or traditions.
3. the opinions of scientists, philosophers, sociologists, psychologists, other academics and medical physicians.

Only a minority of Christians have determined their moral or ethical standards purely on the basis of the teachings and commands of the Bible. Also, tragically because some of the latter minority have never been taught how to interpret the Bible properly according to the principles Jesus and the Apostles used, these Christians still come up with some unbiblical ethical standards. This is despite their zealous brave attempts to be committed to God.

---

<sup>3</sup> Carl Rogers, “A Way of Being”, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1980, page 86.

## The ends-justifies-the-means or expediency philosophy

Most non-Christians and some Christians to varying degrees follow the end-justifies-the-means philosophy in determining what they believe is right and wrong and what to do in various situations. The ends-justifies-the-means philosophy is also called expediency. Expediency refers to obtaining a goal by whatever means is necessary to achieve this goal without any regard as to whether the means of obtaining this goal is good or bad. The Evangelical Dictionary of Theology says that there are three main approaches which people can have to expediency<sup>4</sup>:

1. The first is the utilitarian approach. This states that the rightness or wrongness of an action is not determined by the nature of the action itself but by the *results* of the action in relation to whether it achieves good for the *majority* of people.
2. The second is the approach of the ancient pagan Stoics and Immanuel Kant, the German philosopher (1724-1804 A.D.). The Evangelical Dictionary of Theology records that the second approach means obeying what our minds and consciences believe is right, “but where no moral standard for conduct is applicable, expediency becomes the only sensible path to follow.”<sup>5</sup>
3. The third approach is that it is wrong to apply the expediency or the end justifies the means philosophy to any situation.

The same dictionary states: “Christians generally have followed the second view and argued for an area of adiaphora where expediency has a place, but some have tended to hold the third view.”<sup>6</sup> The Greek word “adiaphora” refers in the above statement to matters not regarded as essential to the Christian faith.

This pagan Stoic view of expediency or the end justifies the means philosophy firstly entered the Christian Church in the 300’s and 400’s A.D. In the Middle Ages, numerous compromising churchgoers adapted this Stoic view. In the 1700’s and 1800’s, many churchgoers followed Kant’s version of this evil philosophy. From the mid-1700’s, many churchgoers adopted a utilitarian expedient approach to deciding what is right and wrong in various situations.

This dictionary argues that most Christians have followed the philosophy of the end justifies the means or expediency in matters in which they believed there was no clearly revealed standard of God to go by. This is especially true of many Christians’ attitude to modesty and nudity. For example, I have spoken to many Christians, including church leaders, who say that the Bible does not give clear moral guidelines about the exposing of our genitals or nudity in many situations. As a result, these Christians claim we can judge the rightness or wrongness of such exposures purely by the supposed goodness or badness of the results.

---

<sup>4</sup> Elwell, page 397.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

## **Ends-justifies-the-means practices in Sparta in ancient Greece**

In his “Constitution of the Lacedaemonians”, the ancient Greek writer Xenophon (approx 435-355 B.C.) wrote about some of the laws which the lawmaker Lycurgus instituted among the Spartans of Southern Greece in roughly the 700’s B.C. Xenophon was a student of Socrates, the Greek philosopher. Xenophon was from Athens but he served Agesilaus, the King of Sparta and fought for the Spartans against the Athenians at Coronea in 394 B.C. Lycurgus was either a real historical figure or a mythical figure who represented the laws of Sparta at a particular period of ancient history.

Xenophon was very complimentary in his praise of Lycurgus and the laws the latter gave to the Spartans. For example, Xenophon wrote: “*Lycurgus who gave them the laws that they obey and to which they owe their prosperity. I do regard with wonder; and I think that he reached the utmost in wisdom...he made his country pre-eminently prosperous.*”<sup>7</sup>

In his “Lycurgus”, the ancient Greek historian Plutarch (48-122 A.D.) wrote about Lycurgus’ laws also. Some of the laws which Lycurgus added to the constitution of the Lacedaemonians or Spartans were wicked, unbiblical and were based on the philosophies of the ends justifies the means or pragmatic expediency. Here are some examples:

### **Aiming to have special children through sanctioned adultery**

Lycurgus taught that if a husband was elderly and his wife young, he could arrange for a younger man of his choosing to have sex with his wife so the older man could have children from their union. Also if a husband did not want to have sex with his wife but wanted children, he could search for a woman from a fine family and noble birth and could have sex with her if her husband gave permission. Xenophon recorded: “*To meet these cases he instituted an entirely different system by requiring the elderly husband to introduce into his house some man whose physical and moral qualities he admired, in order to beget children. On the other hand, in case a man did not want to cohabit with his wife and nevertheless desired children of whom he could be proud, he made it lawful for him to choose a woman who was the mother of a fine family and of high birth, and if he obtained her husband’s consent, to make her the mother of his children. He gave his sanction to many similar arrangements.*”<sup>8</sup>

The ancient historian Plutarch also wrote out these laws which Lycurgus made in relation to Spartans having children by other men or women than their spouses: “*After giving marriage such traits of reserve and decorum, he none the less freed men from the empty and womanish passion of jealous possession, by making it honourable for them, while keeping the marriage relation free from all wanton irregularities, to share with other worthy men in the begetting of children, laughing to scorn those who regard such common privileges as intolerable, and resort to murder and war rather than grant them. For example, an elderly man with a young wife, if he looked with favour and esteem on some fair and noble young man, might introduce him to her, and adopt her offspring by such a noble father as his own. And again, a worthy man who admired some woman for the fine children that she bore her husband and the modesty of her behaviour as a wife, might enjoy her favours, if her husband would consent, thus planting, as it were, in a soil of beautiful fruitage, and begetting for himself noble sons, who would have the blood of noble men in their veins. For in the first place, Lycurgus did not regard sons as the peculiar property of their fathers, but rather as the common property of the state, and therefore would*

---

<sup>7</sup> Xenophon, “Constitution of the Lacedaemonians”, 1, 2.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid, 1, 7-8.

not have his citizens spring from random parentage, but from the best there was...The freedom which thus prevailed at that time in marriage relations was aimed at physical and political well-being.”<sup>9</sup>

As an historian, Plutarch often tried to justify wicked Greek customs. Plutarch was Greek and was very loyal to his ancestors. For example, in his writing on Lycurgus, he spoke uncritically of the common Greek practice of men having paedophile sexual relationships with young boys.<sup>10</sup> In his “Cato the Elder”, Plutarch criticised the Roman leader Cato for opposing Greek morals and philosophy.<sup>11</sup> Also Plutarch claimed Rome was at its best when it had adopted Greek customs and philosophy.<sup>12</sup>

## **Non-Greeks followed the same wicked philosophy**

Some non-Greeks copied wicked Spartan Greek ends-justifies-the-means philosophy about having children through sanctioned acts of adultery. The Latin poet Luxorius ( . A.D.) wrote about a married couple who followed this evil custom during his time: “*About a man who made his wife prostitute herself for the sake of having sons*

*Although you cannot sir children, you, without being a father, still hear yourself called a father. A beloved adulterer, you put the organs of your chaste wife to illicit use so that she may bear you basely born offspring, herself ignorant from what seed they have sprung. Perhaps these shameful pretensions of yours might have been bearable for a little while. Proconius, if ever your son when grown-up could say that his mother herself knew.”*<sup>13</sup>

## **Teaching all children to steal for supposedly good purposes**

In order to teach Spartan boys how to find food when they lack food during warfare and how to use deceit to set ambushes in warfare, Lycurgus permitted them all to steal food. Xenophon wrote that Lycurgus “*allowed them to alleviate their hunger by stealing something*”.<sup>14</sup> Xenophon added: “*there can be no doubt then, that all this education was planned by him in order to make the boys more resourceful in getting supplies and better fighting men.*”<sup>15</sup>

In his “Lycurgus”, Plutarch also recorded that the Spartan boys used to all steal: “*And they steal what they fetch, some of them entering the gardens, and others creeping right slyly and cautiously into the public messes of the men; but if a boy is caught stealing, he is soundly flogged, as a careless and unskilful thief. They steal, too, whatever food they can, and learn to be adept in setting upon people when asleep or off their guard. But the boy who is caught gets a flogging and must go hungry.*”<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Plutarch, “Lycurgus”, 15:6-8.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, 17:1 and 18, 4.

<sup>11</sup> Plutarch, “Cato the Elder”, 23.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> “Luxorius”, edited by Morris Rosenblum, Columbia University Press, New York, 1961, page 133.

<sup>14</sup> Xenophon, “Constitution of the Lacedaemonians”, 2, 6.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid, 2, 7.

<sup>16</sup> Plutarch, “Lycurgus”, 17:3-4.

## Two highly acclaimed ancient doctors were sadistic murderers

Two of the most acclaimed medical doctors in ancient times were Herophilus and Erasistratus.

But Herophilus and Erasistratus were also sadistic murderers. The Oxford History of the Classical World quotes an unnamed source who stated: “*Herophilus and Erasistratus were given criminals from the prison by the kings < of Egypt > and dissected alive: while they were still breathing they observed parts which nature had formerly concealed, and examined their position, colour, shape, size, arrangement, hardness, softness, smoothness, connection...Nor is it cruel, as most people allege, by causing pain to guilty men – and only a few at that – to seek out remedies for innocent people of every age.*”<sup>17</sup>

These two famous medical physicians sadistically cut up the living bodies of human prisoners. These unfortunate prisoners would have experienced shocking pain, terror and horror as they watched their bodies being dissected. The early church leader Tertullian (approx 155-220 A.D.) recorded: “*There is that Herophilus, the well-known surgeon, or (as I may almost call him) butcher, who cut up no end of persons, in order to investigate the secrets of nature, who ruthlessly handled human creatures to discover (their form and make)...*”<sup>18</sup>

Herophilus and Erasistratus believed in the wicked ends-justifies-the-means philosophy. They felt that their cruel inhuman Nazi-like dissections of living human bodies was needed in order to find remedies for other humans.

## An example of Roman ends-justifies-the-means and utilitarianism

Here is an example of Roman ends-justifies-the-means philosophy and utilitarianism. In A.D. 61, the former Roman Consul Pedandius Secundus was murdered by one of his 400 slaves. In his “Annals” 14:42-45, the Roman historian Tacitus recorded that some of Secundus’ friends demanded that all 400 slaves should be executed as a warning to other slaves. The Roman senator Gaius Cassius argued before the Senate in utilitarian and end-justifies-the-means terms that all 400 slaves should be executed regardless of whether they were innocent or guilty: “*You cannot control these dregs of society except through fear. Yes, it’s true that innocent people will suffer. But remember that when every tenth man in a defeated army is beaten to death, even the bravest soldier must draw a lot. Every punishment that is used to provide a negative example contains some element of injustice, but the **individual injustices are outweighed by the advantages to the community as a whole.***”

*No one dared to oppose Cassius’s statements, although some people voiced their disagreement by reminding him of the large number of the female slaves or of the young slaves or of the majority who had protested their undoubted innocence. However, the senators who favored execution prevailed.*”<sup>19</sup>

Tacitus also recorded that great crowds tried to prevent the executions from occurring, but Emperor Nero used troops to ensure the 400 death sentences were carried out.<sup>20</sup>

Therefore about 399 innocent adult and child male and female slaves were executed on the basis of utilitarian “justice” – the idea that if a small minority suffers injustice this is right if it produces good results for the Roman society as a whole.

---

<sup>17</sup> John Boardman, Jasper Griffin and Oswyn Murray (editors), “The Oxford History of the Classical World”, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1986, pages 383-384.

<sup>18</sup> Tertullian, “A Treatise on the Soul”, Chapter 10.

<sup>19</sup> Tacitus, “Annals”, 14:45.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

## Using supposedly good results to justify evil means

Many people try to prove that certain disobediences to God's commands and teachings are justified in some situations. These people try to justify these wicked acts by giving examples of when such sins produce supposed good in some way. Examples of these are:

- A married man commits adultery with a married woman and then divorces his wife, remarries and lives happily ever after. Commenting on this, those, who believe the end justifies the means, suggest, "This example shows this adultery is not always wrong."
- A single woman has an abortion. Then a year later she dies. Commenting on this, those, who believe the end justifies the means, say, "It was good she had an abortion to save the child from suffering being without a mother."

But in Romans 3:8, God totally opposes the idea that a good result from an evil action justifies using the evil action.

## Many Western ethics are based on the ends justifies the means

Very frequently in the 1800's, 1900's and in recent years, much of the discussion in the media on various moral or ethical matters by journalists, politicians, academics, medical doctors and so-called "experts" and resulting government legislation have been based on various mixtures of the-ends-justifies-the-means philosophies like pragmatism and utilitarianism.

For example, in the recent discussion of stem cell research, the majority of doctors, journalists and other commentators have argued from the pragmatic perspective of how many human diseases may be cured by such research or from the utilitarian philosophy that the killing of a small percentage of human fetuses is justified because of its supposed benefits for the majority of humans. These people believe that it is right using evil means – murdering human beings – to achieve desired results.

Similarly when discussing issues like euthanasia, abortion of unborn babies, cloning of humans, lesbians becoming pregnant by sperm donated by men, not feeding very deformed newly-born babies so they will die, smacking children and easy divorce, millions of present-day people base their approval or disapproval of the practices solely on whether in their opinion the practical results are seemingly good for society in general and have more good features than bad. They never consider whether God's broad or specific commands and/or teachings reveal these practices are right or wrong and that He totally opposes using evil means to achieve good results.

In Romans 3:8, Paul condemned those who said he taught that it is okay to do evil things as long as these things resulted in something good: ***"And why not say, 'Let us do evil that good may come'? – as we are slanderously reported and as some affirm that we say. Their condemnation is just."***

As a cover for the evil nature of the practices they support, many politicians, journalists and supposed "experts" will argue that the proposed practice is based on kindness, compassion and mercy towards someone.

But by using the same evil philosophy, many ancient pagan Greeks and Romans tried to justify murdering their little children after birth. These ancients argued, "It is a great act of

mercy and kindness to kill unwanted children to save them suffering feeling rejected and unloved by their parents. Also, it is an act of love when parents kill their newborn children if the parents have not got enough money to provide their needs.”

## **Overcome evil by good and not by others evils**

In Romans 12:21, God commands: **“Do not be overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.”** Here God reveals that He wants us to:

- overcome evil in our own personal relationships and in society by *good* means
- never try to overcome evil in our personal relationships and in society by *evil* means. In other words, God totally opposes the idea that it is right to try to solve an evil or injustice in society by doing something which God’s Word defines as evil, as long as the results of doing the latter evil seem good.

## **Machiavelli’s wicked influence**

The Italian writer Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) wrote a book called “The Prince” in which he advised political rulers to base their decisions on pragmatic ends-justifies-the-means considerations or expediency instead of on God’s absolute commands and teachings.<sup>21</sup> This book was very influential in Europe in the 1500’s and 1600’s.<sup>22</sup>

Many of the kings and queens of Europe who were Christian in name only, applied Machiavelli’s evil teachings to many matters including sex outside marriage, modesty, deception and greed. These rulers used their great influence in the national churches in Europe to pressure church leaders to compromise about various pragmatic moral ‘solutions’ which were contrary to God’s absolute commands and teachings.

## **Using unbiblical philosophies to justify perverted filthy acts**

Dr Ambroise Paré (1510-1590 A.D.) was the chief surgeon of three French kings. He was “the most influential surgeon of the age”<sup>23</sup> and “one of the founders of modern obstetrics”.<sup>24</sup> By using wicked ends-justify-the means philosophies, in his book “Works”, Paré taught that to cure an imaginary disease called the strangulation of the womb, doctors and midwives under the doctors’ supervision should masturbate the female patient’s genitals and pull her pubic hairs hard.<sup>25</sup> He called these perverted sinful acts ‘*a certain tickling pleasure*’ and pulling ‘*hard by the hairs...of the secret parts*’.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> E. Cairns, “Christianity through the Centuries”, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1967, page 285.

<sup>22</sup> “Collins New Age Encyclopedia, page 687.

<sup>23</sup> R. Mc Grew, “Encyclopedia of Medical History”, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1985, page 205.

<sup>24</sup> A. Castiglioni, “A History of Medicine”, Jason Aronson, New York, 1969, page 482.

<sup>25</sup> Ambroise Paré, ‘Works’, Milford House, New York, 1968, pages 942-945.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

Paré claimed that this imaginary disease could cause death to the woman.<sup>27</sup> He also insisted that in all situations in which a woman patient's life was in danger, the midwives had to call for the help of male doctors.<sup>28</sup> So even when the midwives did the masturbation, the doctors would have been watching the woman's sexual organs and arousal intently. Pare was one of the head doctors at the Hotel Dieu – the main public hospital in Paris. At this hospital, he trained and supervised many other doctors and midwives.

The book 'Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science', which was edited by Roy Porter, professor of the history of medicine and Mikulas Teich, also records this masturbation of female patients by doctors and midwives in the later 1500's and 1600's.<sup>29</sup>

On the second page of Paré's Dedication to the French king in "Works", Pare suggested that the best French medical doctors or physicians at the time agreed with his teachings in "Works". Paré stated "*intending to publish my work I first communicated it with men the most excellent in the Art of Physick who gave me greater encouragement to perfect and publish it that it might be in common use.*" Also, because Paré was the most respected surgeon in France at the time, many other physicians and surgeons would have treated his medical writings as a textbook to follow.

Paré revived for the first time in Christianised Europe the wicked philosophy of Galen (130-200 A.D.) who was the pagan Greek court physician of the Christian-persecuting Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius and a surgeon to the school of gladiators in Rome.<sup>30</sup> Galen taught many correct things about medicine, but also insisted that widows or female virgins should have their sexual organs masturbated until these women's seeds were ejected.<sup>31</sup>

Galen also began another foolish wicked practice. He taught "*that disease could be cured by bleeding the patient – through 'blood-letting'...In the centuries that followed, millions of people, many of whom desperately needed all the blood they could muster, were quite literally killed by doctors. Kings, Emperors, Popes, statesmen, gentry, common people were done away with...This professional slaughter, not only of upper class patients who could afford the attention of the physicians, but also of humbler gentry who were bled by barbers (a type of surgeon), continued until well into the eighteenth century.*"<sup>32</sup> Doctors began the bleeding by opening the veins or by scratching or cutting the skin.

There is no Bible verse which specifically says that it is sinful for doctors or midwives to masturbate a female patient or watch her being masturbated. But we are fools if we take this to mean God approves of such so-called 'medical cures'. This is because such immodest practices are condemned in verses with broad meanings such as Romans 1:24, 1:26, 2 Corinthians 12:21, Galatians 5:19, Ephesians 4:19, 5:3, 5:4, 5:5, 5:12, Colossians 3:5, James 1:21, 2 Peter 2:18 and Jude 4. As we will see, these verses use the Greek words which refer to sexual impurity, sexual uncleanness, lewdness, sinful passions, obscenity, shame, moral depravity and filthiness:

- "rhuparia" meaning "filth, moral uncleanness, vulgarity"<sup>33</sup> and used in James 1:21: "***Therefore lay aside all filthiness...***"

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, page 943.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid, page 902.

<sup>29</sup> R. Porter and M. Teich, "Sexual Knowledge, Sexual Science", Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994, page 90.

<sup>30</sup> "Collins New Age Encyclopedia", Collins, London, 1963, page 448.

<sup>31</sup> V. Bullough and J. Brundage, "Handbook of Medieval Sexuality", Garland Publishing, New York, 1996, page 58.

<sup>32</sup> R. Youngson and I Schott, "Medical Blunders", Robinson, London, 1996, page 32.

<sup>33</sup> W. Bauer, "A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament", The Uni of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1979, page 738.

- “phthora” which means “religious and moral depravity”<sup>34</sup> and “seduction of a maiden”<sup>35</sup> and “of the physical effects of merely gratifying the natural desires and ministering to one’s own...lusts”<sup>36</sup> and is used in 2 Peter 1:4 and 2:19. This word would cover any gratifying of any sexual need outside of marriage. It would include masturbation by a doctor or midwife of a male or female to whom they are not married.
- “akartharsia” meaning “impurity, immorality, especially of sexual sins”<sup>37</sup> and used in Romans 1:24, 6:19, 2 Corinthians 12:21, Galatians 5:19, Ephesians 4:19, 5:3, Colossians 3:5 and 1 Thessalonians 4:7. Romans 1:24 says: ***“Therefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, in the lusts of their hearts, to dishonor their bodies among themselves.”*** Ephesians 4:19 states: ***“and they, having become callous, have given themselves over to sensuality, for the practice of every kind of impurity with greediness.”*** (N.A.S.B.)
- “akarthartos” which means “unclean, impure”<sup>38</sup> and is used in Ephesians 5:5: ***“For this you know, that no fornicator, unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, has any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God.”***
- “aischros” meaning “base, disgraceful”<sup>39</sup> and “shameful”<sup>40</sup> and used in Ephesians 5:12: ***“For it is shameful even to speak of those things which are done by them in secret.”***
- “aischrotes” meaning “obscenity, all that is contrary to purity”<sup>41</sup> and used in Ephesians 5:4: ***“neither filthiness...”***
- “aselgeia” meaning “licentiousness, debauchery...especially of sexual excesses”<sup>42</sup> and used in 2 Corinthians 12:21, Galatians 5:19, Ephesians 4:19, 2 Peter 2:7 and Jude 4. The New King James Version translates “aselgeia” as ***“licentiousness”*** in Jude 4: ***“For certain men have crept in unnoticed, who long ago were marked out for this condemnation, ungodly men, who turn the grace of our God into licentiousness...”***
- “pathos” which means “passion, especially of a sexual nature”<sup>43</sup> and is used in Colossians 3:5 and Romans 1:26. In Colossians 3:5, God commands believers to put to death all the sinful passions which arise in their bodies in relation to any sexual experience outside of marriage: ***“Therefore put to death your members which are on earth: fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry.”***

If after reading this, you as a Christian say: “God would say it is right for a male doctor to masturbate the sexual organs of a female, who is a young virgin, a widow or married, or of another man as long as it is professionally done”, you are proving to yourself you do not follow Biblical ethics. Instead you are judging this issue by the standards of worldly pragmatism, utilitarianism, situational ethics or ends-justifies-the-means philosophies.

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid, page 858.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Vine, page 131.

<sup>37</sup> Bauer, page 28.

<sup>38</sup> Vine, page 649.

<sup>39</sup> Green, page 5.

<sup>40</sup> Bauer, page 25.

<sup>41</sup> Vine, page 237.

<sup>42</sup> Bauer, page 114.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid, page 603.

Doctors do abortions very professionally but this does not make them right. A professionally done abortion is just as sinful as a non-professional backyard abortion.

If you lived in Europe in the early 1600's and had Dr Paré as your personal physician and he advised you that your female relatives could become very sick and die if they were not masturbated by him, his fellow doctors or by midwives with doctors watching, would you think: "Many say Ambroise Paré is the best doctor in Europe. He must be extremely wise because the king of France appointed him as the surgeon for the royal family. I have heard he has saved the lives of many of his patients through his surgical and medical procedures. I have four unmarried sexually mature daughters aged from 15 to 23 years. My daughters, my widowed sister and widowed mother are godly believers in Christ. Dr Paré claims they have the symptoms of strangulation of the womb. I love all these females. I do not want them to become worse and die. So I will take them to Dr Paré and his assistant doctors to have them masturbate them. He is such a kind, gentle man that I am sure he will masturbate my daughters, sister and mother considerably. He says he is a Christian and prays regularly."

Also note that because women mostly take a lengthy time of sexual stimulation before they experience orgasm, this would mean that these sexually normal doctors or the midwives would have to masturbate these women for lengthy periods. Also can you honestly say these doctors would not have been tempted to be sexually inflamed about these women through observing how highly sexually aroused the women would have become while being masturbated. If you say "No", I think you need prayer.

This problem of applying Biblical ethics to medicine has faced the Christian Church right from the beginning. The difficulty in the 100's A.D. and now is sifting the God-given natural wisdom which doctors use from the wicked unbiblical ideas and practices they mix with this good wisdom.

## **Australian and American examples**

In Australia, the United States, Britain, Canada and many other Western countries, most non-Christians follow situational ethics or other unbiblical approaches to ethics listed previously at the beginning of this chapter. In these countries, Christians are bombarded continually by these wicked philosophies in magazines, newspapers, books, movies, television shows and via their relationships with non-Christians. Most university lecturers teach situational ethics or similar philosophies and insist there are no absolute rights and wrongs. These lecturers greatly influence what journalists, teachers, lawyers, doctors, psychologists and other leaders in Western countries believe. These latter professionals then greatly influence the values of the whole society.

As a result, multitudes of Christians and many Christian authors have been conditioned by and follow humanistic situational ethics and other unbiblical approaches to morals without even knowing it. These people claim to be daily filled with the Holy Spirit, but they do not show evidence of the fruit of this.

Here are some examples of Christians in Australia and the U.S. following the worldly philosophy of situational ethics and other unbiblical philosophies:

Australian Government statistics revealed that in 1991, 10.7% of Australian Pentecostals in the 15-24 age group were living in de-facto relationships before marriage.<sup>44</sup> This compared with 41.4% of the total Australian population living de-facto in the same age group.<sup>45</sup>

One churchgoing man told my wife that he was claiming full unemployment benefits from the Federal Government in Australia even though he had a full-time job. He claimed his *situation* of urgently needing more money to provide for his family's needs and pleasures made his actions *right* in God's eyes.

At one large church in a capital city in Australia, the pastors were claiming their cars and computers as a full tax deduction in relation to their teaching in a small Bible College. This is even though they only taught in the College about 1-2 hours a week.

In a large Australian Pentecostal church, the youth pastor and his team gave out condoms to many Christian youth. This was supposedly to protect the youth from catching AIDS if they committed the sin of having sex before marriage.

I know a committed Christian woman who worked with a married junior pastor of a large Pentecostal Church. This fellow used to tell his female workmates about his erections at work. On another occasion, he said in front of other workers how this woman likes men's penises. After she confronted him about what he said about her, he refused to apologise.

In the early 1990's, I surveyed numerous Charismatic churchgoing youth in my own local region in Australia and found that two of the favourite secular musical groups they enjoyed listening to, sang wicked pornographically worded songs. Two of the songs of one musical group were called "Sir Psycho Sexy" and "Sex, Blood and Magic". In one song, the singer told his listeners to participate in oral sex with him. Another song referred to sexually mating with pagan gods.

On two of the C.D. covers of the other group, I saw drawings of demons, skulls and a topless woman with her underpants down near her ankles. Also, on one C.D. cover, there were numerous expressions focussing on sex outside of marriage. In their songs, this group often used the four letter word "F...". The churchgoing youth listening to such garbage were sure what they were doing was right, but Proverbs 12:15 warns: "***The way of a fool is right in his own eyes...***"

In another large Australian Pentecostal church, some members who claimed to be born-again still regularly took marijuana and had homosexual relationships. They believed God approved of what they were doing. None of their church leaders ever followed Paul's commands in 2 Timothy 4:2 and Titus 2:15 about rebuking and correcting those believers who would not repent of such practices.

In 1991, 49% of American adults attended a weekly church service.<sup>46</sup> In 1994, 70% of Americans stated they "consistently allow (their) lives to be guided by the Holy Spirit".<sup>47</sup> In 1988, the Gallup and Castelli Poll found only 43% of American churchgoers said pre-marital sex was always wrong.<sup>48</sup> So this means, millions of Americans who claim to be consistently guided by the Holy Spirit believe that pre-marital sex is sometimes right.

---

<sup>44</sup> "Australian Social Trends – 1994", Australian Bureau of Statistics, Catalogue Number 4102.0, page 188.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> Barna, "Index of Leading Spiritual Indicators", page 33.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid, page 67.

<sup>48</sup> G. Gallup and J. Castelli, "The People's Religion", Macmillan, New York, 1989, page 76.

The writer Gene Edward Veitch Jr quoted an American survey which claimed that about 56% of single so-called “born-again” Christians in the United States were engaging in sex outside of marriage.<sup>49</sup>

Note in a survey by Professor James Hunter of seven major Evangelical theological colleges in the U.S. between 1982 to 1985,<sup>50</sup> the students revealed whether they believed the following activities were morally right at least sometimes:

- smoking marijuana (30% of students agreed this is right at least sometimes),
- casual sexual petting before marriage (67% agreed),
- heavy sexual petting before marriage (39% agreed),
- watching R-rated movies (89% agreed)
- and watching X-rated pornographic movies (36% agreed).

The American “Renewal News” magazine records that some women handing out anti-abortion literature outside abortion clinics in the U.S. saw numerous mothers, with pro-life and “Jesus saves” bumper stickers on their cars, taking their pregnant daughters for abortions.<sup>51</sup> This magazine records: “*Several times Christians actually approached the counsellors to say, ‘Don’t speak to my daughter when she goes inside. I don’t want her to change her mind.’*”<sup>52</sup> The counsellors here refer to those handing out anti-abortion literature.

In relation to the sinful world’s morals, many Christians have adopted the attitude: “If we can’t beat them, let’s join them. Let us also find some well thought-up excuses to justify our enjoying some of the sins which the world loves.”

Researcher George Barna found that over 50% of supposedly “born-again” Christians in the United States in 1991 agreed with the unbiblical statement: “The purpose of life is enjoyment and personal fulfilment.”<sup>53</sup> Is it any wonder that some liberal compromising worldly American ministers can build large outwardly successful but inwardly morally corrupt churches with churchgoers having such attitudes?

## God’s wonderful answers for His Church

To reverse this trend of backsliding and liberalising of Christian teachings and practices among many Pentecostal, Charismatic and Evangelical churchgoers, we need to repent. Part of repentance involves having a *change* of mind and will about wrong and evil. We need to turn from following unbiblical ethics and begin to obey God’s absolute Biblical commands by His Holy Spirit’s power.

If we do not repent, we will probably end up like the *first class religious hypocrites* living in the prophet Jeremiah’s time who believed that God had saved or delivered them by His unmerited grace so they could keep practicing their known sins. In Jeremiah 7:9-11, God warned them: “***Will you steal, murder, commit adultery, swear falsely, burn incense to Baal,***

---

<sup>49</sup> G.E. Veitch Jr., “Postmodern Times: a Christian Guide to Contemporary Thought and Culture”, Crossway Books/Good News Publishers, U.S.A., 1994, pages 17-18.

<sup>50</sup> James Hunter, “Evangelicalism – The Coming Generation”, The Uni of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1987, page 61.

<sup>51</sup> Summer 1996 edition, page 5.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.

<sup>53</sup> George Barna, “What Americans Believe”, Regal Books, Ventura, 1991, page 112.

***and walk after other gods whom you do not know, and then come and stand before Me in this house which is called by My name, and say, ‘We are delivered to do all these abominations’? Has this house, which is called by My name, become a den of thieves in your eyes? Behold, I, even I, have seen it, says the Lord.’***

We also need to learn how to interpret the Bible the ways Jesus and the Apostles interpreted the Old Testament. In addition, we must stop twisting or distorting the Scriptures in the ways Peter warned in 2 Peter 3:16: “...*in all his epistles...in which are some things hard to understand, which untaught and unstable people twist to their own destruction, as they do also the rest of the Scriptures*” and must cease following “*every wind of doctrine*” like Paul warned us of in Ephesians 4:14. Paul emphasised the importance of following sound Biblical teaching (see 1 Timothy 4:6, 4:16, 6:3-5, Titus 1:9, 2:1 and 2:7-8).

God has given us a conscience. But if we are born-again, our conscience will not lead us to do things which are contrary to the commands of His Word.

We must start having a real love for and reverential fear of God which results in us living lives of Holy Spirit-empowered integrity and purity.<sup>54</sup> This is instead of having itching ears and selfish desires which lead us to seek teachers who tell us the unbiblical things our flesh wishes to hear (see 2 Timothy 4:3-4).

We can never be truly filled with the Holy Spirit each day unless we turn from our sins and the self-centred false teachings which permit us to flirt with these sins.

### Bible Study Questions

1. Discuss the various unbiblical approaches which many non-Christians and even churchgoers have to determining what is right and wrong!
2. What are the major differences between the worldly ends-justifies-the-means philosophy and God’s written Word’s approach to right and wrong?
3. Think of practical examples in which you or your fellow Christians have been following non-Christian standards in your attitudes to various moral issues.
4. What are God’s wonderful answers to the present problems of backsliding and liberalising in parts of His Church?

---

<sup>54</sup> See Matthew 22:37-38, 2 Corinthians 7:1, 1 Peter 2:17, Philippians 2:14-15, 1 Thessalonians 2:10 and 1 Timothy 5:22.