

Lesson 66

Hopefully by the end of the evening we'll be done with 29, which leaves us only 5 more chapters. It's been a long time going through this; but it's a big book. It's a book that is necessary to understand in order to see the framework of the whole Old Testament and how it works out. So tonight let's start with a word of prayer; then we'll get into chapter 29.

(Opening prayer)

Just to review again on the handouts under chapter 29 - try to summarize under 6 points there the big ideas. As we go through this text we want to keep referencing the big ideas. If you do not do that, you wind up with what I call a ghetto view of the Bible, which means that the Bible is confined to a religious compartment and doesn't carry implications across the span of life.

That's why we always keep regurgitating these principles. The first one you see there is the contrast between the biblical view and the pagan view. The ultimate personality over all history - this is a fundamental idea here. As Christians we need to appreciate - this is a parting of the waters here. People fall on one or the other side of this waterfall. That is either that there is an ultimate personality over all of history, or there isn't. If there isn't; then it's an impersonal fate or chance. There is no third position here, people. It's one or the other. There are 35 or 40 different varieties, but ultimately there are only two ideas underneath.

Second one is ultimate responsibility versus victim hood. There is no in-between. Either we're ultimately responsible or we're not. If we're not and the universe is impersonal; then we are the victims of impersonal processes - the ultimate meaning or it's ultimate meaninglessness. Again there are no shades here. There is one or the other. Ultimate ethical goal versus ultimate metaphysical dissolution - in other words either there's a goal to history that is ethical and righteous; or there isn't. If there isn't; then it's just decaying into nothing with no ethical implications whatsoever.

Deuteronomy establishes a rationale for the rest of the Old Testament. Most important because this is the whole basis of chapter 29 is there is a 900-year theocratic experience. We look at the Old Testament. We can hold it conveniently in our laps because of its small size, relatively.

But if you think about 900 years, that would be like us in our country in the year 2000 going back to 1100 AD and thinking about what life was like in 1100 and 1200 AD and what was discussed back then and does it pertain to us today in 2000? That's what 9 centuries look like.

This is the reason why in chapter 29 particularly, Moses sounds so pessimistic about the future. That's because the Holy Spirit has illuminated him through this experience to think. He doesn't know it's going to be 900 years. He just sees the destiny of the nation as on a pretty fragile basis because the blessing to Israel is contingent. He has already experienced one entire generation that basically blew it. He's

concerned about the second generation - the third, the fourth and fifth generations out to the future.

So chapter 29 is his 4th exposition. We dealt with the past. We are going to deal with the present and the near future tonight. In the past there are some things to review there. That is, in verse 1 he's talking about a covenant. Of course we said that was really basically part of chapter 28.

But again to review - relationships in the Bible are contractually based. The reason - this is not because they're legalists. It is because relationships are not casual. In the Bible a relationship isn't something that happened last Tuesday afternoon. A relationship is something that endures; and therefore it has to be protected. That's why the Bible is adamant about the most basic relationship of all - is between God and man. That relationship is controlled by contracts.

This is a fundamental idea in the Bible. That's why we need to understand what is wrong in our time where we have living together couples that trivialize marriage as a mere legalism.

"We love each other so why do we need to get married?"

The reason you need to get married is because next Saturday afternoon you may not feel like loving somebody else. You better have a contract there. So that's why relationships are important.

Nationally in our country we are unusual among the nations because we have something called a Constitution. You can view the Constitution as a contract between the Founding Fathers and future generations. The trivialization - the massive and consistent trivialization of contracts in our day spills over into the legal domain.

We have judges who feel like they are lawmakers. Basically a judge who takes that activist view is a lawbreaker. The judge is a contract breaker. All he's doing is using fancy legalese to justify his antinomian anti-law philosophy. This is the tragedy in our court system of the casual attitude to the whole contract basis. So that's a whole story in itself; but it's the same root idea. Relationships are to be trivialized or changed randomly regardless of the text of a contract.

When you bring this up people say. "Oh, that's legalism."

It isn't legalism. It's truth.

It's the issue of whether when two people come together and they say, "This is our relationship," - they're defining the relationship. So why is that definition up for grabs every 24 hours? See, that's the difference between our culture and biblical thinking. That's verse 1.

Then we said, verse 2 - "You have seen." There is an eyewitness emphasis over and over again in the Bible. These are not just generating this stuff out of their head. This is a record of history.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:9 "Therefore keep the words of this covenant,

That's something we'll see tonight. The words of Moses are identical to the words of Yahweh. When a man speaks as a prophet, there is no difference between his words and God's words. This is incomprehensible to the modern mind. There is not probably a college class on the Bible or in linguistics today that would agree with what I said. This is a radical idea that is unique to the Bible that there can be human beings called prophets who when they speak, are literally speaking as they speak the words - those words are as God's words, as though God were there dictating through them. That's what prophetic words mean.

So when Moses says, "Obey me," he is saying, "Obey Yahweh," because my words are Yahweh's words.

Now to the modern mind that sounds arrogant. That sounds audacious for anyone to claim that. Well, it is audacious if they are falsely claiming that. But to claim that Moses or any prophet of the Bible is audacious by making that claim is to say you don't believe the claim; because if you did believe the claim, it wouldn't be audacious. Right? If he really is a prophet and his words are God's words; that's not an audacious claim. That's a truth claim. It seems audacious because 99.9% of the time men's words aren't God's words. To object to this as an audacious thing is simply to say that you're doubting the basic fundamental idea of revelation which is begging the question.

Then we conclude that Moses said in verse 9:

and do them, that you may prosper in all that you do.

The prosperity there by the way is another thing to notice in our day of increasing socialist thinking. There are no apologies in the Old Testament for financial prosperity as long as it's legal. Financial prosperity is a sign of God's blessing in the Old Testament. The idea that the economy of Israel would thrive is an evidence of God's blessing. There is no merit in being poor. That identity - now in the New Testament there are warnings against being rich because wealth corrupts. Moses and Mosaic Law said that. You can get you eyes on the wealth and not the wealth giver. Then you're in deep dodo.

The warning is there. Yes, the warning is there; but the warning is not against wealth. It is against the illegal generation and acquisition of wealth and the misuse of wealth. But it's not against wealth. This stuff that you hear in today's political discussions about it's wrong to be wealthy - somehow everyone is supposed to be poor. It's a sign of righteousness or something - is a fallacy. It's not certainly found in the Scriptures.

So we find then that "prosper" in verse 9 says - prosper. It means spiritually prosper; but it also means physically and economically prosperous.

So tonight we now come to verse 10. The section from verse 10 through 19 deals with what Israel is going to face at the moment they renew the contract. Verses 1 to 9 have been the history leading up to it. It's what the nation has experienced to prepare.

So let's skim the text from verse 10 to 19 and try to put ourselves there. This is on the east side of the Jordan River. They are going to crossover, they are going to conquer the land and then they're going to have this covenant renewal at Shechem between those two mountains, Ebal and Gerizim.

Moses isn't going to be there. He tells them what will happen. So verses 10 through 19 emphasize the seriousness of what's going to take place at that so to speak wedding between Yahweh and Israel. This is the magnitude of the decision.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:10 " All of you stand today before the LORD your God: your leaders and your tribes and your elders and your officers, all the men of Israel,

11 "your little ones and your wives -- also the stranger who is in your camp, from the one who cuts your wood to the one who draws your water --

12 "that you may enter into covenant with the LORD your God, and into His oath, which the LORD your God makes with you today,

13 "that He may establish you today as a people for Himself, and that He may be God to you, just as He has spoken to you, and just as He has sworn to your fathers, to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

14 " I make this covenant and this oath, not with you alone,

15 "but with him who stands here with us today before the LORD our God, as well as with him who is not here with us today

16 (for you know that we dwelt in the land of Egypt and that we came through the nations which you passed by,

17 and you saw their abominations and their idols which were among them - wood and stone and silver and gold);

18 "so that there may not be among you man or woman or family or tribe, whose heart turns away today from the LORD our God, to go and serve the gods of these nations, and that there may not be among you a root bearing bitterness or wormwood;

19 "and so it may not happen, when he hears the words of this curse, that he blesses himself in his heart, saying, 'I shall have peace, even though I follow the dictates of my heart' -- as though the drunkard could be included with the sober.

This is a focus now on choice. So in the handout under D I have Israel's present. Then we have a little fill in there. Choices involve consequences. In this view of history there's an ethic of personal responsibility.

You'll see that dramatized in the text because he doesn't exclude anybody. Even the little ones are included in this choice. It's not a choice where the elite making decisions for all the peons. That's a pagan view of society. The biblical view of society - and here is a key text; here is a key passage of God's Word that shows you that everyone is responsible. There is no elitism here. There are no class distinctions here. Everybody is leveled at this point of responsibility. This is an important concept of society.

Freedom of choice entails responsibility for consequences. You can't separate this. When we get to the last verse that we read (verse 19), you'll see that's where the wheels come off very frequently.

So this again is one of those Old Testament passages that looks down at our heart and looks at the depravity that is sitting there.

Freedom entails responsibility. A generation that does not want to accept consequences of choices will always negate freedom. They will give up their freedom. They fear freedom because freedom breeds responsibility. When responsibility is demeaned, nobody wants to accept it.

"Take away my freedom so I'm not responsible and I don't have to worry."

Here are 3 illustrations why freedom is under attack around the world.

In the West, secularism blames outcomes on one's genes, one's parents, one's family. It's always someone else's.

"Not me, not my choices."

It's, "My mother dropped me on my head when I was 3."

"I had bad parenting."

"I had bad teachers in school."

It's always somebody else - never us, never us that are responsible.

You know, when we face judgment before God, nobody is going to be there except us. We will be heard and judged individually before God - no excuses, no blames.

You can't go to God our Designer and say, "You gave me bad genes, God."

Do you think that is going to sell? I don't think so.

So here we have this focal point, this laser beam on personal responsibility.

Islam does the same thing. Islam opposes freedom of choice by Sharia that capitally punishes anyone choosing to leave Islam. They want to lock down to protect their idea of a perfect righteous society by removing the freedom to abandon that and rebel against it.

Now contrast that with the Mosaic Law code. Where is there any mandate to the civil authorities to kill people who against God's rule that leave? They are free to leave that society.

This is a theocracy now where you would think, "Yes, if they are there and they're going to teach adversely to Yahwahism; yeah, they're going to face capital punishment."

But that's because Yahweh is there.

In the case of Islam we have Sharia capitally punishing anyone choosing to leave Islam. This is why in Christianity and where it dominates -

unfortunately in the Middle Ages there were cases that didn't do this consistently.

In 1 Corinthians we have the rule called liberty of conscience. Liberty of conscience says you can't fake it and we're not going to compel you to become Christians by peer pressure. It's your choice. You are free to accept Christ or reject Him. You are not free to change the consequences of that choice; but it's your choice. That is why true biblical Christianity doesn't compel conversions. It doesn't force conversions by the sword, because it can't. It doesn't affect the heart of man.

Then Marxism (socialism) destroys freedom by comprehensive government controls. Today you will hear people who are inclined toward Marxism or socialism.

They are always worried about, "Oh well, if we have too much freedom everyone is going to do whatever they want."

Well, yeah you have certain restraints but you can never get rid of choice and volition.

So Moses is calling the nation to contract renewal, as I said, which means Yahweh is calling them. It is by invitation. And the thing that we want not to read into chapter 29 is that Israel is free at any time to enter into a contract with Yahweh. Not true! Israel has been invited at a point in time to enter into a contract with God. The contract is written by God. The timing of that contract is also sovereignly delegated by God.

There is no human - "Well, I'll decide next Tuesday to worry about that," or, "I'll decide 3 years from now."

No, no. This is going to happen when the entire nation is going to be called before those two mountains (Ebal and Gerizim) for a decision. So this is where it comes together.

Notice the number of nouns in verse 10 - and in verse 11 (both) where you have everybody. All the different subdivisions of that society are included in verses 10 and 11. You can't find in verses 10 and 11 anybody else. There are no exceptions there. Even the stranger is included. Then to make sure that no one is left out it says at the very end of verse 11:

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:11 "...from the one who cuts your wood to the one who draws your water --

You may have hired somebody from somebody else, maybe a stranger, maybe a gere, but they're obligated to make the choice before God.

Then it says:

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:12 "that you may

Here is the purpose clause.

enter into covenant with the LORD your God, and into His oath, which the LORD your God makes with you today,

Then a second purpose clause:

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:13 "that He may establish you today as a people for Himself, ...

This becomes an identity issue. It also obviously from the way he ends verse 13, he is talking about what contract - as you think back through this? What was the contract that preceded the Mosaic contract? The Abrahamic Contract. So do you see the continuity here? One builds on the previous one. There is pedagogy to God's sequential revelation.

So in your notes in verse 12:

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:12 "that you may enter into covenant with the LORD your God,

...contract renewal is initiated and designed by God. It's not just designed by God; but it's also initiated by Him. This is He calling the shots.

Then of course verse 13 is the Abrahamic Covenant.

Now in verses 14 and 15 there's another element that happens here.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:14 " I make this covenant and this oath, not with you alone,

You notice what's going on here and we've seen this in the text before. Do you see the oscillation between the third person pronoun (He, God) and the first person pronoun (I)? It flops back and forth. This is not altogether typical; but it is a common textual characteristic when in the Old Testament prophets are speaking. It is sometimes difficult to tell where the prophet is speaking and he is telling you about God; then all of a sudden he says "I". It's that oscillation back and forth between the third person, first person, third person, first person, third person, first person. That is what I'm saying about a phenomenon of the Old Testament. These men are speaking God's words so that's why the pronouns flip back and forth between the first person and third person for the nouns or the names. So here is an example of it. Verse 14, Moses is speaking; but it's a first person pronoun I - I made this. He just got through saying that verse 12 at the end of verse 12:

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:12 "...which the LORD your God makes with you today,

But then in verse 14:

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:14 " I make this...

It can't be Moses because Moses isn't going to be there at Shechem. So this "I" obviously must be Yahweh. Yet it's coming off the lips of Moses. So again pay attention to this because this is a feature of the text. A

lot of people don't appreciate how close and intimate these men's addresses are to God speaking. .

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:14 " I make this covenant and this oath, not with you alone,

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:15 "but with him who stands here with us today before the LORD our God, as well as with him who is not here with us today

Now we have an idea about this contract. Because revelation in the Bible is not constant with time; but it's full of pulses. You'll have a cluster of revelation; then God is silent, silent, silent. Then a cluster of revelation - then God is silent, silent, silent and then a cluster of revelation. Revelation is not a constant theme in the Bible. You have peaks of revelation. That's what we call historic revelation.

That idea is connected with this - the word "remember." Remember what God has done. The reason you have to remember is because in our generation and my generation revelation may not be going on. So our only access to revelation is in history. We have to go back in history to the last cluster of revelation. So that's why God says - remember this contract is going to be with future generations, not just your generation says Moses.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:15 ... as well as with him who is not here with us today

Then if you'll skip over the parenthesis because verses 16 and 17 is sort of like a parenthesis and go to verse 18 - so you skip grammatically from verse 16 and 17 down to 18 so that:

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:18 "so that there may not be among you man or woman or family or tribe...

So he is going to go on from there.

An idea has come up here. This is why we have this quote. I am going back again to Dr. North not for the exegesis because North is a post millennialist. I am not. I am a pre-millennialist. But the reason I am going to Dr. North here is again because as an economist he picks up on the economic implications here; and he picks up on an idea that I think is really important when we think of poverty in the world and why there are these places of endemic poverty generation after generation after generation. And yet in the West there has been an acceleration of wealth at least until recently.

So here is Dr. North's analysis of this idea that you see here that the contract is looking to the future. This is a future projection.

God was also setting before them a theory of history that was linear and progressive.

We've covered that idea before.

They could extend the covenant over centuries. Israel's future would not be cyclical. They would not inevitably lose whatever God had given them. God was giving them a crucial tool of dominion.

And here's the key. This is why I've italicized it in the quote.

Faith in the future...

We don't think normally think of that sometimes in prophecy and eschatology. Watch what happens here.

Long-term future orientation - He was giving them the psychological basis of an upper class mentality, faith in the future. It is this mentality that provides men with a way out of poverty. Neither linear time nor the concept of compound growth was common in any other ancient society. The concept of cyclical time was all-pervasive in the ancient world. What God was telling Israel was that continuity through time was provided by the covenant itself.

So I want to go backwards in that quote to the middle part of the quote. I want to focus on something Dr. North points out in here.

He was giving them the psychological basis of an upper class mentality - faith in the future.

Now let's stop right there and think about - why is that upper class? Why is that faith in the future necessary for society to climb out of poverty? What tool enables a people to climb out of poverty? It's planning for the future and not spending everything in the present. It's the idea of compound growth. You can't make wealth over night. But wealth is never going to occur if there isn't some compound growth. And people are not going to postpone present spending to save for a future when they don't care about the future or they have no vision of what the future can be.

You can take an application of this because in most of our families our grandparents or our great-grandparents or your grandparents immigrated to this country. I think if you go back into personal family history, you'll see that when your forefathers came to this country they were not wealthy people. Most of the immigrants came to this country almost penniless.

Why did they leave Europe to come to this country sacrificing what they had to do to get here? What was it that drove them here? The idea that their future would be better than their past. If they didn't have that, they wouldn't have come here. If immigrants didn't have that future, the idea that I'm going to build so my children won't have to live like I lived. You see it's opening up the future. It's this idea and why this is so important is North is sensitive to it economically. Why it's so crucial is his last sentence.

This idea may seem incidental...

Isn't that a cute economic principle? But look at the last sentence in his quote.

It's neither linear time nor the concept of compound growth was common in any other ancient society.

Do you see the uniqueness of the Bible? Paganism doesn't give confidence in the future. Why? Why can't paganism give confidence in the future? Let's think about that. What does paganism lack? Think of the 3 basic questions. The second question - is there truth and can I know it? If I don't have confidence that I can know the truth, if I don't have confidence metaphysically that there's a person with a plan for history; I'm not going to care about the future. I have no basis to care for the future.

Gary was telling a story last year about Honduras where he took the chart that I often show about the creation, the fall, the judgment. He's talking to poor kids in Honduras. When they could see on a simple chart that history was moving somewhere - it wasn't going to be cyclical - same old, same old, forever and ever and ever. Did it cause a change, Gary? Yah! This is a powerful idea. It's not living idea apart from the Word of God, apart from the faith of God. That's what makes the Bible so powerful. That's why it's had an historical influence. Paganism has simply not been able to do that.

Now there have been pagan perversions of the idea. But, that's because they first borrowed the idea. Karl Marx being the individual. There have been Karl Marx got the idea of progress in history from Hagel. Hagel got the idea of progress in history from guess what - the book of Daniel. So ironically the every idea of progressive history that's so enlightening of the Marxists; they're always talking about the wonderful future if they can overthrow the present. That idea was stolen out of the book of Daniel for heaven's sake. It doesn't come from Marx. It doesn't come from atheism. It comes out of the Bible.

Even that optimism in that little segment of unbelief is really stolen capital from the Bible. It's because we have One who knows the future. We have revelation. By myself, by yourself - all we have is speculation about the future. That's all we can do. We can't forecast the future. We can only speculate about the future. But if there's a personal God who reveals and talks to us and lets us in on His plans, now we have confidence in the future because we have confidence in Him.

What's the saying? "I don't know the future, but I know the One who holds the future."

That is the song that led my wife to Christ. So the idea here is that the future is related to our faith in God or lack thereof.

Okay, let's proceed to verse 18 now. It's a warning.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:18 "so that

Purpose clause.

there may not be among you man or woman or family or tribe,

See that's the comprehensive sweep of the nouns looking at different segments of society.

whose heart turns away today from the LORD our God,

The idea there as I note in your notes where I say, "Whose heart turns away," at verse 18 - notice I say it's a Hebrew participle. Moses describes that turning away in a participle form. What that means is; it's the characteristic of the heart. In other words it's a strong contrast.

He says, "Look, when you're here and we are renewing this contract your heart..." while you're doing it turning away from God.

See the exposition of sin there?

Faced with that very liturgy the moment of this national renewal of the contract, beware that your heart isn't even at that moment turning away.

So let's look at the turning away now. What is the turning away? We want to look at that.

turns away today from the LORD our God, to go and serve the gods of these nations, and that there may not be among you a root bearing bitterness or wormwood;

We want to look at what this means "serving the gods of these nations." In your handout if you'll follow me, there are quite a few underlines here. The "serve other gods" expression - you can look this up in a concordance to check this out. But "serve other gods," means something tangible.

It means to live first of all to live outside of the theocracy. Anyone who lives outside of the theocracy is serving other gods as far as the Old Testament is concerned. Now if that's the case and that's the biblical claim; what does that imply about society? It seems to me that it implies that every society has a religious orientation - that every society incorporates a value system that is ultimately religious. There is no such thing as a society that has no religion. Every society has a religion. So therefore to live outside the theocracy is to live in a pagan land and serve those gods - that is live in accordance with those values. So to live outside the theocracy which was organized in the Word of God. That is they had policies for every detail of life were under the direct authority of Yahweh.

So all of the culture - remember we went through the dietary rules. We went through the funeral, how to grieve for the fallen. We went through how to get married. We went through how the courts are to function. We went through warfare - who goes in the army, who stays out of the army. All these details of the statutes and the judgments were under the direct authority of Yahweh. Every detail of life was under the direct authority of Yahweh. He was physically present in the sacred space, which was the tabernacle to which Israel had access.

Now I give 3 verses (Joshua 26, I Samuel 26 and Jeremiah 16) because each of those 3 Old Testament references again expounds what serving other gods means.

In Joshua 26, Joshua is talking to them at Shechem by the way right in the middle of the ceremony.

He says, "Don't be like our fathers from Mesopotamia who were serving other gods."

He's talking about Abraham. He's talking about where Abraham came from. He's talking about Tara. He's talking about people who were Semites, that is sons of Shem who were the predecessors of Israel. And they were serving other gods. They were living inside Ur for example - U-R, the city Ur. Ur was dedicated to the moon goddess. So by living there they shared the values of that religious system that dominated the city of Ur.

So Joshua in 26 is saying Abraham served other gods when he was living in Mesopotamia. Notice the geography - when he was living over there he was serving other gods

I Samuel 26, David was forced by Saul to go live with the Philistines.

In I Samuel 26 he says, "You forced me out of here. You forced me to go live and serve other gods."

What he meant was, "I had to leave this area to go to that area and in Philistia I was serving other gods."

..meaning he was serving the values and so on of that society.

So I think there's so social ...somebody that really knows sociology needs to do some research here because this has tremendous sociological-religious implications for how you look upon a people group or a society.

In Jeremiah 16, Jeremiah uses the expression - "you will go and serve other gods in exile." Again in all 3 cases, serving other gods is a geographical change of position where you are living outside the theocracy under a pagan culture. And that is to serve other gods.

On the next page I again look at those 3 basic questions and point out the theocratic answer and the pagan answer. I think this is what is meant by serving other gods - a society dominated by the right column of values versus Israel in the middle column of the chart. So you have the creator-creature distinction versus continuity of being. You have God's revelation necessary versus man's speculation necessary. You have God's holiness versus subjective likes and dislikes. That's the parting of the ways. A society that's built on that last column (the pagans) to live in that, to further the goals of that society is to serve those gods.

Now we skipped verses 16 and 17 to get to verse 18. So let's go back to verses 16 and 17 that are sort of a parenthesis in a sense and pick up this.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:16 (for you know that we dwelt in the land of Egypt and that we came through the nations which you passed by,

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:17 and you saw their abominations and their idols

By the way verse 17 that word abomination is one of the strongest in the Hebrew language for something that is vile and anti-god. It is one of the strongest nouns that you can get.

This is not a PC view of religion here.

which were among them -- wood and stone and silver and gold);

Then there is a list of 4 materials. We want to think about why the materials are important - four of them - wood, stone silver and gold. Why would those 4 materials be picked up in this sentence? You see the idols. Then Moses draws attention to what they are made of. Now I interpret that to mean that it's really talking about man speculations, human constructs.

Look at them. They are materials fabricated by man, worked on by man. The silver and the gold are molded by man. Today you would probably say they were all craftsmen. They were all human crafts. These gods are productions of man.

So mention of materials is common in the Bible in order to contrast them produced dependency with the unseen self sufficient Creator. Paul does the same thing by the way in Corinthians. Today the gods are similarly produced by man's speculations. Nature is mother to the idea of cosmic evolution. Man is evolution self-consciousness. It's all a product of something other than God.

Rulers in the Bible are called gods and principalities. Now this last one I added this third point here for this reason. There is an undercurrent in the Old Testament particularly that blurs. It looks like if you look at certain texts and I gave you a few verses there. When you look at those texts, the boundary between demonic powers and human leaders or between God and human leaders looks like it's smeared.

You begin to wonder what happens to the creator creature distinction?

Let me show you. Let's turn to Exodus - back to Exodus 7. This is a peculiar thing about the Bible. Jesus picks this up by the way. He quotes Psalm 82 in the Gospel of John. In Exodus 7:1 Yahweh is talking to Moses and He tells Moses...

Moses has just said, "Lord, I have uncircumcised lips. How shall Pharaoh heed me? I don't feel up to this assignment."

NKJ Exodus 7:1 So the LORD said to Moses: "See, I have made you as God to Pharaoh, and Aaron your brother shall be your prophet.

So now God is saying to Moses, "I want you to play the role of God through this man; and Aaron, I want him to play the role of a prophet."

So now we have something that sort of jars us a little bit in the Old Testament about why are humans placed in the role of god.

Even more problematical is the passage in Psalm 82. If you'll turn to Psalm 82, it's this psalm that Jesus cites in one of His arguments with the Pharisees. But Psalm 82 has a whole section in the first part of the Psalm. It's clear from Psalm 82 that rulers are called gods.

NKJ Psalm 82:1 A Psalm of Asaph. God stands in the congregation of the mighty; He judges among the gods.

So now we have God judging the gods. Now who are the gods?

NKJ Psalm 82:2 How long will you judge unjustly, And show partiality to the wicked? Selah

See this is what God is saying to the gods. Well, who is it that's judging unjustly and showing partiality to the wicked? Well, it's the rulers.

NKJ Psalm 82:3 Defend the poor and fatherless; Do justice to the afflicted and needy.

4 Deliver the poor and needy; Free them from the hand of the wicked.
5 They do not know, nor do they understand; They walk about in darkness;
All the foundations of the earth are unstable.

6 I said, "You are gods, And all of you are children of the Most High.

7 But you shall die like men, And fall like one of the princes."

8 Arise, O God, judge the earth; For You shall inherit all nations.

Do you see the language here? This is a hard passage because clearly it's a justification or an indictment against civil government rulers, leaders of society. And, God is calling them gods.

I conclude this remark by saying that... We've got to go back to Deuteronomy 29 so that we get through with it tonight. But the words "principalities and powers" in the New Testament that is often used for the demonic forces are also used in the contemporary Greek for rulers. Pilate and Caesar, they're called principalities and powers.

You have the passage in Ezekiel 28 where the king of Tyre is said to be basically addressing Satan by talking to the king of Tyre.

So what's going on here? My suggestion is this - that fallen men when he attains power becomes a target for demonic influence so that rulers who are unregenerate who do not even if they're Christians do not walk closely with the Lord and this is why I think we are called in the Bible to pray for our rulers that they won't be deceived.

There is passage in the Old Testament that says, "Welcome Millennial Kingdom when Satan is put down finally."

He no longer deceives the nations.

What's that passage talking about? He must be deceiving the nations. In other words, demonic powers can influence policies. This is why in the

Bible Egypt one of the key superpowers is also code names leviathan. The prophets speak of Egypt as leviathan. That's a term for demonic forces. So it's clear that in the minds of the prophets of the Bible that yeah these guys are human. They are not the Creator. They are on the creature side of the creator-creature distinction. But they act like gods and are influenced by these gods and goddesses.

You'll see this in the New Testament - a very similar passage that I point out in the box down below. Here's an example of a pagan theme throughout the world in ancient times - the mother-child cult that we're going to get into a moment.

Notice 1 Corinthians 10: 18. That's a passage on communion. Do you know what it's saying? When people in Corinth were partaking of the communion cup that was part of a cultic demonic religion they were having communication with demons - just participating in the communion service. They were of course involving themselves with principalities and powers. That's how close these powers are to the power structures that we see as just political or just religious.

So now we want to look at a passage that is an indictment of what chapter 29 is pushing toward because 29 is talking about, "I don't want anybody at that Shechem ceremony whose heart is turning away and going and serving other gods."

Tragically that was all together too frequent in Israel's 900-year history.

One of the most poignant passages I could find to illustrate this point is Jeremiah 44. Turn over to the weeping prophet, Jeremiah 44 - to that time in history when his nation collapsed. He saw his fellow countrymen massacred. He saw his country fall. He saw his country totally dominated by an alien power. He saw the destruction of the cities. And what happened is many of the Jews fled from Nebuchadnezzar's Babylonian invasion; and they fled to a more familiar area - Egypt.

Jeremiah is going to go to Egypt. That's where he winds up. Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian king, allows Jeremiah to escape and go to Egypt. So he goes to Egypt.

In chapter 44 of Jeremiah beginning in verse 7 he's into an argument with the Jews that have fled when their country fell to have in the pagan nation of Egypt. Here is the argument that Jeremiah gets into with these people.

NKJ Jeremiah 44:7 "Now therefore, thus says the LORD, the God of hosts, the God of Israel: 'Why do you commit this great evil against yourselves, to cut off from you man and woman, child and infant, out of Judah, leaving none to remain,

8 'in that you provoke Me to wrath with the works of your hands, burning incense to other gods in the land of Egypt where you have gone to dwell, that you may cut yourselves off and be a curse and a reproach among all the nations of the earth?

9 'Have you forgotten the wickedness of your fathers, the wickedness of the kings of Judah, the wickedness of their wives, your own wickedness,

and the wickedness of your wives, which they committed in the land of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem?

10 'They have not been humbled, to this day, nor have they feared; they have not walked in My law or in My statutes that I set before you and your fathers.'

11 " Therefore thus says the LORD of hosts, the God of Israel: 'Behold, I will set My face against you for catastrophe and for cutting off all Judah.'

12 'And I will take the remnant of Judah who have set their faces to go into the land of Egypt to dwell there, and they shall all be consumed and fall in the land of Egypt. They shall be consumed by the sword and by famine. They shall die, from the least to the greatest, by the sword and by famine; and they shall be an oath, an astonishment, a curse and a reproach!

13 'For I will punish those who dwell in the land of Egypt, as I have punished Jerusalem, by the sword, by famine, and by pestilence,

14 'so that none of the remnant of Judah who have gone into the land of Egypt to dwell there shall escape or survive, lest they return to the land of Judah, to which they desire to return and dwell. For none shall return except those who escape.' "

What is going on in this passage? Jeremiah's argument is that they haven't learned their lesson. They're going down to Egypt to physically and economically survive. But they're still religiously the same as when they were in the land. So Jeremiah's argument is that the consequences of that choice will play out in their destiny.

Now here is their counter argument. Watch this, because they're going to defend themselves. They're not going to listen to Jeremiah. They are going to reinterpret their own history. Watch how they reinterpret history and their experience.

KJV Jeremiah 44:15 Then all the men which knew that their wives had burned incense unto other gods,

The reason the wives keep coming in here appears to be the mother-child cult. This was an Ishtar cult that permeated paganism. Some like Alexander Hyslop in *The Two Babylons* argues that this is where the Roman Catholic Church picked up this Mary and Jesus thing from. It's actually a pagan-Ishtar thing that was in Greece. It was in Mesopotamia. It came under different names; but it was very prevalent in the ancient world - this goddess and her sacred child. The women were the leaders of it.

Watch this. Even that's an argument here. Interesting passage.

NKJ Jeremiah 44:15 Then all the men who knew that their wives had burned incense to other gods, and all the women that stood by, a great multitude, even all the people that dwelt in the land of Egypt, in Pathros, answered Jeremiah, saying,

16 "As for the word that you have spoken to us in the name of the LORD, we will not listen to you!

17 "But we will certainly do whatever has gone out of our own mouth, to burn incense to the queen of heaven and pour out drink offerings to her, as we have done, we and our fathers, our kings and our princes, in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem.

So they're repeating what Jeremiah said

"You don't get history Jeremiah. Here's the true interpretation of history."

For then we had plenty of food, were well-off, and saw no trouble.

NKJ Jeremiah 44:18 "But since we stopped burning incense to the queen of heaven and pouring out drink offerings to her, we have lacked everything and have been consumed by the sword and by famine."

They are referring to the revival under Josiah when Josiah and the prophets in the closing hours of the nation's existence called them back to the Word of God. He forced them to stop this stuff in the high places. He cleaned up the place.

They said, "See what happened. We were going great when we were doing our thing with the pagan gods and deities. Then we had a revival. Within a century our nation collapses. Fine thing, Jeremiah. If you think we're going to listen to you, forget it!"

What's going on in this argument? Clearly they are referencing history but their interpretation of history is totally screwed up. They are totally misinterpreting consequences. The blessing they had in Israel was the momentum of the previous good decisions that had been made, the Yahwehistic loyal decisions. They misinterpreted under Josiah, which didn't last long by the way. They didn't last long enough to create economic consequences. Then the nation fell apart. So their argument is that if we had been allowed to go ahead and worship the pagan gods and goddesses everything would be fine.

"You prophets are always butting in and you try to make a change back to the Word of God and mess with us. You messed with the gods and goddesses. You insulted them. So now we're reaping this. So, we won't listen to you."

So here's a classic case of Jewish people who are in unbelief who are totally absorbed with serving gods of other lands. This chapter 44 shows you what that looked like in history. And, it shows you their heart. Notice the defiance against the Word of God.

"We're not going to listen to you. We're going to do it the way we said we're going to do it."

See, absolute total defiance.

"We are the authority, not the Word of God."

It's the same old choice. Either we are in authority or God is the authority. It's either, or. Every thought emanates from either one or the other authority.

Lets go back to Deuteronomy 29 and see the rest of this passage. So it concludes in 28 and 29. Here we have:

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:18 "that there may not be among you a root bearing bitterness or wormwood;

Doesn't that sound familiar - those who have read the New Testament? Where is that requoted? In Hebrews:

NKJ Hebrews 12:15 lest any root of bitterness springing up cause trouble

This is where it comes from. Look at the context where that New Testament quote comes from. Moses is warning against this - this bitterness. The idea of the root is it only takes a few people. How many did it take at the foot of Mt. Sinai for the first great apostasy? Just a few - Aaron, some Egyptians. All of a sudden it permeates the whole population. It only takes a few people with bitterness in their hearts to contaminate everyone else.

Here is the root of it in verse 19. Here is one of the clearest expositions in the Bible of the sin nature. Here they are in the very presence of God that He hears the words of the curse.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:19 "... he blesses himself in his heart, saying, 'I shall have peace, even though I follow the dictates of my heart' ...

What do you see is happening with consequences?

"I am deciding the consequences."

This is reengineered reality, people. This is what we do when we sin. We think we can get away with it. We think we can go our own way, and there is nothing to pay. We don't have to sweat the consequences. This is the clearest exposition you have in all the text here of what sin looks like in so far as dealing with choices and consequences.

Then finally in the last section here from verse 20 onto the end of the chapter, this is the future of Israel. We can go through this quite quickly because it'll be expounded in more detail later. It's a very pessimistic thing; but Moses knows this is the heart of these people. This is what's going to happen.

He says, "I have no allusions. You're going to go over there. You're going to conquer the land. God is going to bless you. You're going to get on the mountain and while you're on the mountain you're going to be thinking, 'I can do whatever I want to.' I know you."

So Moses had a realistic appraisal of that second generation. He's not being cynical it's just that he knows that's the human heart.

So verse 20. Here are the consequences.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:20 "The LORD would not spare him; for then the anger of the LORD and His jealousy would burn against that man, and every curse that is written in this book would settle on him, and the LORD would blot out his name from under heaven.

That means eliminate him from history. That means they are going to die physically just like the first generation died. This is what discipline looked like in the Old Testament - death. You'll notice every curse that is written in this book - there are the consequences that are spelled out contractually in the Law. We just read the verses in chapter 28.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:21 "And the LORD would separate him from all the tribes of Israel for adversity, according to all the curses of the covenant that are written in this Book of the Law,

See again the reference to the contract, the reference to spell out consequences.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:22 "so that the coming generation of your children who rise up after you, and the foreigner who comes from a far land, would say, when they see the plagues of that land and the sicknesses which the LORD has laid on it:

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:23 'The whole land is brimstone, salt, and burning; it is not sown, nor does it bear, nor does any grass grow there, like the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboim, which the LORD overthrew in His anger and His wrath.'

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:24 "All nations would say, 'Why has the LORD done so to this land? What does the heat of this great anger mean?'

There is a sarcasm here in verse 24. The pagans are going to see it.

"You guys don't get it. It's going to be obvious to the unbelievers that you've got a problem here."

Why is this land that was so fruitful? Why is this nation that had this wonderful prosperity - it's a mess. It's a total disaster. It's a disaster economically. It's a disaster in their agriculture. It's physically a mess. It's going to be so clear that the unbeliever sees it. That's why the people of the land, the people will say - this is why there's an explanation here.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:25 "Then people would say: 'Because they have forsaken the covenant of the LORD God of their fathers, which He made with them when He brought them out of the land of Egypt;

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:26 'for they went and served other gods and worshiped them, gods that they did not know and that He had not given to them.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:27 'Then the anger of the LORD was aroused against this land, to bring on it every curse that is written in this book.

Third time - third time in this passage references to the consequences of the charter, consequences of the contract.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:28 'And the LORD uprooted them from their land in anger, in wrath, and in great indignation, and cast them into another land, as it is this day.'

So it can't be clearer as he finishes this part of the dialogue.

Verse 29 is the last verse. This is a warning against.... It looks like it's totally out of context when you first look at verse 29. What the heck does verse 29 have to do with verse 28? The context then is the danger of going after and serving other gods.

One of the motivations to serve other gods is this. If I serve the living God of the Scriptures, He tells me about the future. But if I turn my back on the living God now I'm dealing with speculation and probably a little demonic influence. I've got a problem.

What am I going to do that replaces knowledge of the future? I'm going to have to flip for it. This is why you have horoscopes. This is why you have all kinds of protocols in the pagan world about you cut an animal and you pull out the organs. You actually had people that would read the organs of animals. It's in the prophets of the Bible.

They sit there. They look.

"Let's see this is a liver that comes from a sheep. Let's see how it looks."

There would actually be specialists that would try to infer personal future and national future from organs of animals that they took apart.

So the last verse, verse 29, is a sobering warning that the knowledge of the future is through God only. If He hasn't chosen to tell you - don't look for it anywhere else.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:29 "The secret things belong to the LORD our God, but those things which are revealed belong to us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law.

In other words, this is like 2 Timothy 3 in the New Testament that says the Word of God is sufficient unto every good work. Moses is saying the same thing in verse 29. These words are sufficient. We don't need any more. If it's necessary to add to this, God will do that; but God will do it, we won't.

That ends chapter 29. Next time we're going to get into chapter 30. That deals with more of the future. But this is a threat basically, this whole passage verses 20 to 29. These are the consequences. You screw up; and this is the discipline - you die. Very simple.

(Closing prayer)

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:19 "...that he blesses himself in his heart, ...

This continues to focus on the inner cause of idolatry. It's not just external. This has been a good passage that shows you that in the Old Testament it's not just looking at externals. It's looking at the heart just like the New Testament does.

Okay, are there any questions?

Question

That's a good point that he's making about... say a powerful person argues that, "I will prevent myself from being a victim by my works."

But the fact of the matter is that very statement shows you that at root he has encountered the issue of victimhood, else why would he decide that he has to fight it? So at the base, you see, what we're trying to state by saying that is we're trying to state the result of an awareness that I am ultimately going to be judged. The opposite of that is that I do not want to accept that kind of responsibility. Because I don't want to accept that I have to face that kind of responsibility, I start reengineering my reality. It unfolds. You're very right in the sense that is definitely is a reaction.

Your more active, smart people are going to say, "I'm going to run over you before you run over me."

No question about it, the Soros of this world. I think that attitude itself is grounded upon the idea that I got to do this to prevent myself from being a victim. Why does he fear that he's going to be a victim?

Question

Yeah, that's true. They see themselves as gods. There is a peculiar thing that happens with evolutionary thinking. This has been known for 100 years. This is not a new thought. Several authors and writers have pointed this out.

Christian writers have said, "Isn't it interesting that in the evolutionary worldview we are all products of chance. We are all basically the products of atoms, molecules. We're evolved pond scum. That's our ultimate source or origin."

Yet while holding that position, the other position is; and I've run into this talking about environmentalism with smart people (not Christians) who argue that the reason why we are involved with the environment evolutionists come to self-consciousness in us. Therefore we are now going to guide the evolutionary process.

So it seems that there are two incompatible ideas here. On the one hand you have the idea that we are all the products of a chance, meaningless thing; yet on the other hand all of a sudden now we have evolved to the point where we can assume responsibility for the evolutionary process and direct it. It is somewhat peculiar how those two work together. It's a whole study in itself. There's an interesting combination of ideas here.

Question

Well, they argue for the fact... their argument is which I don't accept but their argument basically is that they have all this awareness that animals don't. They have an ethic. They have a conscience.

What they're really arguing here is that they have become self aware of their image hood - which is due to creation not evolution. Therefore they feel this moral burden in ecological studies to assume responsibility for the planet - to take care of the planet.

Question

You see that. That's technological progress. That's finite man. That's the problem that the non-Christian who has rejected revelation from outside - that is from God - from outside him or her. When you reject revelation that is from an omniscient God, you are left with a finite mind, and not only a finite mind, but a fallen finite mind. That's why that chart you see me use with the limits of empirical knowledge.

You always run into that. You always run into the fact of the n+1 problem. What's going to happen when I get that new piece of data? All my knowledge is contingent on my finite experience. That's the epistemological dilemma of unbelief. But I think it's not fully appreciated because the human heart as Moses...

In this Deuteronomy 29 passage - can you imagine people standing there with all the Levites with the people on Mt. Gerizim the people on Mt Ebal this massive ceremony that is obviously...it's got the Ark Covenant with the very Ten Commandments in it.

They're sitting to themselves saying, "You know. This is a big joke. I'm going to live my life the way I want to live it. Furthermore I don't buy this stuff that we're going to get discipline for disobeying."

That's the passage. So there you have the clear exposition of the defiant sin nature. I mean talk about Romans 7. Deuteronomy 29 is a good exposition - same with Deuteronomy 27.

Question

He has raised a very, very good question here. That is, does serving other gods mean just the geographical exclusion from the theocracy? Like, Daniel you're living in Babylon. Was Daniel serving other gods or does serving other gods mean more active like Jeremiah 44 where they were not only outside the land but they were obviously participating in a pagan ritual? I think it has to involve the participation. But I think the reason why it's said to be David - if you take that David passage in 1 Samuel 26. If you read that passage, David is complaining.

He's saying, "You people told me. You kicked me out of this land. You told me, 'Go serve other gods.'"

Now David isn't saying in the narrow religious sense that he served other gods. He's saying he was pushed into a culture that was permeated with this religion, which then meant he was in constant tension with this culture. Daniel is a good counter example because wasn't he all the time in his life - the book of Esther, book of Daniel. They were always in tension with the culture. They never could relax like they could have in Israel.

Relaxing in Israel meant, "Ah! I can relax with the rules and the values and the standards."

But Daniel over in Babylon, he couldn't relax with all the standards going on. Mordecai and Esther, they had their problems with that - the whole struggle there. I think the Bible meaning serving other gods I think it's warning us that every society is basically constructed in its value system, in its priorities toward a god concept. That's the tension point.

All of a sudden now in the Church Age, we got Christians in every culture. . How are the Christians fairing in Iran? How are the Christians fairing in Saudi Arabia?

Now when I hear these Moslems wanting their Bill of Rights in America, I feel like saying to them, "What about the Christians in Bethlehem? What happened?"

Talking about the Palestinian problem - yeah, let's talk about the Palestinian problem. What about the Palestinian Christians? Why are there only 2% left in the West Bank? It wasn't the Jews that kicked the Christians out of the West Bank. It was the Palestinian Muslims that kicked the Jews out of the West Bank because they had two rival religions that could not coexist. Religions are extremely powerful. This is why the church has to be constantly on its guard because the principalities and powers want to move and twist the church and pressure the church to strengthen their position and not be a separate entity. This is why Christians are always the odd people out. We have to get used to that. We are the oddballs from the standpoint of the world. It's because of this tension.

Question

He's making a good point here. It's good that you pointed this out about both Daniel and Joseph. Those are two good examples. Their good works, doing a good job - basically still further Egypt and still further Babylon. Now at critical points they had to oppose that. But you can't argue that Joseph's works certainly didn't empower pharaoh. It certainly strengthened him. Some scholars believe that basically it's Joseph's work in the 7-year famine that establishes centralized power that never before existed in Egypt. He was the one that basically set up the structure of pharaoh. The fact of the matter is you can't be totally separate. Economically you're in dialogue with your culture at all times. It's just a fact of the way society is structured this way. That's why the Millennial Kingdom will be different. In the Millennial Kingdom Jesus is going to be the head of society.

What we have in America now is a polytheistic culture. Think about it. What is polytheism? Many gods. We are rapidly going into a polytheistic culture. This is why you hear me say that instead of this buzzword "progressive" - you know Woodrow Wilson, Teddy Roosevelt started the progressive movement. Our President yesterday gave a speech somewhere in the Midwest where Teddy Roosevelt made one of his famous progressive speeches. He used the word progressive 3 or 4 times.

When you hear that word you need to think "regressive," because what the progressive is for is to get away from the Christina influence in this country and turn it. It's not intentional. They are not deliberately doing this. They are deceived. What they're doing is they're bringing back the neo-Roman culture. I am beginning to think maybe what we should be studying is 2nd and 3rd century Roman society so we can prepare ourselves for what's coming. We need to study - how did the Christians, how did they live in Rome because it's not going to be any different. Rome had a centralized bureaucracy. They had amazing advanced engineering. Technologically they were advanced. They had a remarkably well-trained army. They had water supplies that were the envy of the ancient world. So Christians lived in that kind of culture. Nevertheless, the government was trying to regulate religion. There was tension.

The book of Philemon is a good example. There is a New Testament book. If you read Philemon knowing Roman law, you realize that Philemon is almost an incendiary piece of literature. Paul was violating Rome by not returning the slave to authorities as a runaway. Paul did not do that. So there is an underlying legal issue with Philemon.

Question

Okay in verse 14 and 15, see what he is getting at? Look at verse 14 and 15 a moment.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:14 " I make this covenant and this oath, not with you alone,

Plural, y'all -you alone.

15 "but with him

If you have the New King James, you'll see it's italicized - him.

who stands here with us today before the LORD our God, as well as with him who is not here with us today

You have to read verse 15 both clauses as a way he has of grammatically separating those present and those in the future. It's confusing because of the way the English is translating it here. It was almost a Semitic expression for saying - "I'm not doing it with us alone - end of thought. I'm making it with anyone who's here today; anyone here tomorrow."

That last - verse 15 - is a clause that follows a general statement. Hebrew often does that. They'll make a general statement; and then they'll break it down. What he is trying to do there is get the people to realize the covenant isn't just for today. The covenant is going to go on in history.

Question

In 15? See the "him" is italicized at least in my translation.

NKJ Deuteronomy 29:15 "but with him who stands here with us today before the LORD our God, as well as with him who is not here with us today

Those are two clauses just referring to - how can I say this? We use that kind of expression in our English. I remember being briefed when I was in the Air Force and we were going on a deployment where the commander got up and said, "With everyone of us here today, each one of you that is with us today." That's the way I remember him briefing. He meant the whole wing that we were part of - us. But then he's saying, "I want each one of you who is with us."

"Each one of you is part of the group" is what it means.

Okay, one more.

Question

Mike is bringing up the contemporary issue of the forsaking of capitalism because capitalism ultimately if you think of a free market; the problem with capitalism (the noun) is people often confuse crony capitalism where the big corporations get in bed with the politicians and ...That's not really a free market. The free market assumes that the government is going to control theft. That's ultimately what it's doing.

But the irony of the very same people who are objecting to capitalism's failure...It's very short sided to argue that way because if you look at the failure; the failure was not just in the big banks. The failure was in the government that was monitoring the big banks.

So then they're put in the position of saying that it was capitalism when really it wasn't. It was top down government management that failed. The idea is that you're going to increase government management - and increase the bureaucracy. That sounds like a real winner of a solution.

You see the only solution, people, to the freedom and lack of freedom is to go to legalism which means over regulation which means bureaucracy. You haven't gotten rid of corruption. The problem is sin.

Sadly what we need in this country is somebody on the magnitude of Billy Graham - somebody who has national stature to stand up and say, "The problem here people isn't Republican or Democrat. The problem is that you people are thieves. You have violated God's laws and you have hurt hundreds of thousands of men and women that are out of work not because of themselves but because of you people."

An indictment ethically and morally because ultimately concentration of power in government regulation... I mean come on! The government isn't competent to regulate. You're focusing more and more emphasis on a smaller number of people when the glory of the free market, the justification of the free market scripturally simply is this. Which is better - to have the entire economy controlled by 5 people or 1 million people? Now 1 million people aren't make big decisions. But there are going to be 850,00 making a decision this way versus 200 and some odd thousand working this way. So you're going to balance out. Everybody

won't be wrong, in other words. So yes, it's mediocre; but you don't have a catastrophe.

Think scripturally. Where is the only bureaucracy that you see in all of God's Word that works? It was mentioned just a few minutes ago. Joseph! There you had absolute concentrated power in the Egyptian economy. You had a government plan. Why could that work? It was a revelatory story. The point is you had omniscience input into the forecast of the future. But if you don't have omniscient revelatory input into the future, nobody knows the future. The future is speculation. To me that is so obvious - the political implications of the whole Joseph story.

So has government demonstrated in this last catastrophe it's capable of monitoring violations of regulations? You can't keep increasing regulations.

I mean, those of you who are parents. Now come one - those of us who have raised kids. You know very well that you can't have 500 regulations for your kids. You can't follow up on 500 regulations. And the kid knows it. So he ignores 490 of them. So now where does that leave you as a parent? It is far better to take 3 things and get it clear and follow it up, follow it up, follow it up. That's how you regulate.

Increasing regulations doesn't solve the problem. So that's one of the solutions every parent knows this. I mean, Lord, you're not a parent for than 8 months and you exhaust yourself unless you concentrate on a few things. Get a few lessons right. This is why (and we'll have to conclude because we've gone over tonight) - this is why, remember when I was going through capital punishment and I showed you the laws of evidence - very, very strict. I made the comment that capital punishment was probably rare in the Bible simply because you could not satisfy that two or three witnesses. So capital punishment was rare. But when it happened, what happened to the body of the person capitally punished? Remember? Put out on the road, wasn't it. Why do you suppose that was there? So that everybody that walks down that road sees the consequence.

"Oops! We'd better not do that."

The biblical emphasis is that you don't create thousands of laws. You concentrate on basic things.

Like he's saying, "Come on. I mean it doesn't require a PhD in ethics to figure out what went wrong here. It was simply greed and corruption and negligence on the part of the government - the bankers too! But, it as also the government. The people that wanted a house for nothing.