

## Trends

- Nearly 88,000 people die in the U.S. annually from alcohol-related causes, the fourth leading cause of preventable death.
- In 2014, alcohol-impaired driving accounted for 9,967 deaths on U.S. highways (31% of overall driving fatalities).
- In 2010, alcohol misuse cost the U.S. \$249 billion.
- Alcohol contributes to over 200 diseases and injury-related health conditions.
- Globally, alcohol misuse is the fifth leading risk factor in premature death.

—via National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism

**Proverbs 23:31-32:** "Do not look on the wine when it is red, when it sparkles in the cup, when it swirls around smoothly; 32 At the last it bites like a serpent, and stings like a viper."

## Sentence Sermons

**"I am more afraid of alcohol than of all the bullets of the enemy."**  
—Stonewall Jackson

## News & Notes

- Please pray for those mentioned in the announcements after services and others listed on the bulletin board in the foyer of the church building.
- Pray for all the members at Westside! Please pray for Susan Ferrell and her family as she continues to recover from a brain tumor. Please pray for her and her family.
- Please pray for me. I'm happy to report that the lower back and leg pain have been getting much better. God answers prayer! I see my surgeon again on November 14th.
- Please pray for sister Virginia Brown. On November 14th she has a doctor appointment concerning her potential hip replacement.
- Pray for the all of our students. Schools are back in session and bring many temptations to our young people.
- Pray for Jonathan Kreilen. He has decided to leave law school and take a job using his accounting degree. Best wishes Jonathan!
- Please keep sister Wilma in your prayers! She gives all of us so much encouragement! God bless her and Virginia! Remember both of them in your prayers.
- There are many needy saints! Can you help?! Let me know.

**Words of Life** is published by the **Westside Church of Christ** meeting at 1301 N. Enterprise, Bloomington, IN 47404

**Times of Service:** Bible Study, Sunday 9:30 AM and Wednesday 7:00 PM; Worship, Sunday 10:30 AM and 5:00 PM

**Editor:** Craig Thomas (812-320-9569); [craigthomas82000@gmail.com](mailto:craigthomas82000@gmail.com)

Please direct questions and comments to the editor.

# Words of Life

Westside  
church of Christ

**"Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life."**

John 6:68



Nov. 13,  
2016

Vol. 8,  
No. 38

## Humanism's Hypocrisy

Joe R. Price

Everybody lives by some standard of right and wrong. Jesus said His word is the truth that saves us, the authority to which we are accountable, and the standard by which we will be judged in the last day (Jno. 8:31-32; 12:48-50). The Scriptures of Jesus Christ that tell us what is good and what is sin against God (2 Tim. 3:16-17; 1 Jno. 3:4). When we agree with the teachings of Christ's apostles, we uphold a divine standard, not a human one (Gal. 1:6-10).

Even those who deny the existence of God define themselves by a set of ethics. They perceive these ethics to be human in origin and accepted by the human race as necessary for the good of humanity. For instance, according to The American Humanist Association (AHA), "HUMANISM is a progressive philosophy of life that, without theism or other supernatural beliefs, affirms our ability and responsibility to lead ethical lives of personal fulfillment that aspire to the greater good of humanity" ("Good Without A God," pamphlet, AHA).

Humanists religiously promote a set of ethics, including "strong support of separation of religion from government, preservation and restoration of the environment, protection of civil rights and liberties, and promotion of personal choice regarding introduction of life (i.e., abortion, jrp), family structure (i.e., same-sex marriage, etc., jrp), and death with dignity (i.e., euthanasia, jrp) ... we are a community that encourages tolerance and nurtures diversity – we will not tolerate legally imposed sectarian judgements (sic), human rights violations, or discrimination in any form." (Ibid, emphasis theirs).

The hypocrisy of humanism is glaringly evident in this statement.

First, if there is no God, then who decides what is for the "greater good of humanity"? The AHA? Indeed, who decides what is morally good at all? Well, the humanist says, "Human beings decide for themselves what is moral and good, without a god." Yet, when human beings "legally" decide that it is good to oppose abortion, same-sex marriage and euthanasia, the humanists "will not tolerate" it. Why not? Because they intend to establish their own version of "good" – a society devoid of divine morality. They will decide for everyone else what is good. By attempting to do so, they defy their own "logic" and "ethics."

Therefore, one problem with the humanist philosophy is its attempt to establish a set of ethical principles (to define what is morally “good”) by using no standard greater than mankind’s own, self-defined goodness. Something is good to the humanist because they conclude it is good, not because there is an objective standard by which to test and determine (or discredit) whether it is morally good. Their inconsistency is their unwillingness to allow others to choose a different standard of goodness, namely, one that is built upon faith in God. They are intolerant of those who accept and agree to a God-given standard of moral goodness, while they plead for the right to choose a standard of moral goodness.

Another hypocrisy of humanism is seen in its plea for tolerance. While claiming to be tolerant, they are extremely intolerant of those who disagree with them. Their political objective is to obstruct and overthrow the will of the majority for the sake of their minority opinions. For example, humanists say every mention of God must be expunged from government-funded facilities, agencies and activities. They are not tolerant of religious freedom to exercise one’s faith without government interference. They demand the government interfere with the free expression of faith. Freedom “of” religion is interpreted by them to mean freedom “from” religion. They insist on freedom to choose no religion, yet demand others must choose no religion, too.

The Bible says, “choose for yourselves this day whom you will serve...but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord” (Josh. 24:15). We uphold the freedom of religious choice, while presenting the rational and reasoned evidence for the existence of God. His will should be chosen and preferred over the will of humans (Rom. 1:18-21; Col. 2:8-10; 2 Tim. 3:16-17). Christians are taught, “if it is possible, as much as depends on you, live peaceably with all men” (Rom. 12:18). When doing so, we will “obey God rather than men,” which puts us in conflict with the humanist (Acts 5:29). If humanists are truly committed to tolerance, they should tolerate Christians who conclude it is good and life-fulfilling to follow the Bible. Since they believe they can live “good without god,” they should not object to those who conclude we can be “good with God.” But, they are not, because darkness loves the darkness because it hides their sins from view (Jno. 3:19-21). Expose humanism to the light of truth and its sins against humanity become clear. It tolerates devaluing human life, and even murder in the name of tolerance (abortion and euthanasia). It cries out in rebellious defiance of what is good (Eph. 5:6-14).

The goal of humanism is the eradication of God from society – not the co-existence of believers and non-believers within a society. The AHA claims this goal by identifying itself as “An organization of people working for the advancement of humanism and humanistic change” (Ibid). Humanism denies God and believes man can save himself from the suffering and injustices people inflict on others. We believe Jesus Christ delivers us from sin, the source of suffering, pain and death (Rom. 5:6-11). We love each other, our neighbor as ourselves, because God first loved us (1 Jno. 3:7-11).

### A Question About ‘Pot Luck’ Dinners

Greg Gwin

*“I have seen Pot Lucks done in various ways. I grew up as a Lutheran and they’d*

*have quarterly Pot Luck’s in the building and had a kitchen. A couple of churches where I have worshiped would periodically gather together for a Pot Luck at members homes. No church funds were spent, and it was only announced that there was an invitation posted on the bulletin board. I have seen some groups that have regularly scheduled Pot Lucks with men designated on the official schedule to coordinate it. What level of oversight or involvement in such events by elders do you see as legitimate? How can such things be done properly or improperly? What level of fellowship could you have with these groups? For instance, if no church funds were spent, but the Pot Luck was organized under the authority of the eldership; would you have a problem with that? Could you worship there?”*

Thanks for your question. Here’s how I would approach this:

- We know that the church is not authorized to conduct common meals and social gatherings (1 Cor. 11:20-34).
- Church involvement is not limited to the expenditure of money from the treasury. If the church officially plans and coordinates such common meals, they are involved, even if no treasury money is spent.
- If the elders exercise oversight of such activities, then they are making it a work of the church.
- Announcements of such Pot Lucks may or may not constitute church involvement. This is a judgment area. But, where would we draw the line? Can we also announce baby showers, wedding receptions, retirement parties, family outings, birthday parties, etc.? All of these are in the realm of individual activities (no church involvement), and we wouldn’t want such to be announced in the assemblies. For the same reason, it seems best to not announce Pot Lucks in the assemblies. It is a judgment call, but a bad decision has the potential to set a precedent that can then lead to other problems.
- Fellowship decisions (‘can I worship with a church that does these things?’) will have to be decided based upon the church’s commitment to the Truth. If they are spending funds or exercising actual oversight of non-authorized activities, I couldn’t be in fellowship with that. If they make a judgment call about the announcements or what’s allowed on the bulletin board, I can submit to the decision even though I view it to be a poor judgment.

I hope this helps.

### A Flawed Comparison

Doy Moyer

Trying to compare drinking alcohol and other “bad habits” just doesn’t work, unless we are actually talking about drugs that significantly alter sobriety and the ability to make sound judgments. There are plenty of those types of drugs, but comparing drinking to eating donuts is ludicrous. We aren’t just talking here about long-term health. We are talking about the immediate effects that destroy one’s ability to think. If eating donuts does that to you, then by all means quit eating them. But I have yet to meet the person who destroyed a family or killed someone in a car wreck over losing one’s mind on donuts. If that kind of comparison is the justification for drinking today, then sell it elsewhere.