

Motives behind objections (short item)

- I want to deconstruct a common human tendency when confronted with the message of the Bible.
- The tendency is to question the claims of the Bible (and thus, God) and to cast doubt upon them.
- I want to consider this so you may be aware if you find others, or even yourself, doing this.
- First let's consider Motive
 - Broadly there are two reasons people ask questions about Christianity.
 - 1. One good
 - 2. One bad
 - (1) Some are genuinely inquisitive, even seeking to find a greater understanding of God themselves, and want to find answers.
 - This is legitimate and necessary.
 - (2) Others aren't really interested in finding answers because they've decided what they want.,
 - and that is not to be bothered by the claims of Christianity, because they want to live a lifestyle that is contrary to it.
 - This is because they wrongly assume this will make them free and therefore happy.
 - So the questions are simply bricks in a wall that they have built between themselves and God.
 - If a question gets sufficiently answered then they aren't actually happy because they'll need to find another objection to be a brick in their precious wall.
- This second tendency has been done since Satan questioned God's law in Eden
- Take one common objection people make, just as an example.

- The objection is something like this:

"God is unfair because I can't understand why He condemns us all based upon the sin of Adam. We are just doing our best. Why should we be condemned because He makes it hard to believe"

- Before I even answer this, let's just consider what this person is actually doing.
 - They are accusing God of wrongdoing, and they are excusing themselves and humanity.
 - Setting oneself up as a judge of God!
 - This is exactly the opposite of what the Bible encourages us to do.
- So the motive behind this is important.
 - They are attempting to do this because if God can be charged with unrighteousness then maybe blame can be deflected from humanity.

This was God's complaint of the human mistrust of Him in the book of Job: He says, "Wilt thou also disannul my judgment? wilt thou condemn *me*, that *thou* mayest be righteous?"

- But this is a foolish policy.

- It actually commits a couple of fallacies.
 1. The most obvious one is the incredulity fallacy.
 - That is disbelief in something based upon the fact that one cannot understand it.
 - By that reasoning most of us shouldn't believe in quantum mechanics!
 2. The second is a kind of tacit form of 'begging the question', or 'circular reasoning'.
 - You see this person is questioning the righteousness of God whilst assuming righteousness is something one might have without God - ie the concept of fairness.
- But where do you get the idea of 'fairness' from without God?
 - Why should fairness be important if there's no God?
 - Surely, if that's the case, then we're just matter that doesn't really matter!
- But if you are claiming there is a God but He's unfair, then presumably you believe He made everything, including you and your sense of fairness.
 - So what you are actually trying to do is to use your God given moral sense against the One who gave you that understanding in the first place.
 - In fact you are using the reason God gave you to say God is unreasonable!
- That's like using a telephone to accuse Alexander Graham Bell (the inventor of the telephone) of being against communication!
- When people do this, we might ask, "Are *you* really trying to accuse *God* of wrongdoing?"
- So let's answer this question anyway (even though the questioner may not be happy with us for doing so) because others may ask it genuinely, knowing that it is a problem with *their* understanding *not* God's righteousness.
- Why condemn us for Adam's sin?
 - Well, remember David and Goliath?
 - Goliath was the Philistine's champion - their representative.
 - If he won the battle with David then his whole army won, and if he lost, his whole army lost.
 - that was the deal, the agreement, the covenant.
- That's what Adam was.
- He represented all humanity.
 - Why?
 - Because there was an agreement, a covenant of works.
 - This was because he would do exactly as we all would do.
 - He was the champion, stronger than any of us - after all he had perfect free will.
- So God doesn't need to test us all because Adam already failed.
- He was a public person, our representative.
- The problem with the question (as with most similar questions) is that it makes an unwarranted assumption because of a lack of understanding.

- This assumption is that we are unrelated to Adam, and we would act differently.
- Both are wrong.

That is why Christ, being the 'second Adam' - our 'David' as it were - is so important.

- But this question is not really the point of this short item.
 - It's to try to show the fact that trying to accuse God is not a neutral action,
 - but is actually a great offense to God, tempting Him to wrath because of sinful, rebellious unbelief.
- God gives us all a natural understanding of His existence, and a moral sense (the conscience) to use to judge ourselves, not to try to judge Him.
- The Bible says God is perfectly righteous.
 - If we see something we don't understand in this respect, the right reaction should be to acknowledge that we are lacking in understanding, rather than jump to conclude that God is unfair, in order to excuse ourselves .
 - God will not hold us guiltless for doing such a thing.
 - Even a child can understand that if there's a difference between how we see things and what God says then we must be mistaken rather than *God*.
 - It's only our monstrous pride and the Tempter that makes us think otherwise.

I'll leave you with some verses from Romans 9

God says:

19 "Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus?"