

## WORLDVIEW AND UNTRUTH

(June 1, 2025 Transcription)

By: Corbett Gaulden

We have been in pursuit of a more in-depth understanding of what Truth is. We are obviously handicapped by the fact that ordinarily, if we do a search or look in a dictionary for “truth,” we’re going to find a discussion about all kinds of essentially philosophical approaches, or other things like legally, what is truth and so forth. We spent a fair amount of time prior to today going through some of the machinations of all that stuff.

All along since the first session, this is the fourth session I believe, we’ve been preserving the idea of something called The Truth, a capital letter kind of thing. For something that is uniquely not all of the above that is uniquely in fact, not located in the context of human definition and establishing the case for the most part. And we will make other comments about that in subsequent sessions, establishing the case that the Truth, the one with the capital “T’s,” so to speak, is actually a phenomenon that is not to be found within the creation *per se*. At least not from the standpoint of the fullness of the Truth. The Truth finds its fullness in a larger context than the creation. And that’s kind of where we’ve gotten to.

Last time we looked at some of the deficiencies of human definition of the truth. We will go back and forth with that a bit through the rest of our studies. There should be, I believe it looks to me like, we’ll do either seven or eight total studies before we’re done because it is really a large topic.

One of the passages that we’ve looked at least twice, if not more, prior to now, is the one in John, I believe it’s chapter 16:13, where Jesus said, “the Spirit of Truth will lead you (or guide you) into all truth.” There are aspects of that which we haven’t gotten to yet, and there are yet some to come, with respect to fully “unpacking,” is the current term, everything that might mean for us, this Spirit who is going to guide us into all Truth. We must, I think, pause for a moment and ask ourselves, “Will He lead us into all the truth that can be comprehended in the context of the creation, or has He not some greater thing in mind?”

It doesn’t seem quite reasonable to me to assume that there is not something, let’s call it a repository of truth, beyond the creation to which that would at least partially apply. If that is the case, and I believe it is, then another question is: is all of what is actually the Truth to

be found outside the creation in its native form? I believe the answer to that question is yes, that the thing that I have referred to as The Truth, and that's easier to see in the transcripts because I've been fairly careful to preserve the capital "T's" and that sort of thing. Probably the truth into which the Spirit of Truth will guide us is The Truth that exists in the eternal. To the extent that we deal with truth in the here and now, what we will call the here and now inside the creation, we're dealing with something that is a bit different.

There are, in the world, many ideas about what truth is, and what are the things that are true? What are they? Is "this" thing true or is "that" thing true? And that leaves us human beings really in a situation of being in disagreement quite a bit. Because if we can't find, inside the creation, a more or less absolute compendium of Truth, then there are elements of things that we consider to be part of the Truth that we cannot find inside the creation. The Spirit of Truth, hopefully I've demonstrated adequately to you that the Spirit of Truth is the same personage as the Holy Spirit, who is the same personage as God the Spirit in the Godhead. So, when Jesus is using the term Spirit of Truth in that passage in John 16, He's referring to the Holy Spirit but particularly in the context of one of the functions of the Holy Spirit. That function of the Holy Spirit is to lead us into all Truth. In fact, that function of the Holy Spirit is to lead us into all the Truth, not just Truth, which leaves us with a slightly mushy feeling, but the Truth, something that at least in His mind, the mind of the Godhead, is complete. One of the characteristics of The Truth is that it is complete.

Now, for those of you that think about this, some are going to want to have a discussion, an argument in essence, about all the things in the world that are assumed to be truth, whether they're included in the definition of the Truth that is the thing that the Spirit is leading us into. He is not likely to be the author of confusion. Therefore, I think it's safe for us to say that He knows what the Truth is, better than we know. And that's why He's qualified to be the guide who is going to take us into all Truth. There won't be other, there won't be another guide. There will be human helpers. For example, in Ephesians, we are told that He gave some apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers and evangelist to help us out, to become the human face, to become the human voice that conveys the things of the Lord.

And we assume that the apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers and evangelists will not mislead us with untruth - at least not deliberately. The term false prophet also occurs, the term false apostle. These things occur in scripture because Paul anticipated for us that there would be personages who presented themselves, or were presented, as apostles or prophets or what have you, that were not actually apostles or prophets dealing in the Truth. There is in fact an entire anti-kingdom of God, a mockery, a thing that has the semblance

but is intended to deceive, mislead, and so forth. So, today, I want to just unpack a lot of that.

Now, it turns out that in the German language, occasionally, there are terms that these guys have come up with, theologians and philosophers in Germany (sometimes Austria), who create these amazing compound words. And these compound words are often very interesting to us, and you'll hear me on occasion, use a term, for example, like *Zeitgeist*. Now *Zeit* means time and *Geist* means ghost or spirit. So, *Zeitgeist* means the spirit of the times, the age that we're in, this age of darkness, trying to convey that there's a collective feeling in the world, at least by the majority of people or by the majority of people who can be influential, that a certain thing is true, or not true, or whatever.

The *Zeitgeist* evolves over time. It changes its mind depending on what or whom I perceive to be the master of the *Zeitgeist*. Well, they got another term, and I'm not going to spend more time on *Zeitgeist*. I was just reminding you of it. There's another term that has emerged in academic literature. Anyway, trying to express the idea of what we mean when we say worldview. And you hear us from time to time saying worldview and you hear it on or in the media, you read it in the media, etc. It's a word term used not extremely commonly, but often enough that you probably have encountered it, and you had a feel for what it was. This other term is *Überweltanschauung*. Worldview is *Weltanschauung*, which means worldview. There's another one *Überweltanschauung*, which refers to like a “first order” worldview. And I'm going to be speaking of worldview, I'm not going to spend all my time saying *Überweltanschauung* or *Weltanschauung* today, I'm going to say “worldview,” we all can relate to that a little bit better. Anyway, it's more comfortable to us.

The worldview is sort of the “master plan” for the things, the repository for the things that you believe, you have a worldview and in that worldview is a repository of your beliefs, attitudes, opinions and so forth, things of that sort. I don't want to get into the academics of all that because it gets silly really soon.

And our worldview can be very accurate, or it can be very inaccurate when compared to actuality or reality. An individual's worldview can be really linked well with the ordinary way that things are, or it can be poorly linked. The worldview purports, it believes itself, it presents itself as at least a form of truth in a large sense, not individual true things, but in a large sense of truth as a compendium of a bunch of little truths. Now, the worldview, does not prove its “truth.” It merely accepts it for some reason and includes it. A worldview that doesn't actually have to be consistent with itself. You could talk to a person who has a worldview in which they say this about something, and they say that about the same thing, and they contradict. And as long as that person doesn't find themselves bothered by the

contradiction, they can maintain both things in their worldview, more or less at the same time, as long as they're not trying to entertain both things at the same time.

Whatever one's worldview, one would like to believe that other people share that worldview. And in fact, there's a lot of what we these days are calling "opinion leading" that's all about having little elements of a worldview that we're trying to persuade other people to adopt. "If they'll see it my way," then there's some benefit to somebody, to them or to me or to us all. The worldview however, as I said, can't make things be true. It can only assume that they are, or more importantly, purport that they are, and tell other people that they are true.

For purposes of what we're attempting to accomplish, there are two primary kinds of worldview two *Überweltanschauungs*. One of those is what I would call a "natural worldview." And the other is an extra-natural worldview. The natural worldview is a term that refers to the physical, the material, the sensible. I use the word "sensible" here, not in the sense of being agreeable to people, but sensible in the sense of being able to "sense" it. Some of our terminology is a little ambiguous. And the word natural is used in a lot of different ways. I wanted to make sure that we understand that as I use the word, particularly in today's study, I will be referring to that which is tangible, physical, material and can be, in some manner, observed either by the ears, the eyes, or by the aided eyes, smelled or whatever.

That's the natural and the natural worldview, being one of the two *Überweltanschauungs*, is going to include only those things that are to be found in the creation. It can't include things that are not found in the creation by its very nature. It might have some consideration in the sense of the following statement. "Well, I've heard all that stuff about God, and I don't believe it."

A natural worldview would preclude an active knowledge of God. Some people that have a natural worldview would say, "Well, yeah, I believe in God," but that belief has no meaning to them. It's a thing they can't really explain nor are they in any way answerable to it. So, when we're done with that, if you examine it – and I recommend you do this some night when you're suffering from insomnia. Ask yourself, "Where do people get the things that they put into their natural worldview?" On the surface, we would like to say, "Well, things like science, and you know, but kind of, you find things by looking for them or by bumping into them or something like that." That would be a way that we would think about a natural worldview.

But what's *true in the natural worldview*? If you are following the ongoing debate on climate change, for example, you'll note that while climate change has had pretty strong support, not the universal support that media people report on because of their ignorance but a pretty good bit of support among people who are of, let's say a scientific community. The problem with that is that it is now a debate in which some leading science of climate scientists are saying, "Hey, wait a minute, this thing has been taken too far," which is true. Which of those things is true that it is all the disastrous thing that a young woman from Sweden says it is, or is it maybe not so terribly disastrous? And in fact, according to some, not even necessarily disastrous, even though it will result in change.

And the fellow who originally came up with the idea that turned into climate change once said in an interview, "I didn't mean that. All I was talking about was pollution." He wasn't talking about climate change. "I was talking about pollution being hard to deal with, expensive, and so forth and so on." There is not then a universal, natural truth for that particular scientific idea of climate change, disastrous climate change. Yes, climate changes. I think pretty nearly everybody agrees on it. This month is May, typically April here is pretty wet, and May is not so wet, but our May has been probably as wet as our April was. So, things have changed. By the way, right now, according to my watch, it's 84 degrees outside. If what they say is true, it'll be 90 something later today. And that means the climate will have changed.

Now, obviously, I'm talking about a micro change. I say that merely to make a point that if the natural worldview depends on the truth that it contains, it has a problem almost automatically because it will claim truths, but it has no way of actually knowing. They just claim that truth because it heard it from some reputable source or something like that.

And it's going to be much more concerned with all the little micro-truths that go together to make it up. Then we can believe that the Truth concerns itself with such things because it isn't wrong, this position. We're taking anything we find in the Truth isn't wrong. Now, this natural, physical, material, tangible worldview stands in contrast to what I have called an "extra natural" one, which is based in eternity. That worldview consists essentially of absolutes. Everything that's contained, if we could find the thing called The Truth and look into it and live long enough to do a full examination, we would find there is nothing in it that can be shown to be not true. There is no shadow of untruth in the absolute eternity-based worldview. (That's what I just called an extra natural worldview.)

Now there are lots of ways to talk about worldview. Besides what I've just done. It's just an introduction, and there are many natural worldviews. For example, there's a historically

significant debate about the worldview generally held in oriental countries, of more interdependence among people and the more independent worldview of western peoples. This is an example of worldviews or significant parts of worldviews in the world. There's not a natural worldview, there are worldviews, whatever they may be, that are natural. I'll go so far as to deposit with you the following idea. There are approximately as many worldviews of a natural kind as there are persons who have natural worldviews. That's very unlikely if you really probe them, to find them to be totally consistent from person to person.

I will not suggest that if you and I both had full access to the library that contains the Truth in an eternal sense that we would both find all the same things or interpret them the same way. But that's not the point I'm talking about, I'm talking about the actual content of those worldviews. So, for our sake, I'll talk about natural and extra natural worldviews, not as being exclusive of one another, however. The reason I want to make that clear is that the extra natural worldview does not discard, necessarily, any elements of a natural worldview. It doesn't have to if a thing is obviously true in nature. For example, the extra natural worldview does not consider it to be untrue or anything like that. But it has a different perspective from which that thing would be viewed, even though it is viewed as true in a natural micro sense. The natural worldviews, almost by definition, certainly for people who think about what they believe, will exclude and even deny that there is anything extra natural from the world, from the contents of that worldview. The consequence of that is that room one and room two, room one will look very real and room two won't exist in the mind of a person in the natural worldview. A person with an extra natural worldview will say, "Room one exists and room two exists. In fact, from our perspective, room one exists because room two existed and caused room one to come into existence." That is, what is extra natural, what is eternal caused what is not eternal, what is natural, to come into being. In other words, God created heavens and earth. It is the perspective that we will typically take. So, what our worldview is going to be for us some kind of compendium, whether we are able to articulate all that or not, a compendium of what we believe, what we know to be true because we can "know" something to be true when it actually isn't.

That's one of the problems that human beings have. "I know this, but it isn't actually true." We don't say that part. It turns out that everybody else knows better or knows differently than the one who makes (in their mind) that sort of statement. So, I don't want to spend really any more time right now on the concept, the phenomenon of worldview, except that you hear us say it, and it's a shorthand way of saying that it's a collection of all the knowledge, the attitudes, the opinions and so forth that people have or may have. And that's generally how we will see it from a human perspective.

But from a supernatural, extra natural, or eternal perspective, the worldview will be that the Truth is the Truth, whatever the alternative points of view are that men may have. I'm going to be so bold now as to say that God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit have the same worldview. I'm going to go a little bit further and say that that's important to Them. And that's why one of the functions of God the Spirit is to lead us into all the Truth, to lead us to have with Them, that worldview, that extra natural worldview that is eternal in its nature.

It's actually a tough thing to do because we live in the now, we live in the natural creation. So, for us to have a worldview that is composed of things that are greater than the creation will sometimes put us into a position of conflict. And we should be relatively certain about the things that we believe, that we purport are eternal. So that if we say they are, they are in fact properly aligned with that which is eternal and not just our own beliefs and preferences and opinions and things of that sort. One of the ways that we humans have of making truth be what we want it to be is to impose our point of view on that which is eternal.

I'll give you an example of a thing we've already discussed briefly. The first great Church conference in Nicea, the Council of Nicea, came about largely because a fellow named Arius took the position that Jesus was created, was not actually consubstantial with the Father – that He was created.

And that there was a philosophical, theological argument that ensued from that in a variety of forms. I believe the fellow Athanasius, an Egyptian bishop, was the one who said “no, we can do better than that”. And so, one of the main issues that the council at Nicea was whether Jesus was consubstantial with the Father and they added on at that time really for the first time in the literature, I've been able to find that the Spirit was also consubstantial. Well, that's a truth or it's not, it either is or it isn't. If I believe that it is as it is, then I'm believing that which is eternal, it really is that simple.

Well, I believe that which is eternal? Jesus said “The only way to the Father is through me.” Well, I believe that, or I don't believe that because you'll hear men say there are many ways to God. That's either true or it's true that there's only one way to God. One of those is likely to be the eternal Truth, not necessarily out of my preference, but out of its actual content. So, we'll discuss, on another occasion, content of the things that we believe, propose, suppose, etc, in more depth. Why am I spending so much time doing this? Because I just love to do research. Well, that's not really the answer. The answer is I think it's important as we prepare ourselves for that which is to come, to have a pretty good handle on what it is as opposed to what we wish it would be. I'm (maybe) offensive when I say this, I don't believe it's about eating pie in the sky with Jesus in the sweet by and by. That's not it. It's cute. It

rhymes, but that isn't it. In fact, the purpose isn't that we be in the sky or in heaven in the long run.

As I read the book in (Revelation) chapter 22, that's going to come here, not here actually, but to the new earth. That's going to take the place in this new earth, whatever that is, is going to actually come here so that we can dwell with God and He with us. That's what the book says. Nothing about pie in the sky. OK. So, it behooves us I think, as serious persons, to go deeper into these things than we have historically done.

Now, at this point, I'm going to totally change here. It's as though another thing is about to happen. I want to simply establish the worldview thing because it's already been mentioned and get some sense for you as to what I mean and what I hope most others mean when they say "worldview" in the world. People will say "worldview," and the definition will look about the same, it'll just have different content. So that'll be a natural worldview. I mean, I hope a worldview that says that the essential content is eternal in its nature, and it is found in The Truth to which if I'm willing to go. The Spirit of Truth is leading me and you into all of it.

So, I'm switching gears now. I'm going to talk about untruth – that which is not true is untruth. Sort of. You could make that into a definition, whatever isn't true, is "untruth." In Latin there's an interesting word *mendacium*, that's what it means. It means untruth. It shows up in the English language. We speak, for example, a person exhibiting mendacity is dishonest. That's mendacity. "That was a mendacious lie." That's basically redundant. A mendacious lie is a lie that's a lie. Well, yeah, it sort of means lie. It really means untruth.

Now, the Greek is slightly different, and that's what we encounter in the biblical text. Pseudo *pseudos* we use in English like we say something is pseudo this or pseudo that to us. Usually when we say pseudo, it means "not exactly," but in scripture, when we use the word pseudo, it means "false." For example, the term *pseudoprophetes* is used in scripture in a few places, it means false prophet, not sort of like a prophet but a false prophet. We use, as I said, we use the word *pseudos*, some sort of but not quite, somebody that's sort of a prophet. But not quite a prophet is not a prophet. So, the Greek sense of it is more definite than the English borrowing. It has to do with things that are false.

They are mentioned in, I'm going to forget now, I think it's in Thessalonians, but I'm not positive. So don't worry about that. *Pseudochristos*, pseudo-Christ, false Christ plural. Pseudo Christos or antichrists. *Anti* means against *pseudo* means false. So, there are these falsenesses in the world that we bump into that have the word pseudo attached to them.

In a little bit, I'm going to mention a passage of scripture. I'm mentioning it now because I'm going to mention it. That seems silly. John 8:44 in which Jesus equates or doesn't



equate, gives two of the properties of Satan. One is that he's a liar, the father of lies and a murderer. So, lying and murder, as I move into untruth, have a relationship with each other. It's not about murdering the truth, although some people do that. It's about falseness sometimes. Of course, we lie because we believe in something that isn't true. But we believe it, we actually believe it because we heard it, we are drawn to it by what is to us an acceptable authority. And so, we believe it and when we repeat a lie like that, we're just repeating a lie. We're not necessarily lying, you know. So, our motives matter a little bit.

What is our purpose in saying the thing? I say it because I believe it. And the topic is part of the current conversation; it isn't necessarily a lie then, it's more of a mistake that we make, not knowing, not verifying and so forth and so on.

One of the big things you probably see going on nowadays is the rather public debate that the media are having with themselves about verifying the veracity, the truth of things that they say. Sometimes they can't resist; it's so salacious, so exciting, so energizing that they can't resist failing to find out whether it's true or not. It turns out in the world finding out whether it's true or not can be awfully difficult to do. But we sure don't want to pass up the opportunity of participating in some story, for example, in the media. That's become part of this whole misinformation, disinformation, bunkery, all of that stuff that has become so much a part of our vocabulary, but it's kind of fun to watch it.

So, then there are those things that even scripture engages in that we might call provisionally for the moment exaggeration or hyperbole. A passage might say all the people in a place were killed, and the survivors, this happened to them. Well, it can't be that all of them were killed and there were survivors; that really can't happen. And it is hyperbole. There are places in scripture; Jesus himself used hyperbole to stress the thing to make it apparent that it was a really, big deal, not just a fact in passing.

And then there are the parables. So far as we know the parables that Jesus used and on occasion, some of the prophets also repeated parables to the people – to the Israelites – that were stories that contained a truth, but the actual characters and events didn't exactly take place as presented in the parable. A certain rich man traveled to some place far away, and he called his servants in and did this, that, and the other. It's a way of conveying a truth wrapped in this story that according to Jesus, the people could accept. But He would tell the more fundamental the underlying things to the apostles. If you recall, He actually said that in one place. So, they said, “What does that mean?” And He said, “You know, it's just a parable. I do that because people can't handle the truth, basically. Or they're not that interested in the truth. They just want to see the cool stuff like food that gets all over the

place, or sick people getting up, things of that sort. That's why they come and, you know, they say "I'm not that much interested in the Truth," but I give them the Truth wrapped in parables that are very earthy. A certain rich man. . . Ok? That evokes to some he was getting ready to go on a long journey. That evokes something. Did he check with TSA? No! Those kinds of things, and he called in his servants, and he gave them whatever it was he gave them. And he gave them certain instructions about what to do with what he gave them. That carries a lot of meaning, even though he's not talking about specific people or explicit events rather things that can be seen in principle in the parable.

But there is a third category, if you will, of motivation having to do with untruth, that we will call deception. Call it deception because the lie, you know, it was such a stark word. It's a lie. One of the interesting things you probably have noticed is that in the public space, not so much in our ordinary dealings with other people, if somebody's got a megaphone or a bullhorn, what's coming out of it is a really loud exclamation of something that's obviously not true. I have this down as the, the phenomenon of "shouting to make it true," shouting to be seen, shouting with a purpose of defining what is actual in favor of an idea that the person purports is either more important or more fundamental than the actual truth.

In the cinematic presentation of the story *Fiddler on the Roof*, which was in theaters and everything, very successful (before most of you were born), a long time ago, there's a section of the story where the main character takes into the home an itinerant Jewish fellow, a young man who'd been off to university in Kiev, and he's kind of philosophical, political in his orientation. And he's kind of given the right to speak to the children of the fellow, the main character. And so, there's a scene where he's dealing with the younger daughters of the milkman, and he's quoting something about Jacob and Laban. And he's talking about the story of Jacob confronting Laban over his wages and everything right before he left, or actually after he left, when Laban caught up with him, and he says to the little girls. "So, you see Children, rich men always lie," because that was a popular socialist theme 100 years ago, rich men always lie. That's what you get out of the story of Jacob and Laban.

Oh, there's so many wonderful things in the story of Jacob and Laban that don't have anything to do with lying. Yes, he was a deceiver. So was Jacob. They were both deceivers. That wasn't the point. The point was God was establishing some things about the destiny and the inheritance to come. And He was using these two characters in that process. So, deceptions or lies or whatever you want to call them, prevarications, fibs, we don't like the word lie. So, we say fib, white lie, that softens it up a little bit. Oh, that's a black lie makes it worse than a white lie, that kind of thing.

You know, we do that, we fiddle around with lies in terms of some qualitative or even quantitative, by implication, some quantitative aspect of them. That's like 100% lie versus 60%; a 60% lie is just not as bad (we think). Maybe because the consequences aren't as great, or something like that. Why do we do that? And I say we, so I want to examine a little bit about untruth because I want us actually to come away with something to remember this thing.

What I'm going to give you to remember here is not an absolute parallel, but it's a parallel that, nonetheless, we can hang on to, I believe fairly well, in dealing with the idea of truth and the counter idea of untruth or pseudo truth. You know, if truth is one thing, then untruth is another thing. And the way I want us to look at that is light and darkness. In John 1:4-5, John talks about "light." In Genesis, scripture speaks of when the light came, there was light and the "darkness could not comprehend it," could not overcome it. We have difficulty in our translation at that point.

It's kind of like our own common experience in the world. If you go into a dark room, and you turn on your flashlight, or flip on the light switch, the light comes on, and there's less darkness. You can't flip the switch that turns on the darkness. There isn't such a switch. There's only the switch that turns on the light, and the light overcomes the darkness, and the darkness can't do anything about it. The darkness has no will, and we could even go so far as to say, the darkness has no substance. It's not substantial in and of itself, light is substantial in and of itself. And wherever it goes, if there's darkness there, that's how we're going to know the light came by the way; there was already darkness there. Going into a well-lit room and turning on your flashlight doesn't accomplish much. For example, then light and darkness are related in this way. We could say that darkness is un-light, or lightness is un-darkness, or something.

We could, you know, we could play with things and make those kinds of statements. But what we're going to do in order to move through this is to compare that parallel thing to truth and untruth because it has the same kind of structural idea as light and dark. By the way, in Greek light is *phos*, and darkness is *scotia*; neither one of them is related to the other one (grammatically); the word root, entirely different word roots. So, the light is one thing, darkness is another thing, but it's not substantial. When light comes darkness – someplace in the scripture even talks about darkness flees away when the light comes.

Jesus brought no darkness with Him. He brought only light. In fact, "that light is the life of men." Truth and untruth have a similar relationship to light and dark. They, by the way, don't have any similarity grammatically in Greek, or in English. We make, we say truth into untruth, or a lie. But when we say untruth, we're making it sound like the two words are

somehow related, but they're actually not in the Greek. *Eletheia* being truth and *pseudos* being untruth are just simply not related to one another.

So, if we have an untruth, and it comes into the presence of truth, then the untruth is exposed in the same sense that darkness is exposed when light comes to where darkness is. The untruth, in that sense, will “flee away” from the presence of truth.

One of the reasons we are what we are, one of the reasons that so much of what we do involves the spoken word and the written word, is that if the written word and the spoken word contain truth, then untruth is unseated by them. Untruth has this characteristic though in that the enemy, the father of *pseudoi*, the father of lies, the liar, the father of liars attempts to use deception to obscure what truth is, as he did from the beginning with Eve, he attempted to obscure the Truth. The words that he used were mostly essentially present in God's original prescription, but he used them differently in order to confuse the woman. She didn't have to listen. In fact, the person responsible for her didn't have to permit her to listen. He chose to, whatever his reasons were. And she was then deceived.

Paul even addresses this in scripture in one place. He said a woman shouldn't pray or prophesy with her head uncovered “because of the angels.” He's not talking about obviously the angels of light but of darkness that she should be not deceived and overcome. So, untruth will attempt, and it is actually an attempt, to obscure the Truth to keep the human mind, the mind of the hearer of the lie, from correctly perceiving the truth. We choose to incorrectly perceive truth and believe the untruth, because typically the untruth suits our fancy.

That one, I know, might be one you'll want to think about. And if you grow angry, just send me a text or something, we choose ordinarily between truth and untruth. If we know what The Truth is, then we know what The Truth is. When we don't, we may accept an untruth as being the Truth because it suits us. When we hear an untruth, when we hear a lie, if that doesn't suit us, then we don't believe it. But if it suits us, we have a tendency to believe it, if we don't know what the Truth is.

And so, part of our existence is involved in cooperating with the Spirit of Truth who is trying to lead us into all Truth. Because when we come to the place where we have access to all the Truth, then untruth will simply have no actual power any longer. Wouldn't it be great if we lived in a world in which untruth had no influence over us at all? Of course, it would, except we would miss it because truth wouldn't necessarily suit us.

Sometimes truth is offensive to us. If it can be shown to us that in the eternal Truth, in the context of eternal Truth, there's a certain attitude that we have, that is wrong, that is evil or wicked. If that can be shown to us, and we really like that attitude, we'll just say, “Well, no, I

don't agree with that, or you're misinterpreting that," or some other mechanism, some other thing will be erected to enable us to accept that the untruth is more nearly valid than the actual truth is.

One of the questions this causes to emerge is, can we turn untruth into truth? Can we take some untruth that we hear and say, "Well, I know that's not true, but if I fiddle with it a little bit, I can turn it into the truth." That's kind of like saying, "Can we convert darkness into light?" No, we can't. But we can bring light to where the darkness was. I'm sorry, we can't convert untruth into truth. Nor in the eternal can Truth be made to be untruth. We cannot go before the Almighty and say "There's something about the way you see things that I don't like. And you and I have to have an agreement that we're going to change the way we see that to suit me." You've done it. But it wasn't successful. the Truth didn't change. I say you've done it because you're a human being. I don't that know you have, but it's a thing we humans do. We want things to suit us, and we try to change truth into untruth. We can't do that. It's not the actual Truth.

The eternal Truth is eternally inviolable. It will not, does not, and cannot change because it is of the properties of the Almighty Himself. So instead, we use our little untruths or fibs and white lies and prevarications and things of that sort to console ourselves for having decided to have our own way, in spite of what we know to be the truth. Someone who deliberately creates or shares an untruth has a motivation for doing that. There's a reason they do it, and that is to darken, or to obscure, say, my perception or your perception of what the Truth is, to darken or obscure that.

My goodness. You can find hundreds of books on theology that disagree with each other. Obviously, they can't all be right. Some of them strenuously disagree with others. Going back to the case of the Arian debate at the first Council of Nicea. Arius said Jesus was created. Athanasius said, "No man, it can't be." And the bishops agreed with Athanasius, and they gave us the principle of consubstantiality to support that decision. So, untruth cannot bring light into a dark situation. Truth can bring light using that parallel that I was talking about a few minutes ago. Truth brings light and here's the thing, Truth won't bring darkness, untruth will bring darkness, but it can't or won't bring light.

Light's better. Light has life in it. What does darkness have in it? I'm not doing shows of hands and interruptions today, darkness has death in it. That being the absence of life, darkness being the absence of light, untruth being the absence of truth.

These things must be absolute in God, in the eternal Truth. They must be, I mean there's no other sense that can be made of this, and our diddling with it doesn't change it. I mentioned earlier, the word *pseudos* that's used in the New Testament *koine* to refer to the

lie. We attach it to things in the New Testament and in common parlance, it's hard to attach a prefix for truth.

Truth stands alone. I've talked to you a little bit about little white lies and things of that sort. You don't have little white truths. We don't, we don't have a variety of ways of dancing around the word truth because it is, in itself, already absolute, even in the absence of an awareness of the eternal, it is already an absolute in and of itself. And when we quibble about it in the public space, we're simply disagreeing about its content because we know (think) we can get away with it in a worldview that says we can. We talked in the second session, somewhat anyway, about the evolution, if you will, of social philosophy to now we're in a post-postmodern point of view that says, "Well, it might not have been true when you said it, but because you want it to be true, it became true when you said it." So meaning is whatever I meant for it to mean when I meant for it to mean something. And later, I can even change my mind about that, if I want to without recant, just simply change my mind.

In Genesis 4, we have a narrative of the relationship between two brothers. ~~They were twin brothers and so they had some things in common. They had originally been wombmates /~~ *don't know what I was thinking about in saying that.* They were abroad in the world under the tutelage of their Father, the first man whose name is given us in scripture as Adam, which also means mankind. And a lot of scholars will stop right there and quibble about that. It's not really referring to somebody specific, it just means mankind except that when you read the genealogies, his name is in there. It is Adam, not Bob, or something else.

This fellow had these two sons, and we're going to assume there's no reason to believe that he didn't know that it was important to share with them something about what was right and wrong, and true and false. Given his experience with the difference between those things, it would be ridiculous to say he never taught the boys anything. And they apparently became grown men and in time were engaged in their own pursuits. And in the fourth chapter, we encounter them without any mention of their Father, but we know who he was because they told us that in the third chapter.

One of these fellows was a farmer named Cain, the older of the two was a farmer and his somewhat younger brother, Abel, was a man of herds and flocks. He raised animals and I'm assuming he consumed animal products like milk and butter, and perhaps meat, although meat's not specifically mentioned until, oh, where, the 9th or 10th chapter of Genesis where God told Noah, "You can eat anything you want to now, pretty much."

But there came a time they were aware they needed to do sacrifices. This is one thing; it's kind of a mystery. How did they know that? Did Adam tell them they needed to do sacrifices? Did they make it up? Did they have a meeting and say; "You know what, we've

been doing a few things wrong. Maybe we need to offer up some sacrifices and get back in God's good graces." Whatever it was, they decided to offer sacrifices. So, Abel gave of the first of his flocks in that year, herds and flocks. And Cain gave some veggies and grains, etc., whatever it was, what the composition of those things were, two different kinds of offerings, sacrifices.

And without being told explicitly why, Scripture merely tells us that God accepted Abel's sacrifices; they were more pleasing to Him than Cain's. Now, we speculate about the shedding of blood in the case of Abel's sacrifices, shedding of blood being important and there's a whole teaching all by itself. I'm not going to get into right now. And Cain's being of a lower order in some sense, less palatable or less appropriate to the occasion than were Abel's. And Cain got all ticked off about the whole thing. You know: "Why do you like my little brother better than you like me," and all this kind of stuff. None of us ever does anything like that. But Cain did. And God said: "Man, what are you yelling about? Had you done the right thing, we wouldn't be having this discussion." I'm paraphrasing.

This indicates to me that Cain knew better before he did it. And now he's being mad anyway, because of the consequences of having done it. I love that. It never happened to me! Anyway, when Cain was done with his fit, and he had had his counsel with God, God left him.

Apparently, Cain went and found his brother Abel and said: "Hey man, you know, let's work through this in some manner." And they went out into a field, which I assume was an agricultural place, probably a place where Cain grew crops. Then he killed his brother, shed his brother's blood, in the field. That was unacceptable to God; even though the shedding of blood previously at the hand of Abel, in the matter of offering sacrifices was acceptable. It wasn't about the blood; it was about whose blood and the circumstances of the murder.

Now, we don't know what Cain told Abel. I mean, he suggested to him that they go walk in the field together. We suspect the possibility of some misleading taking place. "Hey, there's something I want to show you. Hey, I'm over it now, let's go across the field here to our tents and, and have a good whatever." I don't know.

But in John 8:44 Jesus specifically links the lie to murder. That's right there, John 8:44. I intended not to have to look things up today, but that's important enough, I'm going to go ahead, John 8:44. He's speaking to the Pharisees, and He said: "You are of your father, the devil, and your will is to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning and doesn't stand in the truth." He is linking murder and lies. "He doesn't stand in the Truth because there is no truth in him. He speaks – when he lies, he speaks out of his own character because he's a liar and the father of lies, this murderer, the father of lies."

Perhaps you'll recall our previous discussion. I mentioned a fellow named George Orwell who wrote a book that you're probably at least have heard of, even if you never read it, 1984. And it's a delightful book to read. In some places, it's infuriating, but it's delightful to read nonetheless. And Orwell was a philosopher. He was a socialist, sort of, and a philosopher, and he had this to say about politics: "Politics makes lies sound truthful and murder to be respectable." Isn't that interesting? A man, who was essentially an atheist, links murder and lies. The ultimate purpose of the lie, in the long run, is to so deceive the other that they lose their capacity to lay hold on the truth, which ultimately results in death – the lie and death, particularly the lie and the kind of death that is purposed by another are related to one another. It's not just a matter of getting our own way, then. It might be a matter of getting our own way at the expense of others. That is this lying thing.

This Spirit of the Truth, Spirit of Truth, the Spirit of the Truth in Greek. And Greek has definite articles everywhere. The Spirit is spoken of in Isaiah 11. It speaks of things that have to do with knowing and processing and thinking, speaks of the Spirit of knowledge and understanding and wisdom and counsel; those four along with some other things. And wisdom and understanding and counsel and even knowledge can be natural, or they can be extra natural.

What I mean is we can become so much a servant to what we perceive to be important to us in untruth, that we simply have no true knowledge or understanding or wisdom. Someplace in scripture it even says that the wisdom of this world is not to be compared. It's like foolishness compared to the wisdom of God. Folks, this is a contrast.

Today, I've spoken of contrasts between that which is actually true in the sight of God, and what we do with it as those who have an opportunity to consider what the Truth is in a spiritual matter, as over against the world full of people who don't know there is a spiritual reality. They only have the lie or the shades of untruth that are presented as though they were Truth because there's no truth to which to compare them.

The natural worldview isn't based on Truth. It's based on shades of either crippled or deliberately obscured things that are called Truth when they're not, because Truth is not the thing that they are. The words of truth may be there. But the thing has been so adulterated by the father of lies, in whom there is no truth, who never speaks anything that is true, and who must be the master of this age because this age denies the Almighty. If that one, the Satan, the father of liars, the father of lies, the murderer in his heart, who seeks by the way, your murder through the lie; as long as he is permitted to be the god of this age, as long as he is permitted to be the inherent empowerment of the *Zeitgeist*; as long as that's true, then a natural worldview doesn't have room in it (for the Truth).



Well, the Truth that we're talking about when Jesus says: "I'm the way, the Truth, and the life," the natural worldview has no place for that. So, you already knew it, but I'm saying it. That's part of the reason I'm pursuing these things with you is to get far enough down in it, to enable us to not be confused, or to have the Truth be obscured by something that looks like the Truth, but that suits something other than the purposes of the will of God. That doesn't mean that He's going to not let you have what you want. That's our biggest fear, is that God won't let us have what we want. It doesn't mean that. It means the Truth isn't what we very frequently perceive it to be, it is not what we perceive. The Truth is other than what we perceive when we choose to believe incorrectly.

Now in another session, maybe the next one or the one after that, I want to spend a good bit of time going through belief and faith and attitudes and things of that sort in more detail about what those things are because they will help us put a foundation under the idea of having access to the Truth, even now while we live in the flesh. The flesh, according to Paul in two places, is at war; the flesh, that is your outward person in the world, is at war with your inward person, who is spirit. It's a war. There is no truce. There is no time out, there's no trading of prisoners. It's a war.

The Spirit of the living God produces in you, and in me, as we permit things like love, joy, peace, kindness, goodness, meekness, long suffering, even self-control. What an idea.

They are never produced in the flesh. The flesh is ministered to by other ideas – the fruits of the lie. See how simple all this is when you really get down in there and dig into it a bit? Now it's OK to us. We typically think anyway, maybe you won't after this, but we typically think it's OK for me to take it or leave it about this kind of stuff.

You know, sometimes I can think about it and be "all holy" and other times I don't necessarily want to be "all holy." So, I won't think about it much. You know, that kind of thing. We do that sort of thing as human beings because the flesh is at war with the spirit. Your spirit doesn't give way to those things. The flesh (*sarx*) is at war with the spirit (*pneuma*). All kinds of things are produced when we introduce the flesh, when we entertain the flesh, instead of entertaining the spirit man that is within us. The mind is trapped in this battle between the two, and it's not something we escape during life, during biological life (the *bios*). We don't escape it while we live in the flesh. This natural body, it is a component of being in the creation as human beings. Now we can say that's all Eve's fault. She's not here. So, I don't have to pay attention. No, that's not the same.

The corruption came, and death came. God spoke to Adam about the tree, about eating the fruit. He said: "don't do that, because in the day you do *mote tamoot*, dying, you will die." We've had a terrible time translating that for a long time. And I don't know how that

dispute and translation will ever be resolved. But I paraphrase it myself to mean. "In the day that you eat that fruit, you will introduce death into the world. There's not been death before. Once you do that, there will be death." Not instantaneous, not going to do the lightning bolt thing. That's not what it was. It took him nearly 1000 years to die. But death was introduced, nonetheless.

With death comes corruption, with death comes darkness, not life. Life comes with light, death comes with darkness. With life comes truth, with death comes the lie. And we even have human agency in the form of murder to get us there. The lie leads to murder, which of course, introduces us into the state of death and not life.

That was about as heavy as I wanted to be today. You're encouraged. I think, more and more, I'm going back through the things that are in the transcripts, and I believe it's of value to read them. Some of the things that we're doing are clearer when you can kind of soberly read and reread a piece. If He leads us into all Truth, then what Truth will He not lead us into? If He leads us into all Truth, and He is called the Spirit of Truth, into what untruths will He lead us? Those kinds of things. They don't jump out, I don't necessarily say, but they're there.

If He will lead me into all Truth, then there's no Truth into which He will not lead me. If I decide for myself what truth I'm going to get led into, then it's my truth and it's meaningless. It's a lie. It's a deception. It is darkness. It is the fruit of darkness. It's the child of darkness when I decide about the truth in my flesh. When I discover the Truth in the company of the Spirit of the living God in my spirit, it is the Truth. It has no darkness in it. It has no death in it.

I'm presenting these things very dichotomously, because we have lost our sense of the absoluteness of who God is. Some of our loss of that sense is deliberate, and some of it is what somebody told us, some of it. I had (there was) a fellow one time. He was fairly important (to me) at the time. Anyway, he was a fairly important person in my life. We were talking about something, and he said, "Well, what do we believe about that?" What he meant was, "What do we Baptists believe about that, huh?" Well, that's not the point, what the Baptists believe about that doesn't have anything to do with your behavior unless you become informed that it's a Baptist doctrine. And then you have to decide how you're going to figure out how to break it, violate it, or something like that, or decide not to. Oh, ok. So, the Baptist doctrine is, you shouldn't drink any alcohol. Ok. Well, I'll quit drinking beer. I've never heard anybody make a declaration like that, "Because the doctrine said so, I won't do it." I don't want to be offensive, but, you know, the doctrine of transubstantiation calls for a belief in me that I just can't get; I can't get there with transubstantiation. I don't know how much difference it actually makes, except that I can't get there. It just, my mind slides right

off of it. I fully understand the communion. I just can't handle the transubstantiation. And in a way you could say, well, it doesn't make much difference, except that to someone who believes in transubstantiation, they will embrace it as being something that is salvific in its nature, when, for them, it's nothing but an event. We need to know what it is we believe, and why we believe it. We'll get to that, that'll be in another session. Ok.