

# Light Brings Salt

Volume 6, Issue 01

January 6, 2007



## Iron Range Bible Church

*Dedicated to the Systematic Exposition of the Word of God*

*"Sanctify them in the truth: Your word is truth."*



### DELIVERANCE

C. H. Mackintosh

When a Christian dies and goes to heaven he is completely delivered from the power of sin. It is manifestly impossible that sin can have any power or authority over a dead man. But it is not so readily seen or admitted that the believer, even now, is as thoroughly delivered from the *power* of sin as though he were dead and gone to heaven. Sin has no more dominion over a Christian than over a man who is actually dead and buried.

We speak of the *power* of sin, not of its presence. Let the reader carefully note this. Regarding the question of sin, there is this material difference between a Christian here and hereafter. Here, he is delivered only from the power of sin; hereafter he will be freed from its presence. In his present condition sin dwells in him, but it is not to reign. By-and-by, it will not even dwell. The reign of sin is over and gone. The reign of grace has begun. "Sin shall not have dominion over you, for ye are not under law, but under grace."

And, be it carefully observed, the apostle is not speaking in Romans 6 of the forgiveness of sins, which he treats in Romans 3. Blessed be God, our sins are all forgiven — blotted out — eternally cancelled. But in chapter 6 the theme is not forgiveness of sins, but complete deliverance from sin as a ruling power or principle.

How do we obtain this immense favor? By death. We have died to sin — died in the death of Christ. Is this true of every believer? Yes, of every believer beneath the canopy of heaven. Is it not a matter of attainment? By no means! It belongs to

every child of God, every true believer. It is the common standing of all. Blessed, holy standing! All praise to Him who has earned it for us and brought us into it! We live under the glorious reign of grace — "grace which reigns through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord."

This liberating truth is little understood by the Lord's people. Very few get beyond the forgiveness of sins, if they even get that far. They do not see their full deliverance from the power of sin. They feel its pressure, and arguing from their painful feeling instead of reckoning themselves to be what God tells them they are, they are plunged into doubt and fear as to their conversion. They are occupied with their own inward self-consciousness instead of with Christ. They are looking at their *state* in order to get peace and comfort, and thus they are and must be miserable. We will never get peace if we seek it in our spiritual state or condition. The way to get peace is to believe that I've died with Christ, was buried with Him, was raised with Him, am justified in Him, accepted in Him. In short that, "As He is so are we in this world" (1 John 4: 17).

This is the solid basis of peace. And not only so, but it is the only divine secret of a holy life. We are dead to sin. We are not called to make ourselves dead. We are so in Christ. A monk, a lover of beauty, or an ardent striver after sinless perfection may try to put sin to death by various bodily exercises. What is the inevitable result? Misery! Yes, misery in proportion to the earnestness. How different is Christianity! We start with the blessed knowledge that we are dead to sin, and in the blessed faith of this we count as dead, not the body but its "deeds."

Note: C. H. Mackintosh clearly understands the reality of the sin nature and its rulership power which is broken by the believer's identification in Christ. He clearly understands Rom 6 and he was writing in the mid 1800's. Far too many pastors today do not have a clue and it impacts their whole ministry.

---

## HuckleScary Win

By INVESTOR'S BUSINESS DAILY

January 04, 2008 4:20 PM PT

**Politics:** Huckabee vs. Obama would pit an unelectable Republican against a Democrat who would wreck our economy and weaken our security. And both have blasted the president's success in the war on terror.

According to Mike Huckabee, GOP winner of the Iowa caucuses, the "administration's arrogant bunker mentality has been counterproductive at home and abroad." The statement easily could have come from the Democratic Iowa victor, Barack Obama — or John Edwards or Hillary Clinton.

Each has long insisted that the president's refusal to sit for tea and get to know, Oprah-style, the enablers of terrorism against our troops in Iraq amounts to locking himself in an airtight foreign-policy echo chamber.

But it was that "bunker mentality" Huckabee and the Democrats have such a problem with — which is really simply fortitude, amid the cacophony of inside-the-Beltway defeatism — that saved our skins in Iraq last year.

The president presumably was in that "bunker" when he approved the National Security Agency's terrorist surveillance program and the CIA's terrorist interrogation program. Both gleaned information that foiled terrorist plots and saved hundreds if not thousands of lives.

In Foreign Affairs magazine, Huckabee complains about "repressive regimes that stay in power by force and through the suppression of basic human rights — many of which we support by buying oil, such as the Saudi government, or with foreign aid, such as the Egyptian government."

He wants to "nurture moderate forces" in such places because "both for us and for the peoples of those countries, it will be better than the dictatorships they have now."

That sounds frighteningly like taking Jimmy Carter's policy of abandoning our ally the shah of Iran because of human rights quibbles and applying it to Saudi Arabia, Egypt and other imperfect Mideast friends and allies. Would Huckabee inadvertently empower an army of Ayatollah Khomeinis around the region?

Huckabee as nominee would have the GOP's realpolitik hawks mad at him; he already has its tax-cutting/smaller government wing mad at him.

According to Club for Growth President Pat Toomey, nominating the tax-friendly Huckabee "would constitute an abject rejection of the free-market, limited-government, economic conservatism that has been the unifying theme of the Republican Party for decades."

Meanwhile, Democrats are salivating at the possibility of facing the onetime Baptist minister in November. As Susan Estrich, who managed Michael Dukakis' 1988 presidential run, remarked to Fox News last week, "Huckabee is a Democrat's dream. . . . Honey, I'm dancing at the inaugural ball."

The establishment media are holding off on exposes of Huckabee in hopes he will win the nomination. But should he win, you can be sure his campaign's penchant for disreputable ploys — such as exploiting Iowa evangelicals' discomfort with rival Mitt Romney's Mormonism and squelching a negative ad on Romney last week with a press conference in which he showed the ad to reporters, who then delivered the ad's message far and wide for free — would soon be all over the airwaves, in print and on the Web.

Obama, Edwards and Clinton are practically identical in their stereotypically liberal ideas: raise taxes, especially on investors; inject health care with more government; and fight international terrorism with diplomacy. As his rivals for the GOP nod will soon drive home, Huckabee is not the man to save the country from that fate.

---

On December 23, 2007, reporter Chris Wallace interviewed Pastor Joel Osteen on the Fox Television Network's "Fox News Sunday" program. Osteen, whose own television program is broadcast worldwide each week and who pastors what is touted as the largest church in the United States (Lakewood Church of Houston, Texas), was quizzed on a number of issues during the interview.

Chris Wallace introduced Joel Osteen as a teacher of "Personal growth and positive thinking" – buzzwords that make biblical thinkers wary but exploring that must wait for another time. Before long, the discussion turned to presidential candidates Mitt Romney and Mike Huckabee and the controversy concerning Romney's Mormon beliefs. It was then that the supposedly Evangelical pastor of America's largest congregation declared that Mormons are Christians and that Mitt Romney is himself a "Christian."

**Wallace:** "Is a Mormon a true Christian?"

**Osteen:** "Well, in my mind they are. Mitt Romney has said that he believes in Christ as his savior and that's what I believe. So, you know I'm not the one to judge the little details of it. So, I believe they are. And so I, you know, Mitt Romney seems like a man of character and integrity to me and, ah, I don't think anything would stop me from voting for him if that's what I felt like."

**Wallace:** "So, so for instance when people start talking about Joseph Smith, the founder of the church and the golden tablets in upstate New York and ah, God assumes the shape of a man; do you not get hung up in those theological issues?"

**Osteen:** "I probably don't get hung up in 'em because I haven't really studied 'em or thought about 'em. And ah, you know, I just try to let God be the judge of that. I mean, I don't know, I certainly can't say that I agree with everything I've heard about it. But, from what I've heard from Mitt when he says that Christ is his savior to me that's a common bond."

As the exchange went on, I was struck by the fact that Chris Wallace appeared to be far more knowledgeable about Mormonism than did the

pastor of America's largest church. How sad. But the question still remains: is Mormonism compatible with Christianity? Just because Mitt Romney, Joel Osteen or anyone else claims that "Jesus Christ is their lord and savior" does not automatically mean that they are talking about the authentic biblical Jesus.

Let's allow the words of the current Mormon President, Gordon B. Hinckley, to educate us as to whether the Mormon Jesus (and Mormonism) and the biblical Jesus (and Christianity) are one in the same. After all, a person can sincerely believe in and place their complete trust and confidence in a "Jesus" and then perish for all eternity if the Jesus being worshipped is but a counterfeit. (See II Corinthians 11:3-4.) What if the Mormon Jesus isn't the biblical one?

President Hinckley, like all Mormon Presidents before him, is revered by the LDS people as the mouthpiece of God and referred to as "prophet, seer and revelator" for the Church. When Hinckley addressed a gathering of 6,600 young Mormon missionaries assembled in Paris in 1998, he was speaking in this capacity.

In their account of the event, the Mormon-owned news agency, *The Deseret News*, reported, "*In bearing testimony of Jesus Christ, President Hinckley spoke of those outside the Church who say Latter-day Saints 'do not believe in the traditional Christ.'* (Hinckley said) **'No, I don't. The traditional Christ of whom they speak is not the Christ of whom I speak. For the Christ of whom I speak has been revealed in this the Dispensation of the Fulness (sic) of Times...In this dispensation, the Lord has declared that this Church (Mormon) is the only true and living Church upon the face of the whole earth.'**" (1) (Emphasis added)

According to their own prophet, the Mormon Jesus is not the traditional Jesus and the Mormon Church is the only "true and living Church" on the planet today!

Also, to clear up the current public controversy between candidates Romney and Huckabee, Mormon authority and First Council of The Seventy member, Milton R. Hunter, made clear

that in Mormonism Lucifer and Jesus are indeed “brothers.”

“He was called Lucifer, son of the morning. Haughty, ambitious, and covetous of power and glory, this spirit-brother of Jesus desperately tried to become the Savior of mankind.”

(Hunter, *The Gospel Through the Ages*, p.15)

The Bible teaches that Jesus is divine and not angelic and that Lucifer (Satan) is angelic and not divine. Instead, Mormonism proclaims that “God himself was once as we are now, and is an exalted man ...” and “... You have got to learn how to be Gods yourselves, and to be kings and priests to God, the same as all Gods have done before you ...” (*Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, p. 345, 348). Mormonism teaches that both Jesus and Lucifer became “gods,” just as the central LDS teaching proclaims: “**As Man is God once was and as God is Man may become.**” Can it be any clearer? The “Jesus” taught in Mormonism is not the Christian Jesus. Period.

Taking biblical stands on issues such as Mormonism seems to be at a premium today. Few leaders seem to have the courage to present dogmatic positions when quarried on the realities of false teachers and false teaching. Some misguided Christian leaders have even gone so far as to apologize to Mormons for the likes of apologetically minded Christians like me who have rightly identified Mormonism as a false and worthless religion. Joel Osteen’s statements on Fox New Sunday are a prime example of a Christian leader trying to straddle a dangerous fence. By not wanting to take a position and thus separate himself (and Christianity in general) from the most notable organized cult in America today, Osteen is actually agreeing with a non-Christian religion whose truly aberrant, cultic theology has trapped millions and blinded them from the identity of the *real* Jesus.

Out of the fear of men or from the fear of lost income, so many evade the questions or just give in to the pressure to accept anyone who can spell Jesus as some sort of “Christian.” I admit that it’s not fun when you are branded as a “radical” or “Fundamentalist” in a negative sense or being accused of spouting “hate speech” because you

are defending the faith. Anyone who stands up for biblical truth and sound doctrine is going to experience all of that eventually. But whether it be on national television or one-on-one over coffee, have we forgotten that God is listening to every slippery parsed word we dare utter when trying to please everyone? The integrity of our leaders must be questioned when they fail to enunciate biblical truths in lieu of maintaining popularity. However, I am not completely without grace here. Certainly, nobody is perfect, including yours truly. We all have flaws and imperfections and I am acutely aware that God is continually convicting and working on me. However, taking biblical stands on unpopular issues is not one of my weak suites. I just learned a long time ago that those who try to walk in the middle of the road usually are hit by cars coming from both directions!

In closing, allow this dynamic quote from A.W. Tozer’s “The Old Cross and the New” to draw the line between true courage and lukewarm compromise. The question is *which side will you stand on?*

*"We who preach the gospel must not think of ourselves as public relations agents sent to establish good will between Christ and the world.*

*We must not imagine ourselves commissioned to make Christ acceptable to big business, the press, the world of sports or modern education. We are not diplomats but prophets, and our message is not a compromise but an ultimatum."*