

God's Pure Logic

An Explanation of the 'Pure Logic' used by God.

This paper will be difficult for many to understand. You can blame me for being inadequate for the task or you can blame the subject. Regardless of blame, the truth is that Calculus is beyond the comprehension of some people and this subject is the foundation of all Mathematics, including Calculus. It is not short because I include many examples (and some repetition) with the hope that if one example is not understood another example can show the principal being explained. In addition, when a lot of people think that there are exceptions to a general principal and precept from the Bible, it takes a lot of explaining to show that there really are no exceptions.

I met a man in his early 60s who insisted that he wasn't going to die. He was living in one of the poorest sections of a major city. He insisted that some unknown person was going to invent a pill and make it widely available at a price that he could afford before he died. He insisted that this pill would end death and corruption and reverse the effects of age, disease and disaster on our bodies. I told him that I could be insulted that he treated me like a fool, but that I would give him an opportunity to show the sincerity of his claim. Since he insisted that his non-belief in death eliminated it, I would give him an opportunity to prove that he could not die. I would pay for both of us to go several thousand feet into the air in a sky diving plane. He could step out without a parachute and prove that he was sincere. He responded to me that he was '*offended*' by my request that he prove his claim and that since I had offended him, he did not have to provide any proof and that I had to accept his claim as fact. Again, I told him that he was welcome to be offended all the way to the '*sudden stop*' and that if he survived that, I would apologize and give him the cost of the plane ride for his trouble. He went away positive that either his non-belief or my offending him set aside death for him. And, yes he was completely serious.

Now, most people would call that man a fool or an idiot. However, many people use the same type of foolish arguments and get offended when the subject is religion or God. When the absurdity of their belief is pointed out to them, they claim that God expects them to act in *faith*. However, their definition of '*faith*' does not meet the Bible definition of *faith* and [Romans 2](#) makes it clear that God considers someone to be a fool if they judge another person but act the same way. Many religious people have agreed that this man was a fool but were '*offended*' when shown that their '*faith*' was just as foolish.

I understand that some people will be offended by my use of the accurate term of '*fool*'. However, being offended by a truth, and claiming that the consequence of that truth is set aside just because you are '*offended*', is evidence that you are playing the fool. A fool is someone who accepts a lie as truth without verifying it and ends up suffering consequences for his/her failure to verify his/her belief. People who accept a lie about the Bible without verifying it are ignorant of the truth and will suffer the consequence of wrongful actions when facing a judging God who says that '*ignorance of the Law is no excuse*'.

There's an old expression about fools insisting on having their own way '*come Hell or high Water*'. *Hell*, in this expression, refers to [Psalms 14:1](#) and [Psalms 53:1](#). [Psalms 14](#) goes on to say *There were they in great fear*, showing the consequence to the fool that denies God. [Psalms 53](#) is a little more detailed with *There were they in great fear, where no fear was: for God hath scattered the bones of him that encampeth against thee: thou hast put them to shame, because God hath despised them*.

The ' *high water*' in that expression refers to the parable in [Matthew 7:24-27](#) where Jesus said *every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: And the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it.* The fool tells his insurance company that it was an ' *act of God*' while ignoring God's wake up call. They not only refuse to pay attention but get offended by anyone trying to warn them of coming judgment.

Since the only thing that will not offend such a fool is for you to join them in their foolishness, we must ignore their offense or suffer the consequences ourselves. Among other things, the Bible says *Let a bear robbed of her whelps meet a man, rather than a fool in his folly* in [Proverbs 17:12](#). Hopefully, anyone still reading has determined that they need to find the truth that is in the Bible and ignore any ' *offense*' they might feel because some religious belief of theirs is proven to be wrong.

Another term that I sometimes use is ' *ignorant*'. ' *Ignorant*' means ' *lacking knowledge*'. We all are ignorant of something so the term ' *ignorant*' is not an insult to anyone except to those who make it an insult because they don't know the definition of the word ' *ignorant*' or they want to remain ignorant so that they can continue to pursue error while claiming that God will bless their error. (They want to keep playing the fool.)

This paper is about some truths that many people have been deceived about. If people accept and understand the truths presented here, they will have a very powerful tool for separating truth from foolishness that can have consequences for eternity.

If people don't understand the truths presented here, but keep an open mind, they might learn the truths at a later date when they understand more or when the truths are presented in a different way. If they never understand them, but also never reject the truths, then they are in the same position as they were before reading this paper. However, those people who reject truth fall into greater deception and bring greater damnation upon themselves. Just look at what happened to the Jews since they rejected Jesus. They've been treated worse by men all over the world, since that time, than they were ever treated before rejecting *the truth* ([John 14:6](#)). Rejecting a truth closes your mind to it and makes it harder for you to accept the truth at a later time. The man in my example rejected the truth that we all die. That man would not prepare for death (would not hear the gospel) and, therefore, will suffer the default results (eternity in the *Lake of Fire* [[Revelation 19:20; 20:10, 14-15](#)]). So also will others suffer the default results when they reject truth.

Some truths can be ignored so long as they don't apply to you. However, no one is going to avoid death and God's judgment. And the first truth about death and God's judgment is that there are too many different opinions and ' *expert's truths*' on this subject for anyone to count. Therefore, the primary tool that people need is a tool that will allow them to find which professed ' *truth*' is correct and which ones are in error. Also, for the tool to be useful, it needs to be simple to use. Religion tells us that we need *faith*, but people have many different definitions of ' *faith*' and they put their ' *faith*' into many different things while expecting God to give them whatever their ' *faith*' promises. However, true Biblical *faith* requires us to find a specific promise in the Bible and then do the action specified by the Bible in order to receive that specific promise. True Biblical *faith* is a ' *work*'. However, many religious fools reject this true definition because they believe that they are ' *saved by faith*' and they know that they are not saved by *works* ([Ephesians 2:8](#)). This paper is not about *faith* (although I deal with *faith* to some extent later) and the definition I provided here proved in other papers. Even so, foolish people will stop reading here, in spite of the opening that they had to agree with in order for them to be reading this far. The wise person will finish reading this paper to see how I say that they have to prove their religious beliefs. They will then:

1. Prove that my claims are correct or
2. Prove my method to be in error or
3. Use my method to test my definition of Biblical *faith* and to test their definition of Biblical *faith* or
4. Admit that the requirements of proof are beyond them and seek the necessary help required to prove what the truth is or
5. play the fool and hold onto a wrong definition while rejecting the demand to prove which definition is correct.

The only tool that I've found which gives absolute proof of universal truth is '*pure logic*'. '*Pure logic*' is not to be confused with common definitions of '*logic*' because the common definitions of '*logic*' do not produce the reliable results (absolute proof) that '*pure logic*' produces. '*Pure logic*' is completely from God and God produces absolutes. The common definitions of '*logic*' all mix in something of this world or our flesh into the definition and the non-God parts introduce corruption and error which make it impossible for those definitions to produce absolute proof.

I am not here to tell you *the truth* ([John 14:6](#)) about death and God's judgment. I am here to give you a tool that will let you find that truth for yourself.

Of course, the first question is '*How do we know that your method works?*' The answer is that I will provide proof. In the following discussion, I will make assertions, provide some support for each assertion, and then, when appropriate, provide a link to a section that shows more detailed proof for that assertion. The reader can then choose whether or not to read the detailed proof. As a result, there can be several different reactions.

- A person with a closed mind will reject a truth no matter what proof is presented. I have already shown that this is the reaction of a fool who will suffer judgment by God.
- A person may claim that I have not provided sufficient proof. If this is a valid claim, that person should be able to explain where and how my proof is lacking. Without identifying the lack in my proof, they are being dishonest in claiming that I had made an error. I provided proof for my arguments. If other people don't provide proof for their arguments, then they show themselves to be like the man that refused to take the plane ride. Instead of admitting a closed mind, they are blaming me for their rejection of truth and will be judged by God for being a fool.
- For some points I do not provide a '*formal proof*' but show an illustration because the '*formal proof*' is too complex. A person may reject the point on the basis that there is a problem with the illustration. However, an honest person will show what that problem is and give me an opportunity to answer their questions and objections.
- A person may not understand a given point. They may or may not accept the point without fully understanding the proof. One person may say '*I don't understand this and can't use it without understanding.*' At which point, the most they have lost is their time reading this paper. Another may say '*I don't understand this but will give it a try and see if it works.*' They can then use the tool provided but they won't have as much confidence and use of it as the person who does understand how '*pure logic*' works. So, making the effort to understand comes with its own reward.
- A person may come to the end of the paper and have whatever level of understanding of each point but not be sure that all of my points add up to prove that the tool I provide will give the results that I say it will. They are in the same position as the person in the last point and can choose either of the prior reactions.
- A person may accept my proof regardless of their level of understanding. They can use '*pure logic*' to separate truth from error so long as they use it within the limits described. However, how this tool will not be as useful as it will be to a person who understands how it

works.

So, I've told you that the purpose of this paper is to give you a tool for separating truth from error when trying to decide which '*truth*' to believe about death and God's judgment. I've told you how I will proceed and how you can verify that my tool of '*pure logic*' is valid. I've told you how you can look at people's reactions and decide for yourself how valid and honest their professed reaction is. Next, I will get into the body of the paper itself.

Synopsis:

Our God is not a God of confusion. Confusion is of the devil. The devil has men confuse the true definitions of words that allow separating truth from error so that foolish men will believe the error and not receive all that God wants them to have. One word that has a confused definition is '*logic*'. '*Pure logic*' is one of the greatest tools available to man for separating truth from error. However, '*pure logic*' is not what most people think of when they hear the word '*logic*'. In [1 Corinthians 2](#) Paul makes the distinction between *the wisdom of God* and *man's wisdom*. What most people think of when they hear the word '*logic*' is part of *man's wisdom* because it mixes men's thinking into the logic that they use. However, '*pure logic*' is part of *the wisdom of God* because it rejects all influences of man and only uses that which comes from God. (The word '*pure*' means '*100%*'. '*pure logic*' is '*100% abstract logic*'. It comes completely from God since anything involving this world or our flesh is not '*abstract*'. To be '*100% abstract*' something must not have any influence from this world or our flesh.) This truth is shown by the traits of '*pure logic*' which are only seen in God. These traits are revealed below. For now, please note that even a little of man's influence in the true definition of '*logic*' renders it part of '*man's wisdom*' and makes this powerful tool ('*pure logic*') useless.

Definitions of Logic:

Per Webster's:

logic - noun: the science that investigates the principles governing correct or reliable inference.

SYMBOLIC LOGIC:

1. a particular method of reasoning or argumentation.
2. the system or principles of reasoning applicable to any branch of knowledge or study.
3. reason or sound judgment, as in utterances or actions.
4. the consistency to be discerned in a work of art, system, etc.
5. any connection between facts that seems reasonable or inevitable.
 1. the arrangement of circuitry in a computer.
 2. a circuit or circuits designed to perform functions defined in terms of Mathematical logic

Per Webster's 1828:

Logic: LOG'IC, noun. L. id; Gr.

1. from reason, to speak.
2. The art of thinking and reasoning justly.
3. Logic is the art of using reason well in our inquiries after truth, and the communication of it to others.
4. Logic may be defined, the science or history of the human mind, as it traces the progress of our knowledge from our first conceptions through their different combinations, and the numerous deductions that result from comparing them with one another.
5. Correct reasoning implies correct thinking and legitimate inferences from premises, which are principles assumed or admitted to be just. Logic then includes the art of thinking, as well as the art of reasoning.
6. The purpose of logic is to direct the intellectual powers in the investigation of truth, and in the communication of it to others.

Both of these dictionary definitions can lead to error because these dictionaries are dictionaries of the English language and not dictionaries of the Bible. Therefore, they contain man's definitions in addition to any Bible definition that may be in them. Therefore, these definitions are the definitions which fit within '*man's wisdom*' and go beyond the limits of '*pure logic*'. More details supporting this claim are presented below.

Let me first give a true definition of '*pure logic*', then separate it from common misconceptions, then show why my definition is correct, and finally show the error of these definitions from the dictionaries. After that I'll show you how using the rules of '*pure logic*' allow you to quickly and easily separate truth from error in certain cases. These are cases where you have to decide on critical matters and you have to choose between opposing opinions of '*experts*' who give arguments too complex to be understood by most people. I'm talking about life threatening decisions and decisions more critical than that.

I'll show you some simple rules of '*pure logic*' that will let you quickly cut through someone's complex argument and find out if they are speaking truth or error, especially on subjects as complex as science, Mathematics, the Bible and religion.

A True Definition of '*pure logic*':

Pure logic is the abstract set of rules that existed before the creation of the universe. The rules of '*pure logic*' are the basic rules that God used when creating the universe. These rules reflect the character of the Creator of the Universe. They are the basis of Mathematics and all true science. They are always true when anything that is from God (without man's corrupting influence) is considered.

The source of confusion about the definition of logic:

The application of '*pure logic*' is one of several methods of reasoning. When properly applied, '*pure logic*' always leads to God's truth. It is the only method of reasoning that consistently leads to the same conclusion from the same basis when using the same argument. Because it is the most dependable method of reasoning, it is the most widely accepted method of reasoning when someone wants to prove a point or claim that some rule is applicable to more than one person or

circumstance. This level of reliability gives logic an authority that is not given to other forms of reasoning. In order to claim the authority of '*pure logic*', some people claim that other methods of reasoning are logic. These false claims cause confusion about pure logic's true definition.

Adding to the confusion is the fact that logic is applied to many areas of life which are not completely logical and where corruption is introduced by these non-logical aspects. The results of these applications are not always consistent and can vary with time, circumstances and other variables. This use of logic, in these cases, causes people to be confused about the rules of '*pure logic*' since they tend to include these examples when dealing with the definition of '*pure logic*'. Since some applications of logic don't produce the reliability that '*pure logic*' produces, people think that '*pure logic*' is also unreliable. However, as will be shown, '*pure logic*' and the application of logic are not the same. Therefore, while some applications of logic do not produce consistent and a reliable result, that inconsistency does not mean that '*pure logic*' is incapable of producing consistent and reliable results.

The main problem with clearing up the confusion about the definition of '*pure logic*' is the fact that '*pure logic*' is abstract. Therefore, it is extremely difficult to teach because many people's thinking isn't able to handle the level of abstract thought required. For examples, most people understand that one minus one equals zero. However, the proof of that statement requires understanding number theory which has a pre-requisite of Calculus. Most people can't understand a Mathematical discussion that requires the ability to understand and apply Calculus to the '*real world*' and that also goes beyond the ability to regurgitate lessons in order to pass a test. In truth, the best way to show some things is to use illustrations. That's how I'll show you the difference between '*pure logic*' and these other forms of reasoning that people call logic. You can see the section labeled [Logic vs Applications of Logic](#) for another illustration of logic versus the application of logic, but you would probably be better off to wait until later in the paper to read that section.

How to show what '*pure logic*' is:

Illustrations are used to teach about '*pure logic*'. However, the illustrations used must be limited to those which use only '*pure logic*' and do not have any of '*man's wisdom*' involved. ('*Pure*' is defined as '*100 %*'.) For example, the electrical resistance of '*pure silver*' is different from the electrical resistance of '*50% silver with 50% lead*'. If someone wanted to learn about the physical properties of silver, they could draw wrong conclusions by looking at non-pure silver. The same is true about '*pure logic*'. The only applications of logic that can properly illustrate the rules of '*pure logic*' are those applications that are 100% derived from '*pure logic*'.

There are only two applications of '*pure logic*' known to man. One is Mathematics and the other is computer programming. While everybody claims that they personally are logical in their thinking, their personal comfort level with Mathematics shows how well '*their logic*' matches '*pure logic*'. People who are poor at Mathematics can be very dogmatic and emotional about their claim to being logical. That just shows how much error and confusion there is about what '*pure logic*' really is. There is no emotion involved in '*pure logic*' itself. However, people can become very emotional when '*pure logic*' shows them the error of their reasoning.

The distinction between man's '*logic*' and '*pure logic*' is important:

Let me give a simple illustration. Try doing an informal survey. Go to some public place, like a shopping mall, that has all types of people. Then ask every adult that you see if they think that they are logical. Then ask them if they would be willing to take a high school Algebra test. You

should find that most people regard themselves as being logical but refuse a test of Algebra. Mathematics, including Algebra, is the most commonly taught application of logic in our society and yet it is (usually) the most hated subject in school because most people have trouble using '*pure logic*'.

'*Pure logic*', including Mathematics, is hard for many people to learn. We go through the effort because '*pure logic*', including Mathematics, gives us benefits that can not be achieved any other way. However, if you use '*your logic*' instead of '*pure logic*', you lose the benefit of '*pure logic*'. It doesn't matter how many times you add up the numbers wrong, or how mad you get, the bank isn't going to give you more money than you have on deposit. However, I have personally forced banks to change their records several times and have been part of two federal investigations where banks were punished significantly for mishandling money (using wrong procedures). These results required using '*pure logic*' and not '*my logic*'.

People claim to be logical because they want other people to accept the things that they claim to have the same reliability as produced by '*pure logic*' but we don't always get what we want. To receive the desired result, we must fulfill all of the requirements.

Standard for comparison:

In order to '*prove*' something, we have to show that it is true consistently. In order to get consistent results, we need a consistent and reliable method for arriving at our results. Since consistency and reliability of the results are the critical factors that we need to prove something, the method of reasoning that produces the most consistent results is considered to be superior to all forms of reasoning which produce inconsistent results (when we are trying to prove that something is true). Yes, there are times when saying '*I love you*' gets desired results a lot quicker than other methods of reasoning. However, there are also times when saying '*I love you*' produces an angry response because the other person feels manipulated or something else. So, while some forms of reasoning can be '*better*' on some scales, those scales aren't applicable to proving something to be true. If you see words like '*better*' further on, that '*better*' is based upon a measurement of consistent and reliable results.

'*Pure logic*' is not the only form of '*Reasoning*':

I said that the application of '*pure logic*' is one of several methods of reasoning. In order to separate logic from other forms of reasoning, we must define '*reasoning*'.

Per Webster's:

1. the act or process of a person who reasons.
2. the process of forming conclusions, judgments, or inferences from facts or premises.
3. the reasons, arguments, proofs, etc., resulting from this process.

Examples of non-logical reasoning

One method of reasoning is called '*authoritarianism*'. One example of authoritarian reasoning is when a religious leader says '*thus says the Lord*' and then threatens you with eternity in Hell, or some other terrible consequence, if you disobey.

'*Reward*' is another form of reasoning. When a religious leader says '*God blesses those who obey*', he is using the promised reward as the reason for your obedience.

Both of these, and other non-logic methods of reasoning, depend upon the people involved and upon other factors that make it impossible for the required actions to consistently lead to the same conclusion. For example, some times people get the promised punishment or reward, and some times they don't. When people ask why they didn't get the promised punishment or reward, they're told that God has a different sense of time, and that it's still coming. Or they're told that they didn't meet the requirements: lacked enough faith or didn't '*pray through*' or something else. Or people are told other reasons but all of these reasons are based upon changeable factors such as circumstances, God's mood, people's inconsistent actions or other non-reliable factors.

Example of Logical reasoning

$2 + 2 = 4$ is always true regardless of the circumstances, people's feelings, the age of man on the earth, the people involved, culture, language or any other factor that you want to introduce. The fact that '*pure logic*' consistently leads to the same conclusion regardless of the circumstances involved makes it more reliable than any other method of reasoning.

So, here we see the first common misconception about logic. Many people think that all reasoning is logic. However, as shown here, there are reasoning methods that are not logical. Therefore, it is wrong to substitute '*logic*' for '*reasoning*' or to substitute '*reasoning*' for '*logic*'.

Confusing Logic and some applications of logic:

There is further confusion about the definition of logic that is due to people applying logic to non-logical systems of knowledge. While this application of logic is valid, the conclusions are not consistent because of the inconsistency of the underlying non-logical system. Because of the inconsistent results, these applications can not be used to teach the rules of '*pure logic*'. For example, a legal system is supposed to be the logical application of '*Rules of Law*'. However, we get inconsistent rulings from different courts that are supposed to be working from the same set of facts and the same set of laws. The main problem with getting consistent decisions from a legal system is that you have personalities and politics involved and there are times (often) when people choose the emotional conclusion over the logical conclusion. A legal system is an example of a non-pure application of logic and the use of it to teach the rules of logic would lead to a wrong understanding of the rules of logic. If you compare the legal system to what most people call logic, you will see that both are very similar. They're non-pure (corrupted) forms of logic that lead to inconsistent conclusions. Therefore, the common definition of logic, which is based upon non-pure applications, is wrong.

Now some people might argue that all definitions changes with usage. That may be true for some things, but it is not true for all. '*All of the world*' agreed that the world was flat at one time. However, their combined agreement didn't change the laws of the universe. If we can't change the laws of the universe, we certainly can't change their basis, which are the rules of '*pure logic*'. (I know I have yet to prove that, but I will.) It doesn't matter how people use the term '*logic*', their usage does not alter the true definition of '*pure logic*'.

The rules of pure logic:

I started my definition of '*pure logic*' with the words '*Pure logic is the abstract set of rules*'. So, in order to prove that definition, I need to provide at least the basic rules of logic and then show that these rules are true.

If we want to understand the rules of '*pure logic*', we need to stick to one of the '*pure*' applications of logic. I will use the '*pure*' applications in a few illustrations so that the reader can understand the basic rules of '*pure logic*'. Some of the basic rules of '*pure logic*' are best illustrated with Mathematics and at least one is best illustrated with programming. Don't worry about my saying '*programming*' most people should be able to understand the illustration.

The first rule of pure logic:

'*Pure logic*' always reaches a consistent conclusion. I said that logic is a form of reasoning. All reasoning starts from a basis and arrives at a conclusion. How you get from the basis to the conclusion is called the argument. The type of argument varies with the method of reasoning used.

Non-logical methods of reasoning include the variableness of personalities within their arguments. '*Pure logic*' uses a completely consistent set of abstract rules. Because of that, '*pure logical*' conclusions are not variable. The first rule of separating a '*pure logic*' conclusion from a non-'*pure logical*' conclusion is to see if the conclusion is consistent or not when you vary critical factors. If you can introduce any outside factor (such as circumstance or time) that changes the conclusion without changing the basis or argument, then the reasoning method used isn't '*pure logic*'. Legal decisions vary based upon factors other than facts and arguments. Legal decisions are not pure logical. $2 + 2$ always equals 4. Mathematics is '*pure logic*'. Thus any argument or '*reasoning*' that leads to variable conclusions (when the same basis and arguments are used) is not '*pure logic*'. These preachers who claim that there are multiple interpretations of God's word are not using '*pure logic*' and, therefore, not interpreting the Bible correctly. There are multiple applications because the application of God's Word must consider the person that it is applied to. That prevents the application from being '*pure logic*'. However, the proper interpretation is rendered by the rules of God's understanding which applies the Word of God too the Word of God. Since God does not change ([Malachi 3:6](#); [Hebrews 13:8](#)), our true picture of God ([John 1:1-2, 14](#)) can not change. This makes the true interpretation the result of '*pure logic*'. That means that there can be only one '*interpretation*' that is the same regardless of any factors such as circumstances or people involved.

The second rule of pure logic:

'*Pure logic*' allows ignoring the argument when you have an invalid conclusion. It makes discarding an argument and the resulting conclusion very easy. An invalid basis or an invalid argument will cause an invalid conclusion. Most people know about the invalid argument, but don't know about the invalid basis. I will next give two examples. The first shows that an invalid argument yields an invalid conclusion. The second shows that an invalid basis yields an invalid conclusion.

When a teacher gives a Mathematics test, they assign the problems and check the student's answers against known correct answers. They usually don't have to look at the student's argument (method of solving the problem) but just look at the answer. Since all forms of '*pure logic*', including Mathematics, always results in the same conclusion, they can determine if the student's

argument is right or wrong just by looking at their answer (conclusion). The first thing that this shows us is that pure logical arguments yield consistent results. The second thing it shows us is that we don't have to look at the argument to determine if the argument is correct. For example, Algebra teachers will tell their students to find the error in the following Algebraic problem.

$$a = b$$

$$aa = ab$$

$$aa-bb = ab - bb$$

$$(a+b)(a-b) = b(a-b)$$

$$a+b=b$$

$$b+b=b$$

$$2b=b$$

$$2=1$$

Now you may not know where the error is, but anyone who can count knows that ' $2=1$ ' is wrong. This illustration should be simple enough for most people to understand the rule that an invalid ('*pure logic*') argument results in an invalid ('*pure logic*') conclusion and an invalid ('*pure logic*') conclusion can result from an invalid ('*pure logic*') argument.

As well as an invalid argument causing an invalid conclusion, an invalid basis can cause an invalid conclusion. While I can show this in Mathematics, most people wouldn't understand it because they don't understand non-Decimal numbering systems such as Binary, Octal and Hex. However, I can illustrate this rule using programming. If you can't understand the next paragraph, don't worry about it. You can ask anyone who does understand it to verify what I'm saying or take my word by faith. However you do it, accept the truth of the rule that an invalid basis will always result in an invalid conclusion in a '*pure logic*' argument.

The rows in a church can be thought of as an array. (An array is an abstract Mathematical construct that is used in programming.) If you have two rows of pews in a church with 10 pews in each row, you have a 2 x 10 array. Imagine that you have a man sitting in the front row on the left and a woman sitting behind him. If I told you to find the person sitting in the number one row on the left, and you counted the front row as the number one row, you would pick the man. However, if you considered the front row to be the row number zero, you would pick the woman as being in the row number one. (This is a very real illustration taken from actual computer programs.) When the front row is considered to be 1, the rows are counted 1 through 10. But when the front row is considered to be zero, the rows are numbered 0 through 9. If you changed a computer program from a language that counted it's arrays from zero to another language that counted it's arrays from 1 (and did not adjust for this conclusion) your program would have the wrong basis for accessing arrays. When it tried to select the number one row it would result in the wrong conclusion (man instead of woman). By the way, this is a major source of error when self-proclaimed '*Greek experts*' use '*their Greek knowledge*' to correct the English Bible from God. The '*Greek*' of the Bible and English have different basis. Among other things, one is a '*noun oriented*' language and the other is a '*verb oriented*' language.

Hopefully you can see that with '*pure logic*', a wrong basis or a wrong argument can lead to a

wrong conclusion. Furthermore, in '*pure logic*', an invalid conclusion proves that either the basis, or the argument, or both are wrong. Thus the reasoning does not need to be considered when a wrong conclusion is reached, if you are using '*pure logic*'. When some preacher says that something in the English Bible is '*an unfortunate translation*', or some similar wrong conclusion; I can know that he uses faulty reasoning and I can discard all that he says without further consideration because his '*unfortunate translation*' is an invalid conclusion. We already have God's correct conclusion in English (the KJV 1611) and all other conclusions ('*unfortunate translations*') are wrong. We do not need to consider how he arrived at this error. In fact, the Bible warns us to be very careful about believing anything that comes from such an erroneous source.

Our rule here is simple to use and understand (even if the proof is difficult to understand). The rule is:

Once you know that you're dealing with a '*pure logic*' method of reasoning, look at the conclusion first and see if it is valid or not.

This rule takes an entire semester of a college Logic class to prove. I will not try to prove this rule. Think of it this way, it doesn't matter what credentials in Mathematics someone might claim, $1=2$ is always wrong even if you can't find the error in their argument. The rules of '*pure logic*' make this reasoning a valid proof because Mathematics is a form of '*pure logic*' and must conform to the rules of '*pure logic*'.

When people want to claim that there is '*no absolute truth*', they start by mixing up the definition of precise words. If you want clear communication between people, you must start with clear, non-ambiguous definitions of the words used. As said, the devil wants us to have an ambiguous definition for '*logic*' because a precise definition allows us to use an extremely powerful tool for separating truth from error. I have stopped the mouths of several people who were far more '*learned*' but spouting error by using the rule of '*pure logic*'. Regardless of whether you argue with others or not, using the rules of '*pure logic*' can help you avoid the consequences of wrong decisions based upon faulty beliefs. In particular, it can help you separate a reliable authority from an unreliable authority.

Summary:

I said that '*pure logic*' is an abstract set of rules. An abstract rule is a rule that we can't sense with any of our 5 senses but which can be applied to a number of similar, but distinct, items. We can use our senses to identify '*five apples*' but we can't use our senses to identify the number '*5*' without applying '*5*' to something we can sense. However, we all understand the abstract concept known as the number '*5*'. Without a long discussion, I hope that you can see that as abstract as Mathematics is ($a + b = c$), '*pure logic*' is even more abstract because we use Mathematics to simplify and explain rules of '*pure logic*'. I will assume that we agree that '*pure logic*' is a set of abstract rules and go on from here.

I also said that '*pure logic*' '*existed before the creation of the universe and is the basis of all creation.*' It should be obvious that '*pure logic*' had to exist before creation if it is the basis of creation. Please read the section labeled [The Logic of Creation](#) for the details which show that '*pure logic*' is the basis of all creation. That should be sufficient to show that my definition of '*pure logic*' is correct.

Going on, I showed where certain reasoning methods are not '*pure logic*'. I also mentioned that you can use the rules of logic for non-logical systems such as man's laws. In these cases, the rules of logic can't always be used to eliminate error because the conclusions can be inconsistent

due to the inconsistencies of the underlying system. However, when you can apply the rules of '*pure logic*', you can use them to quickly eliminate error by looking at the results and ignoring the arguments. This is exactly what I said a Mathematics teacher does when correcting a test.

There are times when the cause of a problem is not obvious. In some of these cases, the best way to show that there is problem is to give the correct answer and then contrast the wrong answer with the right answer. For example, if you were trying to fire a rocket to hit the moon, and could not correct the path of the rocket after it started, your aiming would have to be very precise. You could have a difference in the angle of the rocket that could not be detected by the human eye while the rocket was on the ground. However, that difference could change whether you hit the moon or not. Someone looking at a change to the angle that the rocket was aimed might very well insist that there was no difference. You would not be able to convince them otherwise until you got them to look at where the rocket ended up instead of how it was aimed.

That's why I haven't dealt with the dictionary definitions of '*logic*' before this point. I wanted the reader to understand the proper definition for '*pure logic*' and the consistent results that come from the proper definition. Now that I've explained that difference, you should be able to see the errors in the wrong definitions and the results of those errors. Please see the section marked [Errors in Dictionary Definitions](#) for the details of these differences.

Application:

Using the laws of '*pure logic*' on the Bible:

The rules of '*pure logic*' can be applied to things of the Bible to quickly eliminate error.

Let me start out by saying that there are parts of the Bible where the rules of '*pure logic*' can not be used. There are other sections where the rules of '*pure logic*' do apply. In general, when the Bible is dealing with God's mercy, grace, love and other personality attributes, the rules of '*pure logic*' do not apply. See the section marked [Non-logic in the Bible](#) in order to better understand why the rules of '*pure logic*' don't apply here.

One subject in the Bible that '*pure logic*' does apply to is faith. Now, many people are mistaken in believing that faith and '*pure logic*' are mutually exclusive. I'm show that they actually work together in the section marked [Logic and Faith](#).

As explained in the section marked [Non-logic in the Bible](#), mercy, grace, love and other personality attributes in the Bible are not pure logical. Paul did everything the Bible said for him to do to get God's healing and God's answer was '*no*'. Therefore, while logic can be applied to these subjects within limits, the results can not be consistently predicted. It can not be said that a given result is or is not due to someone correctly doing what the Bible tells him to do when we are dealing with non-'*pure logic*' things like God's mercy, grace, love and other personality attributes.

Once you eliminate mercy, grace, love and other personality attributes in the Bible, most of what is left, in the Bible, is '*law*' or stories of how God and man interacted. The interaction of God and man definitely involves non-logical personality factors. Therefore, they do not fit within the laws of '*pure logic*'. However, God's law is based upon '*pure logic*' and part of that '*law*' are the rules about how to interpret the Bible. The Law of God and how to interpret the Bible are part of where the rules of '*pure logic*' apply to the Bible.

When we come to the interpretation of God's Word, the rule is very simple:

Any conclusion that says that there is an error in God's Word is wrong.

There are several popular reasons that people use when claiming that there are errors in the Bible. One popular claim is '*I'm following the Spirit of God*'. These people actually believe that the Spirit of God (today) disagrees with what He wrote in the Word of God even though God never changes (Malachi 3:6; Hebrews 13:8). Please see the section labeled [I'm following the Spirit of God](#) for the answer to this argument.

I believe that there have been literally thousands of books written supporting or criticizing the unknown number of theories on proper Bible interpretation. I have been told that there are unnumbered counterfeits to money. Rather than teaching tellers about all of the counterfeits, they are taught how to identify true money and told to reject anything that does not match the definition of the true. That is how I will proceed.

Remember, the main rule of '*pure logic*' is that if the conclusion disproves its basis, the conclusion is always wrong. Since the Bible is the basis of any Biblical teaching or '*Christian*' religion, any so-called '*Biblical teaching*' or '*Christian religion*' that claims there is an error in the Bible is wrong. That is, the conclusion disproves its own basis. Therefore, the conclusion (that there is an error in the Bible) is wrong.

End of proof. I'd like to stop here and go home, but I promised to deal with some common errors in people's arguments on this subject. So, that's what I will do in the section labeled [Support for Bible Inerrancy](#). After that, if you want to, read the section labeled [I'm following the Spirit of God](#).

Using the rules of 'pure logic' for salvation.

I have just one more application of '*pure logic*' to explain before I end this paper. The following may not be clear to some, and I'm sorry for that. I just don't know how to make it clearer. I include it because it may help some that do understand what I'm saying. It might seem to be '*straining at gnats*', but this distinction has helped me and may help others.

As mentioned, Hebrews 13:8 says '*Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever.*' We can rely upon receiving God's mercy, grace and love if we meet the requirements in God's Bible. However, the expression of those attributes is personal and, therefore, varies. Thus, we can say that all who are saved will receive the Holy Spirit and while all saved will have some expression of the Holy Spirit evident in their life, not all saved will have the same expression of the Holy Spirit (talking in tongues). We know this by promises like *grace through faith* ([Romans 1:5, 4:16, Ephesians 2:8](#)). The Bible also says that the faithful are the '*seed of Abraham*' ([Genesis 21:12; 26:24; 28:4, 13; Exodus 32:13; 33:1; Joshua 24:3; 2Chronicles 20:7; Psalms 105:6; Isaiah 41:8; Jeremiah 33:23-26; Acts 3:25; Romans 4:13, 16; 9:7; 11:1; 2Corinthians 11:22; Galatians 3:16; Hebrews 2:16](#)) and are saved through faith, just like Abraham was (Romans 9). Salvation has always been through faith, but the expression of that faith has changed over time. Abraham's expression of faith was to offer his son Isaac on an altar. No one wants that expression today. During the time of the Law of Moses, the expression of faith was keeping the requirements of the Law in spirit as well as in letter. Today, the expression of faith is the demonstration of a changed life that shows the '*fruit of the Spirit*' ([Galatians 5:22-23; Ephesians 5:8-10](#)). True Biblical teaching about '*dispensations*' teaches that the expressions of salvation change but the method of salvation (grace through faith) doesn't. False teaching about '*dispensations*' teaches that the method of salvation itself changes.

Please note that nowhere does the Bible say that we are saved ' *by faith*' as many erroneous religious doctrines claim. We have many things ' *by faith*' but salvation is not one of them. The Bible says that we are saved ' *For by grace are ye saved through faith*' ([Ephesians 2:8](#)). Think of being in a burning building with a door to the outside and medics out there who can put out the fire on you and fix up the burns. ' *Grace*' is what the medics (God) provides. However, they can only do it after you go through the door (faith). You can grab the door (faith) and be by it but you will not be saved until after you go through it. The acts of faith (doors) can vary from one person to another but the requirement to go through it is consistent. Further, the grace of God makes us His children and He has a personal relationship with each of His children, like any Godly parent does. Yes, there are family rules that are the same for all, but the relationship is personal and varies as a result. That is why grace does not follow the rules of ' *pure logic*'. In the Bible, *faith* is an action by a person that is based upon a promise of God. The requirement that there must be an act of faith is absolute and follows the rules of ' *pure logic*'. (That is, no act of faith = no promised blessing from God.) However, since Biblical *faith* is the application of God's rule, and an application involves the individual person, the actual act of Biblical ' *faith*' varies from person to person.

The rules of logic sometimes apply to God's love, mercy and grace, and sometimes they don't. Like faith, they often have an absolute requirement for some act of faith by us before we receive a particular application of God's love, mercy and grace. However, that actual application will (probably) vary from incident to incident. A lot of the difference due based on what God does in response to our act that is supposed to be faith. For example, John 3:16 tells us ' *For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.*' Here we are told that God ' *loved the world*' but still made salvation (the application of grace ' *should not perish, but have everlasting life*') conditional upon ' *believeth in him*'. Those who do not meet God's requirement have God's love but not this application of God's love.

If we meet God's requirements for love, mercy and grace, we can expect God to provide them. (However, God provides these in His time, not in our time. So, the apparent lack of receiving the request might be that it's not God's time yet.) God always wants us to praise Him and thank Him for His love, mercy and grace. The way that God tells us to express that praise and thanks is not consistent, and therefore is not logical but the requirement for some act of faith (praise, thanks, etc) is logical. Since the way that God demands that we prove our faith (application) in Him is not consistent, the proof is not logical. So, we can apply the rules of ' *pure logic*' if we ignore the expressions of (faith, love, mercy and grace) and if we concentrate on the requirement of an act of (faith / love / mercy / grace). Therefore, the method of salvation, for example, conforms to the rules of ' *pure logic*' while the expression of it does not.

One more caveat. We are the ones that express God's love, mercy and grace in this world. Since we definitely are not consistent, the expression (in this world) of God's love, mercy and grace is not logical. We definitely can not say that someone never received God's love, mercy or grace just because we don't see any expression of it in that person's life. Most people have given a gift that wasn't appreciated. The failure of the person receiving the gift didn't eliminate the giving or the price that the giver made for the gift. Some people are just ungrateful. However, their character does not, necessarily, reflect the character of the giver.

Going on, we can say that if someone starts with a valid basis, such as meeting the Biblical requirements for salvation, they will have the conclusion (salvation) based upon the valid argument of God's reliability. However, we can not say what evidence of salvation God will demand from the individual believer. Two lost people can hear the same message and one will get saved and the other won't because one meets God's requirements for faith and the other doesn't. If the person who is still lost later meets God's requirements for him personally, God will save him. The personal requirements for true Biblical salvation are the same, but the act of faith may appear to be different. God always demands that we trust Him over anything in this world including the desires

of our flesh. The rich young ruler was told to sell everything and give it to the poor ([Matthew 10:17](#)). The lawyer ([Luke 10:25](#)) had to stop justifying himself. Now, while these personal requirements seem to vary, they actually are showing that God finds the thing that we personally trust in most and demands that we prove that we trust God more than we trust that item. Once those personal requirements are met, we can rely upon God to save the person.

Further, the expression of that salvation is dependent upon the person saved. As said, some people are ungrateful. So, the method of salvation follows the rules of '*pure logic*' while the expression that results does not follow the rules of '*pure logic*'. This is true for many other things in the Bible that involve God's love, mercy, grace and other personality traits of God. This is especially true about anything involving humans. The short rule is that the rules of '*pure logic*' can be applied to anything involving God where humans are not involved (such as God providing salvation) but can no longer be applied as soon as humans get involved (such as accepting God's free gift of salvation).

Logic versus Applications of Logic

We must distinguish between the rules of '*pure logic*' and their application when the application yields inconsistent results. In truth, even the application of Mathematics and programming are not really '*pure logic*' but an application of the rules of '*pure logic*'.

Think of a song like '*Amazing Grace*'. What's in the song book is abstract because we can't hear what's in writing. Now think of two different artists that sing or recorded that song and how each rendition of the song is different even though the song in the song book is the same. You should be able to understand that the two artists created two different applications of the abstract song in the song book. Just as the song by the artists are different from the abstract song in the book, so too are the applications of '*pure logic*' different from '*pure logic*' itself. Further, one artist might stick to the exact notes in the song book while another might use '*artistic license*'. The one who stuck to the exact notes as recorded in the book would have the most '*true*' or '*pure*' application of the song. Even so, Mathematics and programming are the most '*true*' or '*pure*' application of '*pure logic*', but they are still applications and not '*pure logic*' itself.

If you have a '*pure logic*' system, you have consistent results and can judge the correctness of the argument based upon the correctness of the conclusion (assuming a proven valid basis). You do not need to understand, or even consider, the argument. Since conclusions are far simpler to understand than arguments are, this rule can simplify finding truth and error considerably. This is particularly true when the conclusion disagrees with its own basis. In those cases, you don't even have to see if the basis is valid to conclude that the conclusion is wrong. However, all of this requires a pure logical system or one where you can qualify the influence of the non-logical elements. For example, when a computer program acts differently from one run to another we know absolutely that something changed and look at the variable factors (hardware, people, etc) in order to find the cause of the change. Once we eliminate that non-logical influence (hardware, people, etc), we get consistent results. In a system with unqualified non-logical elements (court case, etc), an '*invalid*' conclusion could be the result of that non-logical element (people, etc) and, therefore, does not necessarily show that the argument is invalid.

Therefore, to use the rules that I'm giving, we must first show that the system is '*pure logic*' or that we can qualify the influence of the non-logical elements.

I don't mean to '*shout*' at people but this point is critical and if the reader misses it, they can go on reading and disagreeing with the things said simply because they are using an invalid definition for

'*pure logic*'. For example, you can not use these rules for the '*logic*' of a legal system because a legal system includes non-logical elements. You can not use these rules for a person's '*logic*' that includes their personal feelings. These rules are only for a '*pure logic*' system.

Now, some people might say that these restrictions are too narrow to be useful. However, consider that these rules apply to true science, as opposed to the religion that lies and calls itself science, and allow you to separate the true science from the false. Consider that these rules apply to all Mathematics and to all of the rules of the universe and, as I will show, apply to critical parts of the Bible. Every one of these subjects; Mathematics, science, religion and the Bible; has lots of people giving lots of opposing arguments. Every person presenting an argument on these subjects demands that you agree that they're right and their opponents are wrong. They expect people to understand arguments that are too complicated for most people to understand or to be bothered trying to understand.' *pure logic*' gives you a set of rules that allow you to ignore all of the arguments and look at just the conclusions. These rules make it possible to choose from opposing positions on critical subjects with something better than hanging all of the opinions on the wall, putting on a blindfold and throwing a dart at the wall.

Please read the section labeled [The Logic of Creation](#) to see how to distinguish true science from the religion that calls itself science and that the Bible labels as *science falsely so called* ([1 Timothy 6:20](#)).

The Logic of Creation

What we know of the universe is based upon '*true science*' as opposed to *science falsely so called* ([1 Timothy 6:20](#)). In order to show that the rules of '*pure logic*' are the basis of creation, I need to distinguish '*true science*' from *science falsely so called* ([1 Timothy 6:20](#)). After that, I can show how '*true science*' follows the rules of '*pure logic*' and, thereby, show that the rules of '*pure logic*' apply to all of creation.

'*True science*' always follows the rules of the Scientific Method. *science falsely so called* ([1 Timothy 6:20](#)) first decides upon the '*politically correct*' conclusion that is desired and then perverts the rules of the Scientific Method to '*prove*' the desired conclusion. This is the same methods used in Galileo's day to '*prove*' that the world was flat. (People claimed that they had proven that '*the world is flat*' when Galileo stopped arguing. However, a rope around the neck stops a lot of arguments without proving anything.) The truth that *science falsely so called* ([1 Timothy 6:20](#)) perverts the rules of the Scientific Method can be shown by looking at evolution and the '*big bang*' theory.

The definition of the Scientific Method can be found in basic science books. Basically, the Scientific Method uses the rules of '*Probability and Statistics*' applied to '*real world*' observations to define the laws of science. '*Probability and Statistics*' is a form of Mathematics, and therefore, also a form of '*pure logic*'. Therefore, the rules of '*pure logic*' apply to of '*Probability and Statistics*' and anything derived from it, including '*true science*'.

science falsely so called ([1 Timothy 6:20](#)) perverts the rules of the Scientific Method the same way that people pervert '*pure logic*'. *science falsely so called* ([1 Timothy 6:20](#)) perverts '*true science*' by using non-logical methods of reasoning and using non-pure methods of reasoning. In particular, they do not follow the rules of '*Probability and Statistics*' (a field of Mathematics) which is required to prove all true science. These perversions are seen in the saying of '*Statistics don't lie but statisticians do*'.

All of the time we hear people say that something has '*X%*' probability. However, the rules of '*Probability and Statistics*' require two percentages, one for the probability of correctness and one for the reliability of the number. For example, suppose I found nine people out of a group of ten who agreed that '*Jews are non-human animals*'. I could report that a survey found that '*90% of the citizens in X City that were surveyed say that Jews are non-human animals*'. However, this is a case of the statistician lying because the rules of '*Probability and Statistics*' also require you to report that the reliability of my number is ten divided by the number of people in '*X City*'. If the reliability factor was reported, however, it would be obvious that the survey was bogus. True scientists know the requirements of '*Probability and Statistics*'. When you have a so-called scientific result that only reports one of the two required percentages, you can be fairly sure that someone is lying and hiding the non-reliability of the result reported.

Furthermore, the rules of '*Probability and Statistics*' recognize what is called '*testing errors*'. When the reliability or probability of a result gets too small, the rules of '*Probability and Statistics*' say that any result is to be considered caused by '*testing errors*' and therefore must be ignored.

The reason that the supposed age of the earth keeps getting bigger is because the world would have to be that old for there to be just one chance for '*evolution*' to exist. The number of chemical reactions that can happen on an area as large as the earth in a single year is a number too large to count by anything less than a computer. However, the probability of '*evolution*' causing a human being to be produced is at least 100 million times that number. This number shows that the reliability of '*evolution*' is so small that it must be ignored and declared to be impossible.

Let me give you one more rule of '*pure logic*' before I move on. If you can't understand this rule, don't worry about it. But it is very powerful in the hands of those that do understand.

'*Probability and Statistics*' has a basic rule: '*a random process can only yield a random result and an ordered process can only yield an ordered result*'. That is, '*an ordered result (this universe) can not come from a random process ('big bang' and/or evolution)*'. The fact that we can discover and define rules of nature shows that we live in an ordered universe. You can't make consistent laws, like '*gravity*', if things are constantly changing as they would be in a '*random*' universe. However, '*evolution*' and the '*big bang*' are both random processes. Therefore, the rules of '*Probability and Statistics*' say that this ordered universe could not have come from either of those processes. Since all true scientific laws use the Scientific Method and '*Probability and Statistics*', it is scientifically, Mathematic and logically impossible for '*evolution*' or '*the big bang*' to have produced this ordered universe.

There are other rules of '*Probability and Statistics*' and '*pure logic*' that *science falsely so called* ([1 Timothy 6:20](#)) violate, but I'll give two simple illustrations to show the error of '*evolution*' and '*the big bang*' and then go on.

Suppose that I told you that the building known as the '*Library of Congress*' was created by dropping a big bomb on the mountains. I went on to claim that the stones in the walls '*just happened*' to be blown into cubes and get stacked like they are. The small gravel '*just happened*' to be blown into the right combination to create mortar. The trees '*just happened*' to be blown into the floors, frame, etc. And I went on and on explaining how every little detail '*just happened*' to be the results of the explosion arranging raw materials in that order. I can't imagine anyone accepting that claim. However, the '*big bang*' claims that the process which can't yield one small building created the entire universe. The illustration should be sufficient for people to understand how ridiculous the claim of the '*big bang*' is. Remember, we already saw that people don't have to find the error in the math to prove that $1=2$ is wrong. Likewise, we don't have to deal with all of the convoluted so-called '*logic*' of the '*big bang*' to say it is wrong.

Secondly, supposed that I told you that we could take a computer and grind it into powder and then apply random forces to it and '*eventually*' we would have a fully functional computer with all of the programs and data loaded correctly. Now, if we applied intelligent processes, we might be able to re-manufacture the computer and reload the programs and data. But, there is no way that applying random forces like '*heat*', '*vacuum*', '*light*' or other things are going to create a fully functional computer from dust. However, the '*theory of evolution*' claims that a process which can't produce one little computer can produce a functioning human being. Humans are far more complex than a computer. Again, this illustration should be sufficient for people to understand how ridiculous the claim of the '*theory of evolution*' is. Yes, you can breed for certain traits, within a species. However, when you cross species lines, either you don't get anything or what you do get is sterile, like a mule. Evolution is about crossing lines between species, not about staying within species. If evolution was possible, we should be able to get it to work today. When you can cross a bird and snake to produce a flying dragon let me know. Evolution does not work today and never did.

If we eliminate the lies of *science falsely so called* ([1 Timothy 6:20](#)), we are left with laws of science which follow the rules of '*Probability and Statistics*' and, therefore, follow the rules of '*pure logic*'. These scientific laws aren't defined by science, but rather science discovers the laws of creation that already exist. Since all of the laws of science that man has discovered are proven with '*Probability and Statistics*', and therefore are proven by the rules of '*pure logic*', you should be able to see why I say that the rules of '*pure logic*' are the basis of creation. They are the rules that God used when He created this universe.

Support for Bible Inerrancy.

If the Bible has an error, then we need to know which parts of the Bible are reliable and which parts are not reliable due to the errors. If the Bible has errors, then we have a couple of major problems.

The first is that the Bible claims to be the written Word of the Creator of the Universe and to contain His Law that we will all be judged by. Anyone who pays the least mind to science knows that this world was created with exact details at the smallest levels that we have been able to detect. Each time that we declare the smallest thing to be in creation (atom, etc) we go for some time and then find something smaller. However, that next smaller item follows the same rules of nature that the entire universe follows. All of creation follows the same set of rules and is kept following the same set of rules. We are assured that if these rules were violated at even the smallest level, the cascading effect would be disastrous. In fact, an atomic bomb is essentially the cascaded effect of man forcing a single atom to violate a rule of nature. So we have a Creator of the Universe that shows throughout all creation that He maintains the universe by making sure that His laws don't change and causing severe penalties for violating His laws of nature. If the Bible is, as it claims to be, the written Law of the Creator of the Universe, then the character of that Creator of the Universe is such that there would be disastrous effects upon anyone who changed His Law. The Bible claims to be preserved by God without possibility of corruption ([1 Peter 1:23](#)), which is in keeping with the demonstrated character of the Creator of the Universe ([1 Corinthians 9:25](#), [15:52](#), [1 Peter 1:4](#), etc). If the Bible does contain errors, it could not possibly be the written Law of the Creator of the Universe because such errors are too far outside of the character of that Creator of the Universe. Therefore, if the Bible does contain errors, it is an extremely dangerous lie that has caused countless deaths and should be completely rejected and destroyed because of its effect. Either the Bible is the inerrant written Word of the Creator of the Universe, and should be obeyed completely, or it is the most dangerous lie in the world and should be completely destroyed. However, those who claim that the Bible contains errors and then claim to speak for the Creator of the Universe based upon the authority of the Bible show themselves to be hypocrites and liars.

Furthermore, if the Bible contains errors, then the only basis that we have for believing in the salvation of the Bible is the word of the self-proclaimed ' *expert*'. After all, we have no way of proving if the verses that she/he uses for salvation are corrupt or not. Since she/he hasn't proven that she/he has conquered death, she/he has no reliability and only a fool would trust her/his word that she/he provides salvation from death and judgment beyond death.

When someone claims to have the authority that is equal to, or greater than, the authority of the Bible, they are acting like what the Bible calls an *antichrist* ([1John 2:18, 22](#); [4:3](#); [2John 1:7](#)). To see what I'm saying, read [1John](#) and [2John](#) where the Bible that tells us what an *antichrist* really is. The prefix '*anti*' means against or alternative. An *antichrist* opposes the truth from *Christ* and offers an alternative '*truth*'. Jesus Christ said *For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.* in [Matthew 5:18](#). Jesus said that we can rely on even the punctuation of the Bible being preserved and an *antichrist* teaches people to ignore the punctuation. These *antichrist* claim that their opposing opinion is greater than Christ's word. When they stand against Christ's word, they prove themselves to be '*anti*' to Christ's word. Thus, they are *antichrists*.

Jesus did die and raise himself from the dead to prove His message. If these '*antichrist*' won't do the same as Jesus did, then they prove themselves to be like the man I told about in the beginning of the paper. They are fools who can not prove their claims. They are '*offended*' by those who will not be greater fools for them. They will answer to Christ for the lies they tell and for the souls they send to Hell. Christ was raised from the dead to prove that He was God and could provide life after death. Anyone that will not do that can not guarantee that we will be raised from the dead. Without that evidence, we have no hope of salvation and, as Paul said in [1 Corinthians 15:19](#), *If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.*

Simply put, anyone that claims that the Bible has an error proves themselves to be following the spirit of the *antichrist* as described in the Bible. You can risk the eternal destination of your soul on the word of an *antichrist* if you want. I'm trusting the word of the one who died and then came back from the dead just to prove that He could raise you and me from death. He said that He would preserve His Word as *incorruptible* ([1Peter 1:23](#)). In addition, He promises us an *inheritance incorruptible* ([1Peter 1:4](#); [1 Corinthians 9:25](#)) that can only be received by those who are also *incorruptible* ([1 Corinthians 15:42, 50, 52, 53, 54](#)). Therefore, the only way that we can receive an *incorruptible* salvation is through an *incorruptible* Word of God. If the Bible has any errors, it is not *incorruptible* and can not show us the way of salvation. If the Bible has any errors then we are all going to Hell.

Another point is that the Bible is the only God approved image of God that is in the World. [John 1:1-3](#) says *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. he same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.* This tells us that the *Word was God* and *All things were made by him*. It goes on in [John 1:14](#) to say *And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.* Since *the Word was made flesh*, we know that the *Word* is *Jesus* (' *God in human flesh*'. See the [Lord Jesus Christ](#) documents). Now anyone that has ever met a parent has heard them say '*this is my baby*' while showing a picture of their child. We read that the Father said *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased* about *Jesus* in [Matthew 3:17](#); [17:5](#); [Mark 9:7](#); [Luke 9:35](#) and [2 Peter 1:17](#). Putting it all together, we have God the Father showing us the Bible (Word) and saying *this is My Son*. So, those who claim that the Bible has errors are also claiming that God allowed men to corrupt the only God approved image that exists of an incorruptible Son of God who is also the incorruptible God and the Creator of the Universe. This claim is against the revealed character of God and is the claim of an *antichrist* ([1John 2:18, 22](#); [4:3](#); [2John 1:7](#)).

Now, everyone that claims that the Bible has errors then goes on to ' *correct*' it or is ' *parrotting*' a Bible corrector. (My brother once told me that parrotting someone reduced my demonstrated intelligence to the level of a ' *stupid bird*'.) However, some people claim that they don't ' *correct*' the Bible but just ' *spiritualize*' it. ' *Spiritualizing*' is saying that some ' *hidden spiritual*' meaning is more correct than the literal interpretation. For example, I can remember a religious teacher saying that the Bible wasn't talking about sex in [Genesis 4:1](#) which says *And Adam knew Eve his wife; and she conceived, and bare Cain, and said, I have gotten a man from the LORD.* I forgot what she claimed that this verse really meant because I rejected her claim as the babbling of a blatant fool. ' *Spiritualizing*' is just another way of correcting the Bible. In addition to what was said before about those that ' *correct*' the Bible, you have [Revelation 2:6-15](#) where God says that *them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate.*" The *doctrine of the Nicolaitans* (that God hates) is the doctrine of ' *spiritualization*'.

Some men claim that the Bible was written or preserved by man and therefore must contain errors. This lie is of the devil. I can't go into everything involved in this lie but will provide some highlights. But before I do, let me deal with some possible offended readers.

Any true Christian reader should be able to accept that there is no Christian leader alive today that can claim to have more authority in the church than Peter had. No one alive today can claim to have more acknowledgment from God than Peter had. Two of Peter's letters are part of the Bible and he brought the gospel to the Jews and to the Gentiles. Yet Jesus told Peter *Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men* in [Matthew 16:23](#) and [Mark 8:33](#) and [Galatians 2:11](#) tells us *But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.* When these things happened, Peter definitely loved God, was trying to serve God and had every other claim that any religious leader could claim today. Yet, Jesus called Peter *Satan* because Peter was following the spirit of Satan when he tried to correct the living Word of God ([John 1](#)) when the Word of God disagreed with the teachings of the religious leaders of the day. Now while religious leaders claim to be more spiritual than religious leaders of that day, they are still not more spiritual than Peter or John. Peter learned his lesson and tells us *We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts* in [2 Peter 1:19](#). The thing that Peter said was *less sure* than prophecy (Bible) was Peter's personal witnessing Jesus transfigured and hearing directly from the Father that Jesus was His Son. This was the height of Peter's spiritual experience. Peter himself said that the Bible is more reliable than any personal experience or human authority. John followed that up with his teaching on *antichrists*. ([1John 2:18, 22; 4:3; 2John 1:7](#))

Let me illustrate and go on. If you wrote your name on a piece of paper with a pen, and then claimed that the pen did it by itself, you would be lying. A man can no more provide the 100% accurate prophecy of the Bible without God than the pen can move itself. Man could not write the Bible. Further, not only does the Bible say that God preserves the Bible ([Deuteronomy 7:9, 1 Chronicles 16:15, Psalms 105:8](#), etc), but if God allowed changes in the Bible, then an unfulfilled prophecy might be changed to something that God was not willing to do.

This is just one of many problems that would result if God allowed changes in His Word. The problem that most people have is that they are looking at the wrong thing. They're like the person who's looking at how the rocket is aimed and claiming that there's no difference from one position to another. They need to look at the consequences of a reliable Bible verses the consequences of a changing Bible. If a person can't detail all of the consequences of each of these differences, including the impact upon nature, then they need to admit they aren't qualified to make a judgment in this matter. They then need to choose which authority they want to risk their soul on. I choose the risen savior who said *For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.*

Some men claim that the Bible contradicts itself. I have had an open challenge to anyone and everyone to prove that claim. In every case where my challenge was taken, the people have proven themselves to be ignorant fools who accepted a liar's lie without verifying it, or they were the liar. (Remember the definitions of '*ignorant*' and '*fool*'.) As for the original liars, in every case that I have met, I've shown that the liar *wrest* ([2 Peter 3:16](#)) the verses into an invalid interpretation. *Wrest* comes from wrestle where two opponents try to twist and force each other into unnatural positions and demand submission. However, the Bible does not submit to a liar's twisting. In every case, reading the verses in context, and paying attention to the punctuation, and comparing scripture with scripture, I was able to see and show the true interpretation of each verse. I then showed that the conflict was actually between the wrong interpretations that some man imposed upon God's Word, and not between the underlying verses.

I have been able to make this open challenge because of my faith in the Bible that came from understanding '*pure logic*' and how it applies to the Bible. If anyone said that they solved the same Mathematics problem two different ways and came to two different conclusions, I would have no problem insisting that they made an error and that there was no problem with the rules of Mathematics. Since true science is based upon the Mathematical field called '*Probability and Statistics*', I also have no problem saying that if someone finds two laws of nature and science in conflict, then they have made an error someplace and the laws are in fact not in conflict. The same holds true for the Word of God which uses the same '*pure logic*' as the laws of nature. All so-called conflicts within the Bible are actually due to man's error.

I could go on with other false claims along this line, but, hopefully, I have provided enough examples in detail to convince the greatest skeptic that these laws hold under all conditions. I hope that the reader understands enough to be able to use '*pure logic*' to reason out the truth or error of these types of claims.

Non-logic in the Bible

In [Isaiah 14](#) and [Ezekiel 28](#) we're told about Satan reasoning with himself and coming to the conclusion that he was greater than God. Satan didn't have that conclusion before that time, and since then Satan has been proven to be wrong. While people might use the popular, but wrong, definition of logic and call Satan's reasoning logic, it was not '*pure logic*'. The inconsistent results are our first clue that this reasoning was not '*pure logic*'. Secondly, Satan put his own desires into his reasoning. I've already pointed out that when you introduce non-logical systems, such as human (devil) desires, you no longer have a pure logical system and the results are not always logical. Any time that you have personalities involved, you get inconsistent, non-logical results.

However, when you have a situation where someone is drawing wrong conclusions, if you can get them to remove the '*human*' factor, you can often use '*pure logic*' to show them the correct results. One of the best ways to eliminate the '*human*' factor is to use the '*third person*' for any people involved. We must change specific details to be similar enough to truthfully portray the conditions, yet be different enough that the specific people can't be identified from the story. If you don't change the details, people that know the situation will reintroduce the '*human element*' in their minds. This method of eliminating the '*human*' factor is what the prophet did when confronting David with his sin. With the '*human element*' removed, David arrived at a just judgment. When Satan introduced the '*human element*' into his reasoning, he arrived at error.

When we look at the Bible, there are times that we can apply the rules of '*pure logic*' and there are times that they do not apply. Since we need to *rightly divide the Word of Truth* ([2 Timothy 2:15](#) and see [Dividing](#)), we need to know when these rules apply and when they don't. When personalities

are involved, the rules of ' *pure logic*' should be set aside. However, if you can eliminate the influence of personalities, the rules of ' *pure logic*' often apply. I'm going to explain this more in a minute. First, I need to eliminate the biggest non-logical factors.

God's grace, mercy and love are not given by ' *pure logic*' because our personality is involved in the expression of these traits of God. God's Law is based upon ' *pure logic*'. [Psalms 8](#) tells us that all of creation shows God's glory. I'll show more details of this in a minute, but just like God's laws of nature are completely based upon ' *pure logic*', so also is God's Law that is found in the Bible. Think about what the Bible says the Law is used for. It's a *schoolmaster* ([Galatians 3:24-25](#)) that's used to show men error, sin, corruption, etc. The Law is absolute and unforgiving, just like ' *pure logic*' is.

Only a fool wants cold impersonal ' *pure logic*' of the Law applied to himself. The wise want non-logical grace, mercy and love. However, when we look at the Bible for applying the rules of ' *pure logic*', we have to eliminate those things that include God's love, mercy and grace. God's mercy and grace involve a personality factor. In this case, it's God's personality and our personality. However, this points out some wisdom. If you're talking to someone about God's love, mercy and/or grace, don't bring in God's Law except to contrast it to the love, mercy and/or grace of God. Instead, bring in God's personality when speaking about these things.

Logic and Faith

Let me start out by saying that many people are mistaken in believing that faith and ' *pure logic*' are mutually exclusive. I'm going to show that they actually work together, once you eliminate the confusing, non-logical, elements. The non-logical elements were discussed in detail in the section marked [Non-logic in the Bible](#) and will not be repeated here.

Starting with ' *pure logic*', we see that [Hebrews 13:8](#) says *Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever*. [Malachi 3:6](#) *For I am the LORD, I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed*. I believe that I have showed that ' *pure logic*' is also *the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever* and *changes not*. Thus, ' *pure logic*' has this (and other) traits of God. [Romans 2:11](#) says *For there is no respect of persons with God* and [Acts 10:34](#); [Ephesians 6:9](#); [Colossians 3:25](#); and [1Peter 1:17](#) tell us the same. ' *Pure logic*', like Mathematics, has *no respect of persons* when it comes to the correct answer. [James 2:1](#) tells us *My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons* and [James 2:9](#) tells us *But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors*. [Colossians 2:16](#) and [James 2:3](#) tell us the same thing. Basically, we are told to use ' *pure logic*' when it comes to things of the Bible because ' *pure logic*' is the only reasoning method that has *no respect of persons*.

I mentioned that [Psalms 8](#) says that all of nature shows the glory of God. I showed that the laws of nature are based upon the laws of ' *pure logic*'. Therefore, ' *pure logic*' came from God and shows the glory of God.

Moving on to faith, we see that [Hebrews 11:1](#) says that *faith is the evidence of things not seen*. A study of the word *faith* in the Bible shows that true Biblical *faith* is action by us based upon a promise of God. God doesn't expect us to do what someone tells us to do and expect that ' *something good will happen*' because God is not bound by anyone else's claim. [Isaiah](#), [James](#) and other places tell us that our prayers aren't answered because we don't meet God's requirements. True Biblical *faith* is finding a promise (conclusion) in the Bible, finding and meeting God's requirements (basis) and being fully convinced that God (valid argument) will make the conclusion happen in His time. True Biblical *faith* does not take away God's free will and ' *force*' God to do

anything. True Biblical *faith* gives God the proof that He needs to tell Satan that He is not taking away our free will when He works in our lives. *Faith is the evidence* (proof) that God uses in His spiritual war with Satan (*of things not seen*'). Think of a car. There is a big cable that goes from the battery to the starter. There is also a skinny little wire that goes from the ignition switch to the starter. The starter does all the work of starting the engine but it can't do anything until it has permission to work from the ignition switch. True Biblical *faith* is like the ignition switch in that it gives God permission to work in our life. It does not control how God works but it gives God the permission to work. Thus, as I said earlier, the requirement for us to act in faith matches the requirements of '*pure logic*' because God working or not working in our life is a direct result of if we do acts of true Biblical "faith or not. However, the result of that Biblical *faith* (how and when God works in our lives) is not the result of '*pure logic*' because it involves our personality and God's personality. The result is that people (in error) claim that '*faith is not logical*' when, in truth, the results of faith are not logical. That is: God working in response to our act of *faith* is logical while how God chooses to act is not based upon '*pure logic*'.

Isaiah 1:18 says *Come now, and let us reason together, saith the LORD: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.* In this place, most preachers see an application of faith. This is true. The believer has to trust God to keep His word. However, this verse also shows God using logic as His reasoning method. God provides the basis (starting point) as *though your sins be as scarlet, ' though they be red like crimson.* He provides the conclusion of *they shall be as white as snow ' they shall be as wool.* God does not provide the argument (tell us how He does this) because we can not understand all that is involved. That argument is that God makes a miraculous difference. Since God uses '*pure logic*', we can see that this conclusion is possible from the basis even though we don't understand the argument (how God does it). Believing that God will keep His promise and acting upon that promise, even though we do not understand how God will keep His promise, is faith. People, who refuse to act upon the promise, while they don't understand the argument, are living in unbelief. In truth, all true Biblical faith is based upon '*pure logic*' in that the Bible provides a definite starting place and a definite conclusion and tells us the argument, even if we can't understand the argument in our own abilities. The Bible does not tell us to have faith in some ambiguous result. The Bible uses *hope* for ambiguous results. A person is demonstrating faith in '*pure logic*' when they say that they can't say what's wrong in the Mathematics problem shown earlier, but they're sure that '*1=2*' is always wrong. Likewise, the believer is supposed to say that they don't know how God does it but they're sure that God will give Biblically promised results if the believer has the right basis (Biblically specified requirements for the desired result) and he acts upon those requirements.

Biblical *faith* and '*pure logic*' are compatible. We act in Biblical *faith*, according to the rules of '*pure logic*', so that God has the '*evidence*' that he needs before He can act in our lives in a non-logical manner. Non-Biblical '*faith*' and '*pure logic*' are not compatible because non-Biblical '*faith*' insists upon understanding the '*argument*' and/or insist upon forcing God to act in a specific way. Non-Biblical '*faith*' can not accept a non-logical result from a process that requires '*pure logic*' action (act of Biblical *faith*) as the key which gives God to act as he wants to.

Errors in Dictionary Definitions

Webster's definition is:

logic - noun: the science that investigates the principles governing correct or reliable inference.

SYMBOLIC LOGIC:

1. a particular method of reasoning or argumentation.
2. the system or principles of reasoning applicable to any branch of knowledge or study.
3. reason or sound judgment, as in utterances or actions.
4. the consistency to be discerned in a work of art, system, etc.
5. any connection between facts that seems reasonable or inevitable.
 1. the arrangement of circuitry in a computer.
 2. a circuit or circuits designed to perform functions defined in terms of Mathematical logic

Dealing with each of these definitions we have:

the science that investigates the principles governing correct or reliable inference.

' *Correct or reliable inference* ' allow for us to argue about what is ' *correct* ' because people believe that they can define what is ' *correct* '. As I pointed out, once you introduce personalities, you no longer have ' *reliable inference* '. However, [Malachi 3:6](#) and [Hebrews 13:8](#) tells us that God does not change. Therefore, if ' *correct* ' is what God says is ' *correct* ' ([Psalms 39:11](#); [94:10](#); [Proverbs 29:17](#); [Jeremiah 2:19](#); [10:24](#); [30:11](#); [46:28](#)) then the definition does not change. This definition is correct only if we restrict it to what matches God's definition of ' *correct* ', which is His laws. I showed that science does not define the laws of creation but uses the rules of ' *pure logic* ' to declare the laws that already exist. When this definition lines up with the Laws of God it is a correct definition of logic. When it does not line up with the Laws of God, it is a wrong definition of logic

SYMBOLIC LOGIC.

Is abstract logic and, therefore, this definition is correct in the use of the word ' *symbolic* '. An example of SYMBOLIC LOGIC is ' $a + b = c$ '. However, this definition is ambiguous and violates the rule that you can't use a word (' *logic* ') to define itself. Further, people use this definition to justify non-logical things like ' *Spiritualism* ', which was discussed earlier.

a particular method of reasoning or argumentation.

This definition fits with what I've said before but this definition does not define which method of reasoning nor does it show how to distinguish logic from other methods of reasoning. Therefore, it is incomplete.

the system or principles of reasoning applicable to any branch of knowledge or study.

While the previous definition indicated that there are more than one method of reasoning (' *a particular method*'), this definition indicates that there is only one (' *the*'): logic. (Look at a definition for ' *the*' and you will see that it means ' *there is only one and here it is*'.) Furthermore, there are ' *branches of knowledge*', such as magic, which are recognized to be not logical. Therefore, this definition is wrong for more than one reason.

reason or sound judgment, as in utterances or actions

As I said, there is a difference between the abstract rules that compromise ' *pure logic*' and the application of logic. While logic can lead someone to ' *utter*' something or to take some particular action, most people would agree that some ' *utterances or actions*' are not logical. Further, some may argue that this definition isn't emphasizing ' *utterances or actions*' but is emphasizing the reasoning behind the ' *utterances or actions*'. In this case, they still have a problem in that some valid reasoning methods are not logical. This definition is wrong.

the consistency to be discerned in a work of art, system, etc

I remember seeing a ' *work of art*' that as a solid red canvas. That canvas was definitely consistent, but I would not agree that it was logical. However, if we look closely at this definition we see that it says only that which is ' *the consistency*' is logical. We can argue that this definition does not include those aspects which are not ' *consistent*'. However, this definition continues with ' *to be discerned*', which introduces personalities and what some people ' *discern*' is not logical. This definition is wrong.

any connection between facts that seems reasonable or inevitable

I'm sure that Satan considered his rise above God to be ' *reasonable or inevitable*' and he was probably sure that he was based upon facts. But, as I already pointed out, Satan's reasoning was not logical. This definition is wrong.

the arrangement of circuitry in a computer.

The ' *circuitry in a computer*' is definitely called ' *circuit logic*' but it is an application of logic and not logic itself. Seeing as I hold a college degree in ' *Electronics Technology*' and have spent quite some time dealing with ' *circuitry in a computer*', I can claim to be somewhat of an expert here. This definition is wrong because it is a practical application of logic and not the abstract rules themselves. Anyone who is trained to work with ' *circuitry in a computer*' would definitely understand the distinction that I'm making. But let me make it simple. Hardware (' *circuitry in a computer*') can change due to circumstances (being flooded, etc) and hardware does not always give the same results while ' *pure logic*' does.

a circuit or circuits designed to perform functions defined in terms of Mathematical logic

This definition could be argued to be valid or invalid depending upon how many gnats you want to

strain. Since this definition says '*defined in terms of Mathematical logic*', we know that it is talking about the abstract construct, not the physical implementation of that construct. If you didn't understand that sentence, say '*yah, OK*' and go on. For the gnat strainers, this definition, like Mathematics and programming, is not '*pure logic*' but is an application of '*pure logic*'. So, you decide how valid you want to consider it.

Webster's 1828 definition is:

Logic: LOG'IC, noun. L. id; Gr.

1. from reason, to speak.
2. The art of thinking and reasoning justly.
3. Logic is the art of using reason well in our inquiries after truth, and the communication of it to others.
4. Logic may be defined, the science or history of the human mind, as it traces the progress of our knowledge from our first conceptions through their different combinations, and the numerous deductions that result from comparing them with one another.
5. Correct reasoning implies correct thinking and legitimate inferences from premises, which are principles assumed or admitted to be just. Logic then includes the art of thinking, as well as the art of reasoning.
6. The purpose of logic is to direct the intellectual powers in the investigation of truth, and in the communication of it to others.

Dealing with each of these definitions we have:

The art of thinking and reasoning justly.

This definition is better than the more modern definition in that it qualifies the definition with '*justly*'. Only God's Law gives true justice and, therefore, this definition lines up with my claims that '*pure logic*' is of God and God's Law follows the rules of '*pure logic*'. However, it also allows those who believe in non-Godly '*justice*' to think that aligning their reasoning with the non-Godly '*justice*' is also logic. Lining up with Satan's reasoning is not logical and, therefore, this definition is incomplete or wrong, depending on how you judge it.

Logic is the art of using reason well in our inquiries after truth, and the communication of it to others.

Again, this definition limits itself to '*reasoning well*' and '*inquiries after truth*'. Since Jesus is *the Truth* ([John 14:6](#)), this definition, again, lines up with the Law of God, if you accept the limits of the Bible. It also limits logic to '*reasoning well*' and '*inquiries after truth*'. Satan's reasoning, and any reasoning that includes personalities, are eliminated from the definition of '*pure logic*' by this qualifier, although most people would not realize that these are eliminated. Again, this definition is too ambiguous and open to misinterpretation to be considered a good definition.

Logic may be defined, the science or history of the human mind, as it traces the progress of our knowledge from our first conceptions through their different combinations, and the numerous deductions that result from comparing them with one another.

This definition is right in some ways and wrong in other. Definitely, Adam started with *the mind of Christ* [[1 Corinthians 2:16](#)] (thinking like God did) and would have arrived at consistent correct deductions. However, when sin was introduced, man's reasoning became corrupt and this definition was no longer true since it is limited to '*the human mind*' and '*our knowledge*'. We have already seen that these things do not match the '*pure logic*' which is from God.

Correct reasoning implies correct thinking and legitimate inferences from premises, which are principles assumed or admitted to be just. Logic then includes the art of thinking, as well as the art of reasoning.

The problem with this definition is that the second sentence does not include the limits of the first sentence. If you add the limits from the first sentence ('*correct thinking*', '*legitimate inferences*' and '*just principles*'), then this definition is correct. However, the second sentence, without those limits, is not correct.

The purpose of logic is to direct the intellectual powers in the investigation of truth, and in the communication of it to others

This definition is definitely correct in that *the Truth* ([John 14:6](#)) is Jesus. The purpose of '*pure logic*' is to '*direct the intellectual powers in the investigation of (Jesus), and in the communication of it to others*'. That is what I will do next.

We can see in the differences between the definitions from the two versions of the same dictionary how man is changing word definitions to be more confusing. Deliberately increasing the confusion of definitions is not of God but is of Satan.

The argument that 'I'm following the Spirit of God'.

Usually, when people claim '*I'm following the Spirit of God*' (while they are disagreeing with the written Word of God), they are attaching their emotional sense of self to an idea or a '*conviction*'. I say usually, because in a small percentage of the cases, they can prove that they're correct. However, most people who are truly correct respond with '*the Bible says*' (like Jesus and the Apostles did) and not with this emotional response. An emotional reaction (anger, etc) reveals that they have self involved in their '*stand*' and their motivation is often not as '*pure*' as they think. As has been my position on many other points in this paper, the truth is not shown by what people claim but is shown by their reaction to an impartial test.

You are not your idea. Saying that your idea is wrong is not saying that you are wrong. I would remind the reader that there have been many examples throughout the world in recent years, and throughout all history, of religious believers being willing to die for their beliefs. Many of these people have died for a religious lie. Therefore, zealotry, even unto death, does not prove right. That isn't to say that zeal in itself is to be condemned. The Bible says that Jesus was zealous and died for His beliefs. Yet He was not controlled by any emotion, not even His zeal. In [John 5:31](#), Jesus said *If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true* Saying '*I'm following the Spirit*

of God' is (usually) ' *bearing witness of yourself*'. Jesus said this as part of [John 5:30-36](#) where Jesus said that John the Baptist, His works (miracles), the Father and the Scriptures were His witnesses. Again, in [John 10:24-42](#) and [14:10-12](#), Jesus did not respond emotionally but responded to challenging circumstances with logic and named outside witnesses. Now if Jesus was willing to have people challenge Him, and not respond in anger but provided outside witnesses, we can do no less and still be right.

So right off the top, check your emotional response. Are you willing to accept any challenge without getting angry? Can you respond logically with witnesses that are outside of yourself and are accepted by both sides as being independent and impartial? If not, you are not following the Spirit demonstrated by Jesus which is proof that the spirit you are following is not of the God of the Bible.

As mentioned elsewhere, Jesus told Peter *Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men* in [Matthew 16:23](#), [Mark 8:33](#) and [Luke 4:8](#). In [Matthew 4](#), [Mark 1](#) and [Luke 4](#) we read about Satan tempting Jesus. In all three accounts, Satan asks Jesus to worship him, thereby acknowledging an authority greater than God. In Luke 4:8, we are told that Jesus answered to this temptation with *Get thee behind me, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.*" Here we see a link between the answer that Jesus gave Satan and the one to Peter. In both cases, Jesus said *get thee behind me, Satan*. The reason Jesus gave Peter was *for thou savourest (prefer) not the things that be of God, but those that be of men* and the reason Jesus gave Satan was *for it is written, Thou shalt worship (prefer) the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*. So we see Jesus reacting the same way when someone puts anything above God's written Word. Peter put the religious teachings above the written Word that the Christ must suffer and die. Satan put his personal desire for power and recognition above God's written order of authority.

In all three accounts, Satan quotes the Bible ([Psalms 91:11](#)), in a way that many people see as an accurate quote, but Satan misapplies the verse. Jesus responds with *It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God*. In all three accounts, Jesus is tempted three different ways and each time responds with *It is written*.

So, we can see many things from these accounts.

- Jesus responds to temptation with *It is written*. He trusted what was written and available to Him at that time without any indication of needing to correct or undo ' *errors*' introduced by ' *man's copying*'.
- Jesus refused to accept Satan incorrectly quoting a verse and applying it anyway that he wanted. Jesus said that such use was in error because the context of the Psalm showed that Satan's use was in error. Therefore, quoting the Bible without consideration of the surrounding context and punctuation leads to error.
- Jesus rebuked Peter for accepting and believing what his religious teachers told him was a Biblical teaching without verifying that teaching against the context of the Bible. They quoted verses and told people what those verses meant and people accepted those teachings even when those teachings went against other verses in the Bible. Jesus called Peter *Satan* because Peter was following the spirit of Satan. In [John 8:43-45](#) Jesus says *Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it. And because I tell you the truth, ye believe me not.* The spirit of Satan is to accept a desirable lie and reject an uncomfortable truth from the Bible. Peter was uncomfortable with the truth that Jesus would die. When he rejected the truth, Jesus

called him *Satan*.

At the time of this incident, Peter was saved, following Jesus, had left his business and home to serve Jesus and was doing everything that anyone today could claim as evidence that they're serving God. Yet Peter still made a doctrinal error. All of us are subject to also making doctrinal errors.

[1John 4:1](#) says *Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world.*" He goes on and says in [1John 4:5-6](#) *They are of the world: therefore speak they of the world, and the world heareth them. We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us. Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.* The world tells us that man preserves the Bible, and therefore must introduce errors. The Bible (as shown in the section labeled [Support for Bible Inerrancy](#)) tells us that God preserves the Bible *inerrant*

Now I could give a whole lot of other arguments, but I will end with John's message from God. John tells us *Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.*" *Hereby* means by what John just said. What John just said was *We are of God: he that knoweth God heareth us; he that is not of God heareth not us.* So, those that *heareth us* have *the spirit of truth* and those that *heareth not us* have *the spirit of error*. As stated above, the *us* that John is talking about is the writers of the Bible that says God preserves the Word inerrant. Those that listen to the world and believe that the Bible contains errors are deceived by a *spirit of error*. Peter was a God loving man trying his best to serve God while he was deceived. Even so, many of these people love God and are trying to serve God to the best of their abilities but are still deceived. They are not to be condemned but prayed for that God would remove their blinders and show them the truth.
