

CHAPTER D35

CUSSING, SWEARING, TAKING GOD'S NAME IN VAIN

Morality, as you well know from your studies in the historical section and in the earlier doctrinal chapters, has nothing to do with God's authoritative decrees about sin in the Bible. Morality and ethics actually undermine the authority and prerogative of God by using the general, or majority, consensus of the masses to determine what is currently good and evil. In other words, morality and ethics are evolutionary values the Bible calls *tradition*. As a Bible believer, therefore, I am neither a moral nor an ethical man. I despise morality and ethics because they are blasphemy, rebellion, and sin that make the word of God of none effect. The fact that traditional morality and ethics are "respectable" parts of modern Christianity is a sad testimony to the shocking carnality and inarguable ignorance of Christians. This chapter attacks that well-intentioned-but-ignorance-based Bible-rejecting "foul language" tradition and exposes it as contradictory, inexcusable, and offensive to God.

As a young, ignorant, unsaved Bible rejecter I learned some things about word usage *from the world*. These teachings were *common knowledge* because they were the product of morality. When I later was saved, I was surprised to learn *nothing was different*: God's people don't go to their Lord and Savior for guidance and instruction for very much at all. We have already covered many major topics that prove that. This topic is but another specific example of the general fact that today's smugly self-righteous Christians have neither mastered nor believed what the Bible says – *no matter what the topic, major or minor*. And because they are too lazy and unmotivated to study the Bible, they have no option but to slothfully rely on tradition and society-based morality, which makes them insecure, which in turn makes them aggressively defend their majority-based ignorant opinions by attacking the "morals" of doctrinally-correct Bible believers, and by claiming that certain English words are – by their mere existence – *dirty, filthy, and offensive to God*. In this chapter we'll see that most Christians are not only wrong, they are so enamored with tradition they are not even correct when it comes to simple doctrines such as cussing, swearing, and taking God's name in vain. Therefore they still believe and preach the same pagan blasphemy about word usage that I learned from the world as an unsaved ignoramus. (Why is it that we have a tendency to lazily assume *other* Christians have been the kind of dedicated, motivated, responsible, knowledgeable experts on Bible doctrines that *we* have never cared enough to become?) Let's look into what I learned from the world in order to demonstrate it is the same confusing, contradictory nonsense believed by Bible-ignorant, morality-promoting, tradition-bound Christians.

I learned that *cussing, swearing, dirty talk, filthy language, profanity, foul language, and bad words* all mean exactly the same thing and refer to such words as *damn, shit, hell, and fuck*. And saying things like "Jesus Christ!" is called "taking God's name in vain." The rules are often complicated: As a child it was OK for me to say *privates* or *womanhood*, sometimes OK to say *vagina*, and wrong to say *pussy, bearded clam, cunt*, etc. It was OK to say *privates, body-body, manhood*, etc., sometimes OK to say *penis*, wrong to say *cock, dick, and prick*. My worldly infusion of leaven began in kindergarten when I was taken into the bathroom and had my mouth washed out with soap in order to remove the "dirty words." Around my grandmother we could not say *vomit* or *puke* because she preferred *upchuck*. Even Bible words like *piss* were despised in favor of *number one, tinkle-tankle, wee-wee, or urinate*. *Shit* was proscribed in favor of *number two, BM, poopies, and take a dump*. It was OK to use *some* geographic locations in speech such as, "Oh, heavens no!", but wrong to use *other* geographic locations such as, "Oh, hell no!" The nonsense even extends to animals. For example, it was OK to say *female dog* but wrong to say *bitch* (which makes it amusing to watch Christian "warriors" visit a dog show where they are shocked, offended, and embarrassed to hear owners, trainers, and judges nonchalantly discussing the animals). When discussing books on livestock I even had one person hold up a volume entitled *Horses, Asses, and Mules* and pronounce the first word, silently point to the second word, and say the last two words. And a fundamentalist preacher I know (who says with his lips the King James Bible is the inspired word of God) worships morality so much he ignores God's warning that we should not add to or take away from the words of His Book: Every time he reads from the pulpit verses in his KJV that say "shittim wood" (such as when God tells Moses to use shittim wood to make the ark of the covenant, the tabernacle, and the altar in **Ex 25:10; 26:15; 27:1**), he changes *shittim* to *acacia* in order to tickle the ears of his ignorant, slothful (but tithing!) pewsters who would be offended by hearing the true word of God. All modern Bible translations *change* the above verses to say *acacia* because they think the shittim tree was probably a variety of acacia trees, which makes *shittim* and *acacia* "close enough." But they can't change the *Shittim* in **Nu 25:1** because it's a proper historical name and the unscriptural word *acacia* just isn't the same word as shittim.

It is not a sin to use any words. Certain *actions* are sinful, such as *fornication*, but it is never wrong to use the word *fornication*. In order to make *words* sinful, preachers needed to redefine *words* as *actions*. So they usurped God's prerogative by inventing sins that have made the word of God of none effect. That is an abomination. So let's ignore their ignorance-based shock that we have the balls to discuss any topic under the Son, and their unscriptural offense at our willingness to mock their moral traditions by using *words* from "the gutter", and let's see why this issue is in fact not a minor one.

Cussing is the slang of *cursing*. They mean the same thing: To call evil, harm, or misfortune upon; to execrate. It's as simple as that. Examples of cussing include, *Go to hell!*; *I hope he chokes on his cigar!*; and *Damn your eyes!* Those are sins; it is always a sin to curse someone. Examples of not cussing include, *That ass sure does create a hell of a lot of shit to shovel*, and *He really got fucked by that car salesman!* Notice that cussing is a forbidden action and has nothing to do with vocabulary. For example, *I hope you break your leg* is cursing and is a sin, but *You are so fucking funny* is not.

Swearing is defined as: Appealing to something else to lend value, credibility, or truth to a statement. Examples of swearing include, *By God I'm telling the truth!*; *With God as my witness I'll never swear again!*; *I solemnly affirm on a stack of Bibles it's the truth!*; *Cross my heart and hope to die!*; and *I tell you on my mother's grave I didn't do it!* Those are sins; it is always a sin to swear. Examples of not swearing include, *Shit, I stubbed my toe!* and *The fucking car won't start!* Notice that swearing is a forbidden action and has nothing to do with vocabulary.

Noah Webster contributed to Christian apostasy in his *Dictionary of 1828*. Many Christians prefer this dictionary today because Webster, who was probably a Christian (although he was a fervent believer in the doctrines of the Age of Reason), frequently attached Bible references to the definitions of words. For example, his definitions of *curse* (which are all correct) are full of Scriptural references that were helpful back when concordances were not available. However, one of his definitions of *swear* is conspicuous because it both lacks any Scripture and is incorrect. It also shows that if Webster was a Christian, he was an immature one at the time he published his dictionary. His definition of *swear* says: "To be profane; to practice

profaneness. Certain classes of men are accustomed to swear. For *men* to swear is sinful, disreputable, and odious; but for *females or ladies* to swear appears more abominable and scandalous.”

Only an immature, tradition-bound Christian would think the Bible teaches it is a bigger sin for women to swear (or murder) than it is for men. And only an immature Christian whose custom was to back up his dictionary definitions with Scripture would publish such a dramatically unscriptural definition without feeling guilt over the fact that he could find nothing in Scripture to support it. Other definitions of *swear* in his dictionary are correct, which is why Webster was able to provide Scripture to support them. In the definition I quoted he does something that has long been an acceptable practice in dictionaries: He adds a definition that is incorrect just because ignorant people use it. That is OK because sometimes we may speak with ignorant people and will want to know what they meant to say but didn't because they were ignorant. But Webster stepped way over the line when he added to the word of God by making the use of common vulgarities, idioms, and slang a sin for men and a bigger sin for women! Chapter and verse, please! Webster was so full of shit Martin Luther would have liked him as an ammunition source during his battles with Satan.

Whoa, pardner! You just used the s word! That's a sin because the Bible says it's a sin to swear and curse, and you just used a “swear word” or “curse word.”

See what I mean? Those are the kinds of stupid battles today's Christians engage in. What I just said is an idiom. And the word shit has become vulgar English and slang. (Vulgar is defined on page 3.) But from the beginning it was not so.

The problem with swearing and the reason it is banned by the New Testament is it lessens the truth, validity, or weight of all unsworn statements. The New Testament says don't swear but rather let all of your utterances be true. God's word is *what?* His word is *truth*. When He Who is truth speaks, it is truth; and we who have taken His name should be the same way. If we aren't, we have taken His name in vain.

In court they have you put your hand on a Bible and raise your right hand. This custom is *swearing*. Both the Bible and the raised hand are lending weight, credence, truth, or validity to what you say. That is swearing. I know the President of the U.S. is still *sworn* in with a Bible, but it may be that today the Bibles have been removed from the courtroom swearing in procedure. If so, many Christians will be pissed off they can no longer swear on the very Book that orders them not to. But they still get to lend weight to their testimony, to swear, by raising their right hand. That means any statement they make that is not preceded by a raised right hand is suspect.

What should you do if you have to be sworn in by raising your right hand? Let someone know in advance, in a humble way, that you believe it is wrong because you have been told by Christ not to swear. They probably won't object because they're just trying to get through their day and go home like everybody else. But if they do object you might want to consider rendering custom to the authorities by raising your right hand and *stating* that you'll tell the truth. Some may think I'm compromising, but if the authorities are going to get upset if you don't follow their little customs (remember, the Bible says we should render custom to whom it is due: **Ro 13:7**), I don't see any wrong. The important thing is to know God's truth and live it. Remember, you and I are like Joseph in Egypt and Daniel in Babylon – sojourners without dominion who are serving a pagan nation. We are ordered to please our pagan masters. Whatever you decide is fine as long as you are being a good servant of Christ.

Taking God's name in vain is the same as being put away by Christ. As His bride we have taken His name upon us. And since we represent the female/servant part of the relationship we are supposed to submit to His will. Everything we do – even our prayers – are done in His name because we get our orders and authority from Him; we are nothing. Taking God's name in vain means being a lousy Christian in danger of being put away and sent to hell (**Mt 7:22**). Doing something in *vain* means it is hollow, empty, meaningless, without efficacy, and producing no good result. Saying, “Jesus Christ!” is not taking God's name in vain. To verify that the Commandment specifically uses the word *take* see **Ex 20:7** and **Dt 5:11**. There is no such thing as “*using* God's name in vain”; it has no Biblical meaning. When we *take* God's name in vain we deny Him as Lord (**Pv 30:9**), which can cause Him to deny us (**2 Ti 2:12**). If God's name is *used improperly* the correct term for it is not “taking His name in vain”, it is *profanity*.

Profanity is treating the Lord – or anything sacred – as if He were base, common, or vulgar (**Ezek 22:26; 44:23; Le 19:12**). Examples of profanity include outbursts of surprise such as *Oh my God!*, *Oh God!*, *Sweet Jesus!*, *God damn it!*, *Christ!*, *Jesus fucking Christ!*, and *Good God Almighty!* Therefore, many Christians often lace their speech with profanity because their churches never taught them it is a sin to *profane* God's name, to *debase* God's sacred name. Many ignorant Christians who think it is “taking God's name in vain” to say *God damn it!* and *Jesus fucking Christ!* will often say, “Oh my God! Did you hear what she just said!” None of the above examples of profanity is any worse than any of the others – they are all profanity. (Although *God damn it!* would be cussing in addition to profanity if it were meant as a curse.) I never use profanity; my speech always honors the Lord. The more we know the Bible the more careful we'll be with our choice of words.

The fact that Christians have allowed tradition to redefine *taking God's name in vain* by giving it the definition of *profaning God's name* has done more evil than just cause many Christians to run around uttering sinful profanities. It has also allowed the false doctrine of **eternal security** to thrive in the darkness of ignorance. If they knew marriage is when a woman takes her husband's name, and her being put away is the result of her taking his name in vain, and if they knew what vain means, they would realize all they have to do to disprove eternal security is point to the fact that **Ex 20:7** and **Mt 15:9** both say the same thing – you can be a Christian in vain. But even if the only definition Christians knew was that of *profane* it would cause them to wonder why preachers think the definition of *profane* is the definition of *taking God's name in vain*. Maybe then they'd look it up and realize they've been blind followers of the blind. But I'm over simplifying it; if they knew the Bible and were able to eschew tradition they'd already have realized every type God uses to represent His church, *He can get rid of!* That consistently and directly contradicts the theory of eternal security: Child of God **Dt 21:18-21; Nu 14:7-12**; member of His body **Mk 9:43-47**; house or temple of God **1 Co 3:16,17; He 3:6; Mt 7:26,27**; a living branch **Jn 15:2a,6; Ro 11:19-22**; a bride espoused to Christ **Mt 19:9; Le 21:14; 2 Co 11:2**; a person under grace **Ga 5:4; He 12:15-17**; and salt **Mt 5:13**. The fact that Christians don't even know basics like the Biblical definitions of *profanity*, *taking God's name in vain*, *cussing*, and *swearing* is just the tip of the iceberg and shows they either don't study the Bible or they don't believe what the Bible says.

You say you think I'm just nit picking word definitions and I should realize, accept, and conform to the fact that “common usage” makes certain English words sinful to say? And I respond by saying I don't give a shit about society's “moral values”, but I am greatly offended when you usurp God's authority by inventing sins. And if you respond by saying you don't think it's *technically* sinful to say “shit” but you are just earnestly contending for the traditions of society, I respond by saying

3 D35 CUSSING

you should pull your head out of your ass so you can see that you and I are not in a social situation – we’re in a Christian classroom where we don’t have to act like the morality-loving dogs that rule us. We’re two Christians having a Christ-honoring conversation in His presence. Therefore let’s not offend Him by letting the world’s abominable traditions make His word of none effect. I don’t want you to ever leave the Lord out of a conversation again; I’m sick of always hearing what you think, and hearing you worship society’s ungodly standards, and hearing you leave God out of your thinking. From now on when you open your mouth I want to hear you start out with, “Thus saith the Lord...”

One of the side lessons we’re getting in this chapter has to do with the comparative efficacy of the living English word of God and the dead language ERROR manuscripts: Your preacher has been FUCKING you with “the Greek” because *it hasn’t taught you a fucking thing!* Your problem is *you don’t know English!* That’s why it is necessary for me to type out all of these definitions of *English words!* But I don’t really mind your ignorance of *English*; I mind that you are ignorant of the Bible that defines all of these words for you so you don’t have to get up and look them up in an English dictionary. You pious hypocrite! Doesn’t it bother you that whenever you open your ignorant, tradition-bound mouth it reveals to mature Christians that you haven’t even spent enough time in the Bible to master these simple basics? Doesn’t it bother you that every time I try to get you to focus on what God says in His Bible your new man is so weak you can’t keep yourself from carnally ignoring the Scriptures by continuing to defend tradition’s definition of “sinful speech”? You must learn to love Scripture, to hate tradition, and to deliberately *attack* tradition like our Lord did.

The indignation I just demonstrated is called **righteous anger** in the Bible. *We need more of it in the church.* I get exasperated sometimes because I’m sick of wimpy Christians who are afraid to challenge tradition: If you try to tell them all this they’ll treat you just like the Pharisees did Christ when He corrected them about their precious traditions: They will give you silent, dark looks and then speak ill of you behind your back. Cowardly wimps like that shouldn’t stop you Swordbearers from cutting a wide swath in the church. But hear this, brother: If the shoe fits, you have a woeful track record as a student and doer of the word, and you have a lot of work to do before Judgment. Let’s get back to this basic lesson.

Vulgar defined: Marked by a lack of sophistication; lacking the refined manners and education of the Enlightened; not using refined taste in speech, dress, or actions; of or pertaining to the common masses of society – such as “common (vulgar) knowledge.” Vulgar language is nothing more or less than the vernacular language used by the general public as distinguished from the language of the upper classes who strive to conform to conventional secular rules of *etiquette* (a French word). Giving birth in a livestock manger is *vulgar* behavior. Sleeping in the garden of Gethsemane with bums, and eating with low-class people like shepherds and tax collectors is *vulgar* and was offensive behavior to the Pharisees.

If you say, “Look at the redbird!” you have used vulgar language. It is not a sin to use the vulgar term *redbird*, which is the term most people use. Bird watchers are careful to use the correct *Summer Tanager*, and those who really want to strut their stuff will use the Latin *Piránga rúbra*. It is not sinful to use any of the three terms – even the vulgarity.

Before the Protestant Reformation the Roman Catholic Church published the Bible and conducted church services in Latin, the language of the elite. They didn’t want to *profane* – to treat as base or common – God’s holy word or His worship services by using the common language of society. Their good intentions lacked a Biblical foundation; the Bible gives no indication that using vernacular language is *profanity*. Clerics wanted Latin to prevent the ignorant masses from wresting doctrine (e.g. the Scriptural definitions of *profanity, cussing, swearing*). But after the Protestant Reformation applied the Age of Reason’s belief in democratic rule by the ignorant masses, church rule was taken from autocratic shepherds (**He 13:17**), and democratically given to the ignorant *majority* (**Ec 10:5-7**), thus rendering *individuals* (doctrinally-correct preachers and pewsters) powerless to rudder Christianity back onto a Biblical course. Repentance can only come if we are steered by the monarchical Bible rather than by the multi-headed, tradition-bound, carnal body of the church.

In old England, back when English was a new language derived from the Anglos and the Saxons, good parents used to read Aesop’s *Fables* to their children: “The wolf shote thrice by the way for the great fear that he had.” *Shote* is merely a different tense of *shit*. *Shit* is a legitimate English word. I say *legitimate* because it is OK to use *words* to communicate.

People have always expressed themselves with words. Anger, surprise, fear, pain, emphasis, amazement, etc., are often expressed by idiomatic utterances whose literal definitions have nothing to do with the intended meaning. Catholic cultures tend to use religious figures such as, “Mother of God!”, “Jesus, Mary, and Joseph!”, and “Jesus Christ!” in their expressions. Protestant Anglo-Saxon cultures tend to use body parts and bodily functions such as “dickhead”, “shit”, and “fuck.” The two cultures are often combined into expressions like “Jesus fucking Christ!” and “Holy fucking Mother!”

In Britain’s Massachusetts Bay Colony in the 1760’s our f-ing father, John Adams, defended a gentleman in court who was accused of fathering a bastard. The gentleman in the official transcript testified, “I fucked once, but I minded my pullbacks. I swear I did not get her with child.” The man was acquitted. Language is merely the use of words in an effort to communicate. The gentleman was using proper English in a formal setting.

In old England legitimate vocabulary included *shit, piss, and fuck*. And a rose by any other name would still be the same thing! Have you got a problem with that? But in 1066 William the Conqueror from Normandy (northern France) crossed the English Channel, kicked ass, and made himself king. He was a French Roman Catholic who spoke French, Latin, and English. French became the language of government, Latin remained the language of the educated elite, and English remained the vulgar tongue of the general public. In other words, if you were anybody at all in England – priest, government official, aristocrat, or scholar – you spoke Latin and/or French as a symbol of your status. And, pride being what it is, you often became an insufferable snob: When an English gentleman was talking with his farmer neighbor in the pub and he smelled shit he’d say, “Does that stink mean you have feces on your boot?” The puzzled farmer would look down at his boot and reply, “You mean this shit?” “Yes, that is the vulgar word for it” replied the haughty gentleman, “but gentlemen say *feces* – a Latin word.” Later when the farmer’s buddies pointed out that he had a stinking shit heel, he’d try to act sophisticated by saying, “Your vocabulary is what stinks; shit is a vulture word. But us gentlemen say, ‘I’ve got a *feces* heel.’ That’s because I’ve been shoveling out the sheep barn all day.” In that way we slowly “improved” our vocabulary by doing the best we could to adopt the foreign words used by the “upper” classes. When democracy leveled society we were all supposed to be equal as *citizens*. That made people want to use “*sophisticated* language” instead of “*vulgar* language” in order to disguise the fact that they were nothing but shepherds who smelled of lanolin and sheep shit. Shepherds have *always* offended worldly civilization (**Ge 46:34**). If during the course of a conversation you said *shit* because of a slip of the tongue or because you couldn’t remember the foreign word for it, you’d apologize by saying, “Pardon my poor French.”

Sometimes people prefer to keep certain biological functions such as shitting, farting, fucking, and pissing private. Educated people therefore used the same trick parents do when they don't want their small children knowing what they are talking about: They used vocabulary words the commoners wouldn't understand. Even during an English conversation the upper classes would often substitute the Latin words *copulate* and *intercourse* for the English *fuck*; the Latin *urine* was used instead of the English *piss*; the French word (derived from Latin) *flatulence* was used when talking out loud about a *fart*; and the English *shit* was obscured by the Latin *feces* and *excrement*. And if you didn't want your children – who are still unsophisticated and only know vulgar words – to know you were looking at a Summer Tanager you might say *Piranga rubra*. It is OK to do that. But don't teach your children it's a sin to say *redbird* just because you found out it is a vulgarity.

In the 1760s all of these social customs were already being formed because Enlightened Christians were in a frenzy to become sophisticated and cosmopolitan. But when the thirteen British colonies in America were working themselves up into a revolutionary fever they began to despise everything British and to exalt their Americanism. They became proud that they lived in crude log homes, wore homespun clothes, and were in other material ways very different from England and “the continent.” They were not as well educated as the social circles in Europe and emphasized that fact by speaking English, not Latin. (In fact, Webster and others even considered building upon the regional Americanisms in the English spoken in the colonies by developing a new language called *American* in order to more completely sever our ties with our former nation.)

But the language of the scholars – even the American ones – continued to be Latin. As the new United States built schools many of them taught Latin – even Protestant schools! And as a result of perhaps the most rapid acquisition of wealth by any society in history, American Christians soon began to covet the finery of the continent.

As both British and American society grew in wealth during the 19th century, people found themselves able to afford something that had largely been a luxury – privacy. They could now afford to have and wear summer clothes. If the clothes got sweaty, dirty, and torn during work they'd simply put on another garment. Houses got bigger and were partitioned into separate rooms. The kids and relatives no longer had to sleep in the same room with Mom and Dad. Nudity and biological acts disappeared from public view and from around the home, and people increasingly grew embarrassed by them. Nudity, shitting, fucking, pissing, and farting became unmentionable pseudo sins. The definitions of cursing and swearing were changed so that the *English* words that described those unmentionable biological acts became sins. Timid Christians, offended by the English words, began to refer to “the s word” and “the f word” when talking about the language of shit-heeled shepherds.

Society's growing interest in wealth and sophistication caused more and more people to move away from the rural realities of life in farming communities. As a result, many urbanites began to look down their noses at the labor-filled, sweat-soaked lives of shepherds and farmers, and to be shocked, embarrassed, and offended when they came face-to-face with livestock peacefully living their daily lives as the Lord God, in His infinite wisdom, designed them...such as: an he goat, which is so comely in going, reaches around and down to piss all over his own face, sniffs the crotch of a doe in heat, and shows his delight by lifting his regal head and curling his upper lip into a lecherous grin; a dainty ewe sweetly smiles as she sways her bottom to attract a ram, and then leans back against his thrusts when he mounts her; the family cow, while having her face petted by an admiring visitor, quietly lifts her tail and wetly drops early-spring-grass cow pies that spatter her own legs and those of all within range; the loyal family dog on the living room rug – right in the middle of a conversation with guests – spends 15 minutes happily licking his dick; the gorgeous draft horse stands nonchalantly in the shade on a hot summer day with his cock hanging down to his fetlocks; and a rooster hops onto the back of a hen just as she wades through a puddle, pumps her full of life as she awkwardly holds her head above water, stands (still on her back), proudly thrusts out his chest and spreads his wings, and then struts away by stepping from her back onto the back of her head – splashing it face-down into the puddle. Appreciating the humor of this cocky display, my wife and I burst into laughter. But a guest, trying to cover embarrassment with a change of subject, quickly asks, “Why are the feathers missing from the hen's back?” But God's reminders of the way He created life are everywhere: “Because she is a favorite lay of the roosters; the roosters maintain their balance while on top of a hen by gripping her back with their feet, which breaks and plucks her feathers. It's the same with grass in playgrounds; the bare spots are always in places that get the most foot traffic.” And, without the ever-present realities of tending to our food supplies, including putting down dying animals and culls, killing animals is today being edged ever closer to the sin of murder by horrified urbanites. When modern effeminate Christians react to the above reminders of God's everyday realities with self-righteous shock and disapproval, all shepherds and farmers throughout history turn their eyes to heaven, shake their heads, sigh, and then shoulder the burden of our weaker brethren whose inexperience-based ignorance and haughty condemnation cause them to be offended by *life* and by *words*.

History records that even in the late 1800s words like *fuck*, *shit*, and *piss* were correctly referred to as “Anglo-Saxon words.” For example, a man from Kansas said that in his small town you could get an education in sex by just walking down the street reading “Saxon words chalked on the sidewalks and barns.”

“Dirty” talk and “gutter” language are throwbacks to the days when shepherds, whose type of work put them in the *lower* social class, were disdainfully called “dirty” because they “looked like they'd been lying in the *gutter*” because their clothes were often soiled from farm work. After many generations Christians forgot that “dirty words” was just a term originally used to differentiate between the foreign words common to the erudite classes (“sophisticated” words that were accepted by high society, words that were “socially acceptable”) and those same words in English used by the lower “dirty” classes. Because these “low class”, “socially unacceptable” words came to be identified with the “vulgar classes”, the working classes, the words themselves gradually became *dirty*, which meant *unclean*, which is a Bible word that means *sinful*. (Christians have been sloppy about synonyms for many years.)

In that environment filled with ignorant, haughty, self-righteous sissies, preachers found yet another way they could tickle ears by preaching against “sin.” They twisted verses like **Ph 1:27**; **1 Pe 1:15**; and **2 Pe 2:7** to make it a sin to say something in English instead of in Latin! But if any pewsters had bothered comparing 2 Pe 2:7 with **v.8** they'd have seen that God defines “filthy conversation” as “unlawful deeds” not as “unlawful words.” Christ wants us to be doers of righteousness, not religious avoiders of contradictory, nonsensical, invented “sins” that make His word of none effect. Consistent with this, when the Bible speaks against “filthy communication out of your mouth” in **Co 3:8**, it does so in the context of and in a list of *sinful deeds* (**vv.5-9**) – not sinful English vocabulary words. Tradition-bound, morality-worshipping modern Christians don't mind when someone blasphemes God by saying, “He has failed to preserve His inspired and inerrant word”; and they don't mind profaning His Holy Scripture by claiming, “No book on earth is the inspired, inerrant word of God because all bibles in existence are mere *corrupt translations of human origin*”. But they go to battle stations against any brother who uses the

5 D35 CUSSING

English “I need to take a *shit*” rather than the Latin “I need to make *feces*.” As **Ja 3:2-14** says, it is very difficult to control our tongues. But our tongues aren’t evil when they use English vocabulary words instead of foreign synonyms, our tongues are evil when they convey a sinful heart. Think about that as you read **1 Sa 2:3** and **Mk 7:20-23**. God is a God of truth and love, and He wants our words to reflect His truth and love. That is very important, but as we learned in James, the pride of *self* is often behind our words – not the love and truth of God. Modern Christianity has trivialized that important doctrine by creating the “sin of certain English vocabulary words.” As it was at the First Coming, so it is now: To be affiliated with any denomination is to be linked with apostasy; their blind denominational leaders have blinded them.

Many preachers taught that any sexual contact between husband and wife except for the “missionary position” was a sin because having sex for enjoyment instead of in fulfillment of the Old Testament’s Old Commission to be fruitful and multiply was a “sin against nature.” Many Christian couples believed their preachers, went home, decided sex was more fun than obeying Christ, turned their backs on Him, and enjoyed each other’s company in bed. In other words they sinned by doing something that really wasn’t a sin.

Vocabulary-oriented morality got so bad Christians couldn’t say, “The dog bit Jane’s *thigh*.” They had to say, “The dog bit Jane’s *limb* above the knee”, because *thigh* was too suggestive. In fact, the word *leg* was itself so suggestive of sinful things that the word *drumstick* was coined so Christians who wanted a turkey or chicken leg at supper wouldn’t have to learn the Latin word for leg in order to avoid another “sinful” English word.

Christians no longer fear asking for a chicken leg. Do you know why they don’t? Sure you do; it’s because traditional morality no longer puts the word *leg* in the “gutter” with the other “filthy” English words. But Christians still ignore the word of God by clinging to their precious pagan morality. I am very offended by the moral majority of Christians; they are serving two masters and are therefore enemies of the cause of Christ. Our concern should be the *sinfulness* of the church, not the *morality* of the church.

I do not advocate walking around saying shit and fuck all the time. It’s OK to say those things, but be careful. I’m saying them now in this chapter because we’re all mature brothers-at-arms who can say anything to each other. But when I’m around unsaved denominationalists and immature Christians I’m careful about bringing up *any* of the subjects in this book. I *do* bring them up, but I try to pick my opportunities wisely. I certainly wouldn’t want to FUCK a brother by keeping the truth from him and letting him continue in sin.

When staying in a hotel one time I met a man and began chatting with him. We quickly identified each other as Christians and agreed to get together for some fellowship. He was a Christian author and was passionate about things of the Lord. During the course of our conversation I deliberately said something like, “It’s a bunch of crap.” He rebuked me. I asked him if he thought saying words like shit and fuck is a sin. “Absolutely”, he replied. “OK”, I asked, “is it a sin to say copulate, fornicate, poo-poo, feces, excrement, etc., because they mean *exactly the same thing*?” He looked at me, thought about it for a minute, and said, “Yes, saying those words is also a sin.” He is the only Christian I’ve met who had the mental consistency to reject the idea that it is a sin to say something with an English word but not a sin to say the same thing with an imported foreign word. But here’s the shame: If he ever says copulate, poo-poo, or feces he’ll be sinning, not because saying poo-poo is a sin but because he believes it is (**Ro 14:14,23**). You see, when you think something is a sin against God that really isn’t – like enjoying sex with your spouse or using English words rather than Latin synonyms – and you do it anyway, you have sinned in your heart. That means your heart is not circumcised – no matter what your penis looks like – and, faced with a choice between what you think God wants and what you want, you turn your back on God and exalt self.

Anyway, I then asked this man to turn to **Ph 3:8**. When he read it he looked up in surprise and said, “I’ve never noticed that before!” That’s the problem: Because of tradition Christians don’t really pay attention to the words of God. It is even possible to be a nationally known, very popular Christian author *without knowing the Bible!* And according to his false doctrine about “filthy language”, even if he reworded **Is 36:12** (...they may eat their own dung, and drink their own piss...) to read, “they may eat their own poopies, and drink their own wee-wee”, the Bible would still be “disgustingly filthy” to him in word and in meaning.

In closing, let me point out a big failure in Christianity. The word of God is a Pearl of great price. We should treasure it, spend time with it, and learn everything it says. When I speak with Christians they don’t talk about the Scriptures. And they say things (and don’t say things) that reveal them to be woefully ignorant of the word. But they *do* talk – at great length – about *other* things: toothpaste logos; black helicopters; balm of Gilead natural remedies; how often their neighbor says “the f word”; why Christians with facial hair and metal-rimmed reading glasses shouldn’t be trusted; how a certain prominent Christian preacher committed adultery with his secretary; holey underwear; how to register your car in a distant state in order to trick the authorities; how I shouldn’t have a telephone calling card or a bank account because they are contributing to the one world government of the Antichrist; how we should boycott Disney until it stops being civil to homos; how demonic hairy reptiles are; how I should join a neighborhood militia so we can kill the authorities when they “come for us”; how bad it is to buy a Bible bound in “unclean” pigskin; how no book or magazine on the table at home should *ever* be placed on top of the Bible; how we should all help get conservative voters to the polling booths; etc. The list *never ends* and it changes every week in order to keep Christians entertained and full of shit. Instead of spending all that time learning about what the world is doing, Christians should be spending all that time learning the Bible.

Christ hates tradition because His church cannot survive without believing every word of God. That’s why He deliberately did little things contrary to the false doctrines and traditions of His day knowing they would offend Christians and cause them to rebuke Him. As soon as they expressed their displeasure He gave them a Bible lesson. You are a follower of Christ; He is your example. Therefore it is incumbent upon you to do the same thing: be Christ-like by attacking tradition.

Christ said our enemies are they of our own household. Christians who believe and promote false doctrine and tradition are our enemies just as they were Christ’s enemies. That’s why Christ also told us to love our enemies; our enemies are fellow Christians. And He said we don’t love them if we spare the rod.

If we let our brethren continue on the broad, popular way that leadeth many to destruction we are effectively cursing them. That is *fornication*, which can result in our *taking the Lord’s name in vain*.