

# The Big Lie

by Russell Boatman

The most noxious seed ever sown in the soil of the Christian faith is the dogma of original sin. Every branch of the Christian doctrine of salvation has subsequently been corrupted. Someone has said, "One of the nicest things about telling the truth is that one doesn't have to remember what has been said." On the other hand, telling a lie is like stepping off onto a ski slide. There is no stopping until one hits the bottom. The bigger the lie, the more precipitous the slide. For every lie that is told, another, and another, etc., etc., etc., must be told. Such is the history of the "big lie" in denominational dogma.

The dogma of original sin produced the doctrine of hereditary depravity— teaching that man is by nature, in consequence of Adam's transgression, dead in sin from the moment of conception. This doctrine is generally attributed to "Saint" Augustine who lived in the latter half of the 4th century. Historians, however, point out that Augustine should only be credited with the particular form of the doctrine attributed to him. He was a compiler, not an originator.

A Jewish sect as early as the Exilic period is known to have taught a doctrine fo similar import. This is attested by the vigorous refutation of such contemporary prophets as Jeremiah and Ezekiel (see Jer. 31:29, 30 and Ezek. 18 (particularly vs. 1-4 and 19-20). Notwithstanding the thoroughness and finality of the prophet's refutation the teaching persisted, supported by false application of such passages as Exodus 20:5 and Psalms 51:5.

The Jewish form of the doctrine sought only to provide excuse for man's personal wickedness. It was argued that he came by it naturally. Father was a sinner, his father was a sinner, his father also, etc., etc. The phrase that was coined to express this was a cute one - "The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge" (see Ezek. 18:2 Jer. 31:29,30). The modern behavioristic school of psychology would find in the ancient Jewish minds kindred to their own.

The Augustinian doctrine is a perversion of a deeper dye. Not the consequences only, not even a susceptibility or tendency to sin, but the very guilt of Adam's sin - this too is transmitted unto all generations through the process of procreation! This is the big lie in denominational dogma - the most noxious seed ever sown in the soil of the Christian faith. Behold how every branch of the Christian doctrine of salvation has been corrupted by it.



## **Part 1**

### **APOSTACIES CULMINATING IN THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION BY WORKS ALONE**

#### Infant Baptism

Out of the doctrine of total hereditary depravity grew the practice of infant “baptism”. (Quotation marks may be omitted, insofar as the mode is concerned at the outset, for the Roman Church as well as the Greek branch in Augustine’s time immersed and continued to do so for several centuries afterwards.) If the doctrine of total hereditary depravity be allowed then infant “baptism” becomes mandatory even if it isn’t commanded, alluded to or allowance made for it in the New testament. As soon as it began to be believed that “there are babies in hell not a span long’ (because of the transmissions of Adam’s guilt) mothers began to clamor for their babies to be admitted to the rite of baptism.

The reason is not hard to understand. If babies are born sinners, then (since baptism is for the remission of sin) \* obviously babies should be baptized at the earliest time possible. \*NOTE\*: The notion that “baptism for the remission of sins” violates a principle of justification by faith is of much later origin, being a reaction to the doctrine of sacerdotalism which arose out of the practice of infant baptism.

#### **SACERDOTALISM, BAPTISMAL REGENERATION, ETC.**

Out of the practice of infant baptism arose a cluster of closely related perversions of Christian doctrine. Obviously, the “baptism” of infants posed a problem. In that infants cannot fulfill the requirement of faith (Mark 16:16) it was necessary to reason around this requirement. This was accomplished

- 1)** by attributing “priestly” powers to the officiating ministers (sacerdotalism) the basic ingredient of the Romanist hierarchical system, or
- 2)** by assuming that the faith of believing parents sanctifies their children, through baptism. The logical outgrowth of such reasoning is the doctrine of baptismal regeneration (water salvation, as it is sometime called).

Our brethren, in this the heyday of the faith only cult, are often charged with teaching and practicing baptismal regeneration. To make such a charge is to nei-

ther understand the terminology employed nor the teaching and practice of our people. Baptismal regeneration is a necessary corollary of infant baptism. In our insistence of believer's baptism we reject the very conditions that necessitate such a doctrine. No, not the baptism of penitent believers "for the remissions of [personal] sins (Acts 2:38) but the "baptism" of unwitting (and often unwilling) infants for the remission of Adam's sin—this is "baptismal regeneration."

John 3:3-5 clearly informs us we must be spirit begotten (regenerated by the Holy Spirit) as well as born of the water to enter the kingdom of heaven. Thus we insist that baptism be reserved for those who have first been evangelized by the Christian gospel, who profess their faith in Christ thereby, and who come repentantly, surrendering body and soul to the Lord Jesus Christ.

## **CONFIRMATION**

Another outgrowth of The Big Lie is confirmation, as practiced throughout the paedo-baptist denominations. In a society where it is customary for the parents to make life's greatest decision for their children, even to their occupations and partners in marriage, it was not at all difficult to develop this corollary to infant baptism also. The child "baptized" without his or her knowledge or consent upon reaching the age of accountability was required to confirm (personally accept) the decision the parents had made for him/her.

## **SALVATION BY WORKS**

The "leaven of the Pharisees" (Matthew 16:6), the doctrine that salvation is secured by ritual was infused into the "lump" of Christian doctrine by the foregoing development. Two divergent movements have grown out of such a notion—Roman Catholicism and Protestant Liberalism.

## **ROMAN CATHOLICISM**

Roman Catholicism represents one end to which the doctrine of total hereditary depravity had led. Besides the foregoing, a number of kindred errors peculiar to the papist system have arisen. The doctrine of the immaculate conception (introduced to spare the Christ child of the guilt of Adam's transgression) and more recently, the doctrine of the assumption of Mary are contingencies. Purga-

tory, works of supererogation and a number of other encrustations are other contingencies. The bridge between these and the Augustinian dogma is the sacerdotal system.

## **PROTESTANT LIBERALISM**

Protestant liberalism has avowed to cut itself adrift from all tradition, to seek truth wherever it may be found. But the road to salvation blazed by the papists is the road these would travel also. Only the vehicles in which they would have us travel is different. These, too, expect to find salvation (whatever that may mean to a liberal Protestant) by works.

Ethicism and sociology replace the vehicles in which the Romanists expect to ride to the pearly gates. Liberal Protestantism may not be too sure the road they are traveling leads to eternal life in that “better country”, but to whatever ultimate goal they do expect to arrive, if any, they are sure the way to get there is by “works of righteousness which we do ourselves”; to borrow a phrase from Paul, in which he denied the very thing the liberals avow! (Tiptoes 3:5)

**AUTHOR’S NOTE:** The tracing of the doctrine of salvation by works is not a difficult task. The lines of dependency, especially in the papal system, are clear and are generally conceded. That Protestant liberals share the concept of salvation by works is a fact common knowledge, although it may not be as generally recognized that they are indebted to the Romanist for the development of the idea. In Part two we wish to show that 20th Century Fundamentalism also, in its teaching of “salvation by faith alone” is likewise an outgrowth of the same basic error.

The doctrine of salvation by faith (alone) stands today as the antithesis of the doctrine of salvation by works (alone, or otherwise), but the roots thereof are the same. Fundamentalism simply represent another offshoot of the same parent stock. Not since Adam and Eve ate of the forbidden tree and introduced sin and death into the world has one act of man had such dire consequences as the introduction into the church of the dogma of original sin. In Part Two we propose to refute this dogma and discuss also the other branch thereof—20th Century Fundamentalism.

## (Synopsis of Part One)

In Part One we traced out the dependency of the papal doctrine of salvation (by works) upon the dogma of original sin. We showed, too, that modern Protestant liberalism is nourished from the same stock. In the instance of the latter, the dependency is akin to such a growth as mistletoe, a vegetable parasite which derives its life from the tree upon which it feeds.

The doctrine of salvation by works as developed by the papists is an offshoot of sacerdotalism, which is an offshoot of infant baptism, an offshoot of the doctrine of the total hereditary depravity, growing out of The Big Lie— the dogma of original sin.

Modern Protestant liberalism is in no sense native to such a system, but like any other parasite it has enough affinity to that upon which it feeds to sustain itself thereby.. The affinity in this case is the doctrine we have taken pains to expose. Whether the doctrine be in its papal form (salvation by ritual) or its Protestant form (salvation by social progress) it is utterly false to the Christian doctrine of salvation.

In Part Two we wish to examine the tenets of fundamentalism, and to show its dependency likewise upon The Big Lie. It has been truly said, “The old serpent, the devil has a forked tongue!”

## **Part Two**

### **APOSTASIES CULMINATING IN THE DOCTRINE OF SALVATION BY FAITH (ALONE)**

#### **THE DOGMA DEFINED**

The dogma of original sin find its classic expression in the official confession of the Presbyterian Church in the USA

“By this sin [eating the forbidden fruit] they (Adam and Eve) fell from their original righteousness and communion with God, and so became dead to sin, and wholly defiled in all the faculties and parts of body and soul. They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all posterity descending from them by ordinary generation. From this original corruption whereby we are indisposed, disabled and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to evil, do proceed all actual transgressions.

(Revised edition, 1939, pp. 25.26)

#### **PREDESTINATION**

Such a doctrine call for action—strong, immediate action—on the part of God, or man, else all would be lost. No worse thing could be said of the devil himself than the dogma has said of all Adam’s race. One branch of theology has man taking the initiative to spare the race of guilt and condemnation of Adam’s transgression. By the introduction of the practice of infant baptism, the depraved child is supposed to be provided a way of escape. Another branch of theology has God taking the initiative. With this branch we now wish to deal.

Some such doctrine as predestination seems a logical necessity if the major premise of the dogmatists be allowed to stand. If a child is born “dead” in sin, “utterly disposed, disabled and made the opposite of good,” nothing the child could possibly do, or ever hope to do, could count for righteousness. The fact is, these theorists would remind us, a dead man can’t do anything! He must be first made alive; and that is the Divine prerogative and function. Thus, these theorists would have us believe salvation is wholly of God, and not by anything which we may do ourselves. Our fate is wholly in the hands of God who has predestined (predetermined, foreordained) all things.

How then shall anyone be saved? This is matter of God's arbitrary election. God being both just and merciful elects some to be lost, others to be saved. All deserve to go to hell in consequence of the guilt of Adam. Those whom God elects to go to hell receive their just dessert. Those who God elects to go to heaven are just as deserving of hell but God, to show Himself merciful, elects that they be saved. This is the Calvinistic doctrine of salvation. Calvinists would dignify this farce by calling it the doctrine of the Divine Sovereignty of God. He arbitrarily elects some to participate in the "free grace" of Christ's "finished work on Calvary." He elects equally as arbitrarily, to allow others to be lost, that His justice may also be vindicated.

### **MOURNER'S BENCH**

Out of such a theory came the mourner's bench, altar calls and "praying through" ceremonies so common to the fundamentalists movement. Herein is one of the paradoxes of fundamentalism. While professing to believe in salvation by faith alone rather than in "works of righteousness which we do ourselves", they have devised a system all their own, having no relevance to the New Testament record of salvation.

Instead of an open confession of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God, fundamentalists instruct sinners to "raise your hand" (while every head is bowed and every eye is closed). That the New Testament provides no authority for such procedure seems to bother them not at all.

When as many as can be persuaded at a given service to raise their hands, having indicated they would have the evangelist to pray for them, the altar call is given. They are now exhorted to show they "mean business" by coming to the mourner's bench to be prayed through. This is generally required as a deliberate alternative to Christian baptism. The latter would be a "work", by praying through is not a work! How deceived and deceiving can these deceivers be? That which is of faith (faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of Christ," Romans 10:17) is called a work, and that which is altogether a work of righteousness which men do themselves, being not by commandment of Christ but by order of fundamentalist evangelists; that is pawned off as salvation by faith alone!

## **SALVATION BY FAITH ALONE**

There is no such thing as salvation by faith alone, not even in the practice of those who shout such a doctrine from the tallest transmitters towering above out housetops. Fundamentalists have substituted works of their own devising for "the obedience of faith" (Romans 1:5; 6:16-18; 16:26) "raise your hands", "come to the altar", "pray through", "say pray for me...[name of evangelist]." These "works" are required of every seeker of salvation, after which they are told "just believe you have received."

Salvation by faith alone is only a catch phrase to "catch" the ignorant and unsuspecting. The doctrine itself was conceived as a necessary corollary to the doctrine of election whereby it is assumed God "gives faith" to those upon which His "free grace" has been "elected" to fall. His Divine Sovereignty foreordains who is to be elected, who is to be omitted. We may agonize and plead and pray at the mourner's bench for God to give us faith, but we dare not "confess with our mouth Christ Jesus as Lord" and "be baptized for the remission of sins." That would be to minimize the grace of God. Salvation could not be the "free gift of God" if we would work for it. Apparently praying through, sweating it out on the mourner's bench, this is not work. But simply yielding oneself body and soul to the will of God so completely that one can be represented as having died, and been buried, and raised to walk in the newness of life, that's work! Can you believe it?

## **ETERNAL SECURITY**

The cap sheath of this strange mode of reasoning is the doctrine of Eternal security ("once saved, always saved"). It is not generally recognized how necessary this doctrine is to the anti-be-baptized cult. In order to hold that salvation is by faith alone these theorists have to teach that not only baptism, but "continuing steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrines, fellowship, the breaking of bread and prayers, "and other aspects of the Christian life likewise are just "electives". They may determine the extent of reward in heaven, the size and splendor of our mansion, but not entrance into heaven itself.

## **FAITH BASED UPON EXPERIENCE**

That such doctrines are completely at variance with scores of scripture does not seem to disturb the fundamentalists one whit. Theirs is a “faith” based upon “experience”. That experience may be, and often is a form of self-hypnosis, experienced under the emotional strain and suggestion of the “prayer warriors” whose wailing and entreating and exhorting destroys all power to reason. This experience, nonetheless, is made a basis for belief that one had been gloriously and everlastingly elected to salvation, brought under the blood of Christ, and glory bound.

**CONCLUSION:** Astronomers used to believe that the earth was flat, that it stood still and that the sun, moon and stars revolved about it. Error of such magnitude led to so many difficulties that when King Alphonso of Spain was being instructed by his court astronomers, he shook his head and said, “Even I could have told you the Creator a better plan.”

The difficulties were not with the Creator's plan. They were due to man’s false reasoning. When Copernicus, some years afterward, demonstrated the true nature of the solar system the difficulties of which King Alphonso complained were solved.

In like manner, the myriad of errors growing out of the Big Lie will never be solved by arguing with our religious neighbors about infant baptism, baptism for the remission of sins, predestination, election, etc. The Bog Lie itself must be exposed, and God's truth be made clear. The axe needs to be laid to the root of this noxious weed that has become as a great tree.

**SUPPLEMENT:** The foregoing remarks are not intended to be scholarly or exhaustive, but rather to summarize and expose in terms the ordinary person can understand the terrible fruitage of the Big Lie. As a supplement to the foregoing, a critical analysis of the nature and effect of Adam’s transgression is hereby appended.

## **THE DOGMA OF ORIGINAL SIN**

We have reviewed the devious doctrines growing out of The Big Lie (the dogma

of original sin). In this supplement we wish to examine the dogma directly. This is no great task, provided we limit ourselves to the teaching of the scriptures on the subject. The sin of Adam, and the direct and immediate consequences are discussed in Romans 5:12-21 and 1 Corinthians 15:21,22. An incidental allusion to Adam's transgressions is found in 1 Timothy 2:14.

## **ADAM'S SIN**

From Genesis 3 we learn Adam and Eve ate the forbidden fruit as an act of willful disobedience. The immediate consequence was that "their eyes were opened". Inasmuch as the tree they had eaten of was the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil the inference is that they passed from the state of innocence into the state of moral accountability. In this regard they exhibited a sense of shame at their physical nakedness and set about to cover themselves as best they could. They apparently had no evil imaginations prior to their temptation and fall. The second consequence was that they were "afraid" when they heard the voice of God and immediately undertook to hide themselves as best they could.

## **WAS ADAM ORIGINALLY IMMORTAL?**

At this point we need to note man was not created immortal. Were this so, what purpose would have been served by the "Tree of Life? The fact that subsequent to their transgression they were barred from the Tree of Life is evidence the perpetuity of their lives was conditioned upon access to that tree. By the sweat of his brow Adam might, and did, eke out a living for himself and his bride for a time, but it was a losing battle. He died, as his posterity have done. Thus, God has warned: "Of the tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day thou eatest thereof dying, thou shalt surely die," Genesis 2:7 (Italics indicate the more exact meaning of the Hebrew text). Adam and Eve came under the sentence of death when they sinned. Like a fish thrown into a stagnant pool, gilling laboriously to escape impending death, so Adam and Eve, by toil, sweat and pain "lived" for some time and even begat children, but death was inevitable. Inasmuch as the garden with the Tree of Life was subsequently removed from earth all Adam's posterity passed under the sentence of death.

## **DID ADAM DIE SPIRITUALLY?**

Did Adam and Eve die spiritually the day they sinned? This may be allowed, for sin separates from God (Isaiah 59:2) and the basic idea in the biblical usage of the word "death" is that of separation. The separation of the soul from the body is called death, (This is physical ordinary death.) The ultimate and final separation of the soul from God, after the judgement, is called "the second death", Revelation 20:14. The New Testament refers to those in this present life who are separated from God by reason of sin as "dead through trespasses" Ephesians 2:2,5. Reasoning from the dogma of original sin, fundamentalists are inclined to interpret the term in its literal sense, that is in the sense of one being without life, feeling, sensibility, consciousness, inclinations, capacity to act, etc. In such case the sinner is thereby rendered wholly dependent upon the "quickening" grace of God to even so much as have the capacity to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, to know and love God, trust in Christ for salvation, etc. But this is a decided and obvious misuse of the figure of speech. We repeat, the basic idea in the Biblical usage of the term is that of separation. In the sense in which the scriptures use the term we may allow Adam and Eve entered in upon the state of spiritual death upon becoming transgressors.

## **ARE WE ALL BORN "DEAD" SPIRITUALLY?**

Are all men "born dead" spiritually in consequence of Adam's transgression? This is the paramount issue involved in this discussion. Exponents of the dogma of original sin teach that all are "stillborn" spiritually. This is a strange wresting of the scriptures. Adam and Eve suffered physical death in consequence of their sin but their descendants certainly are not all born dead (spiritually), else the race itself would have died at the stem. On what basis must we assume all are born dead spiritually? Neither by analogy nor by any Word of the Lord may we draw such a conclusion. Paul's statement in 1 Corinthians 15:21,22 cannot rightly be so construed. If spiritual death is the death he is speaking of then all men will be saved. The text reads "As in Adam all shall die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." The Universalists are no more in error in using the last half of the verse to teach universal redemption through Christ than are the dogmatists in using the first half of the verse to teach universal Adamic guiltiness. They are no more wrong, but they are also no more right. 1 Corinthians 15:21,22

The context of 1 Corinthians 15:21,22 makes it unmistakably plain that the death spoken of is physical death, for the resurrection spoken of is certainly the resurrection of the body. Here we do have a parallel. All die (physically) in Adam. And all are made alive (physically) in Christ. Here ye Him: "The hour cometh in which all that are in the tombs shall hear His voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection and the life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of judgement," John 5:28,29.

## **ROMANS 5:12-21**

Romans 5:12-21 is not so easily explained, at least not in so few words. But when explained in the light of the doctrine of inherited guilt a far greater difficulty is raised than are explained thereby. It is impossible to escape the doctrine of universal redemption if universal guilt is reckoned as passing upon men in consequence of Adam's transgression. Not all parts of Paul's analogy are readily comprehensible but this much is plainly propounded: Everything that has "passed upon" man by reason of Adam's transgression is canceled by the gracious act of Christ. To the extent Adam's sin is said to affect us, to the same extent Christ's righteousness is said to nullify that effect. The same number of persons affected by the one are said to be affected by the other. If the solitary act of Adam condemned all men to spiritual death (apart from personal accountability) then one solitary act of Christ redeemed all men apart from personal, individual accountability. Since all men are not "saved" just because Christ is savior, all men are not sinners just because Adam was a sinner. The one state of being or relationship is no automatic nor universal than is the other. What Paul is actually saying is not that we inherit Adam's guilt, but simply that Adam introduced sin, condemnation and death into the world. Thus Christ came to bring righteousness, justification and eternal life. To say more than this is to say too much. If the guilt of Adam's sin is the ground for our condemnation then Adam is greater than Christ, for more by far are thereby "made sinners" (if this interpretation is allowed) than are "made righteous" through Christ.

## **GUILT versus CONSEQUENCES**

The dogmatists fail to distinguish between the consequences of an act and the guilt of that act. The children of adulterers, drunkards, murderers, thieves and such like suffer many consequences but none of the guilt. Exodus 20:5 is often

cited to support the doctrine that guilt is inherited. The passage reads, "I Jehovah, thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generations of them that hate me." But the next verse reads, "and showing loving kindness unto thousands [of generations, see marginal note] of them that love me and keep my commandments."

Psalms 51:5 is the classic scripture used to support the doctrine of inherited guilt. "Behold I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." If every distress wrought cry in the Psalms were to be taken as a basis of Christian doctrine the confusion would even be greater than it now is. Was David stating a truth that is to be interpreted as being universally accepted? The words were spoken after his own great sin of adultery. He undoubtedly was reminded of a point of law recorded in Deuteronomy 23:2, "a bastard shall not enter into the assembly of Jehovah; even to the tenth generation shall none enter into the assembly of Jehovah." From Ruth 4:12-22 and Matthew 1:2-6 we find that David was the tenth generation to rise from the base fornication of Judah (see Genesis 38:24-30). Contemplating his own great sin of like nature David may well have surmised himself to be born and conceived in sin. But the distressed cry wrung from the heart of the guilty king is hardly the basis for Christian doctrine, especially since the only scriptures he could possibly appeal to in support of such an excuse for his folly is a part of the law that was nailed to the cross and made of none effect by Christ's redemptive death.

#### THE PROPHET'S ANSWER

Scriptures such as Exodus 20:5 and Deuteronomy 23:2 apparently were misconstrued by the Jews as they are by dogmatists of our generation. The Jews found in such scriptures excuse for themselves. "We can't help it. We were born that way". Yea, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." (Jeremiah 31:29; Ezekiel 18:2). Therefore God through His prophets, cried out: "As I live, saith the Lord Jehovah, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel," (Ezekiel 18:3; cf Jeremiah 31:29). Having thus spoken God announced through Jeremiah the coming of a new covenant (verses 31-3) which the Hebrew writer declares to be fulfilled in Christ (Hebrews 8:8-13), and through Ezekiel God declares: The soul that sinneth, it shall die; the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, the wickedness of

the wicked shall be upon him, (Ezekiel 18:20).

This should end the matter. Unfortunately, it has not done so. Thus one more observation is in order. The practice of infant baptism arose to meet the emergency created by the dogma of original sin. Noting the fact that the scriptures teach baptism for the remission of sins, the baptism of infants was introduced to remit the inherited sin of newborn babies lest they should die in infancy and thus dying (physically) before they were old enough to be evangelized they should go to hell by reason of being spiritually dead also. But note that every consequence of Adam's sin, real and imaginary, Biblical and traditional, continues in force after baptism. Male children "baptized" as well as unbaptized, must battle weeds in every garden, lawn or field they may have to till. They must sweat, toil and die. Female children likewise suffer the same lot imposed on Eve, "baptized" or not! What kind of remission of sin is this that remits sin but wreaks out vengeance upon the remisees nonetheless?

Does one say, it is not the physical consequences of Adam's sin, but the inherited guilt that baptism remits? The issue is unchanged. If baptism is for the remission of inherited guilt how is it then that the offspring of those who have been baptized still inherit Adam's guilt? Is Adam's guilt remitted or isn't it?

This is too much. It is assumed that infants inherit the sin of Adam and therefore must be baptized. Yet they remain cursed with that guilt despite baptism to pass it on to the next generation. Does God thus mock us?

The dogma of original sin is the biggest lie Satan has told since the day he told the first lie to the hapless pair he caused to be driven out of Eden. "He is a liar, and the father thereof," John 8:44. Only the world's biggest liar could have conceived The Big Lie which has proven to be the most noxious weed ever sown in the soil of the Christian faith; the Dogma of original sin.

Russell E. Boatman