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Please open your Bibles to Romans 2. We begin this chapter with the first verse in which we are going to look at the moral man's self-incrimination.

**The Immoral Man**

You'll remember that Romans 1 has established the nature of the problem of the heathen who have no Bible revelation. The heathen do have a testimony about God that comes to them through creation – that which they can see about them. The invisible attributes of God are actually conveyed through creation to the heathen mind. They see thus the eternal uninterrupted power of God that was required to produce such a creation. They also see the divinity of God. So, it reveals to the immoral heathen the existence of God, and this results in what we call God-consciousness. He is aware that God is out there. The immoral person may have a negative or positive response to the awareness of God. And whichever direction he goes will determine his further opportunity to come to salvation itself.

**Creation**

Again, I remind you that creation can never give a person what he needs to know to be saved. Creation can only alert him to the fact that someday he's going to face a judge with a Supreme Being, and that he has to come to a knowledge of how to be related in an acceptable way to that Supreme Being – to God Himself.

The immoral heathen man (we find from Romans 1) went negative in the knowledge which he had about God through creation. Consequently, spiritual darkness engulfed the mentality of the immoral man. These men thought themselves to be sophisticated people, and they thought to be wise people. But the Bible says that, because of their rejection and the darkness that consequently descended upon their minds, they became foolish in their thinking. They became fools in their actions. Consequently, they worshiped animals (idols which they had made in the form of animals), and called them their gods. They practiced the most debased kind of sexual perversion. God himself, because of their disapproved mind (their reprobate mind), abandoned them to the consequences of their thinking. So, they pursued evil as a way of life.

The final declaration of Paul in the last verse of Romans 1 is that the moral person deserves the doom which he will experience in the form of the second death in the lake of fire forever. His thinking has led him into practices which completely deserve this kind of condemnation of the second death.

**The Moral Man**

With that as a background, we proceed to chapter two, which then begins the analysis of a different kind of person. This is the person who is the moral man. This is the person who practices good things; that is, he deserves what's right and what's wrong, and he says, "I want to do what is right." He is the person who speaks out in behalf of what is right, and in behalf of what is moral.

So, Paul begins chapter 2 by saying, "Therefore, you are inexcusable, O man, whosoever you are that judges." Immediately the moral man is declared to be without excuse in some respect. As Paul described the condemnation and the punishment of God upon the evil works of the immoral person, the moral man stood by him and kept saying, "Amen." The moral man completely approved what Paul said in Romans 1. He completely approves the judgment and the condemnation from God upon the immoral man. The moral man says, "Yes, that is absolutely right."

**The Religious Man**

I want to remind you that the immoral heathen is an unsaved person. He is an unbeliever. The moral man, of whom we now speak, is also an unbeliever. He, too, is unsaved. Later in this chapter, we shall view a third man (the religious person) who also is an unbeliever and is unsaved. What Paul is doing is taking all types of human beings, and everybody falls into one of these three categories. And he's going to demonstrate that all are equally condemned before God.

The moral has been agreeing to what Paul has had to say concerning the immoral person. The moral unbelievers are quick to agree that the heathen are immoral, and they deserve to come under the judgment of God. Now Paul proceeds to show that the hell, which the unsaved so richly deserved by their words and their negative volition, is also filled with moral people who are equally deserving of that lake of fire. This comes as a shock to the moral man. He doesn't view himself as being in the same category of condemnation before God that the immoral man is.

So, chapter 2 begins with the word, "Therefore." "Therefore" is the Greek word "dio." "Dio" means "on account of which." Well, he's referring back. This is a word that's connecting back to something that came previously in order to make a conclusion upon what follows. In this case, it's referring back to verse 32, where we read, "Who, knowing the judgment of God, that they who commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them." Romans 1:32 declares that evils which are practiced by the immoral man are worthy of the second death – eternity in the lake of fire.

The point that is being made is that if these practices are soundly condemned by God in the immoral person, they are going to be equally condemned in the moral person. So, having closed chapter 1 with the statement of how God completely condemns that which the immoral person does, and that he deserves the lake of fire, Paul then picks up the moral man and says, "Therefore," meaning that if it's bad for them, it's bad for you. If it brings eternal condemnation for the immoral man, it will bring eternal condemnation for the moral man:

**Indefensible**

"Therefore, you are, "which is the Greek word "eimi." This is present tense. This is always true. It is active. It's an active condition of the moral man. It is indicative. It is a statement of fact: "You are inexcusable" ("anapologetos"). It comes, first of all, from the negative "a" here, and then the proposition "apo," which means "off from." And then the next part comes from the verb "lego," which means "to speak." So, what you have here is "not to speak off from," meaning "not to defend." "Not to speak off from" means "not to defend." He says, "You are 'anapologetos,'" meaning "You are without a ground of defense." The moral person has something about him before God which is indefensible. This world in the Greek Bible stands first in the sentence. It is the way the Greek would emphasize and stress the word. So, they are stressing this concept of no defense for the moral man in some respect.

**You who Judge**

So, he says, "Therefore, in consequence of what is true about the immoral man, you are always without difference." Then it says, "O man." This is the Greek word "anthropos." "Anthropos" is the general word for human being. Therefore, this covers male and female of the human race. The idea here is, "O human being." Whoever you are, man or woman – you are without excuse. "Whosoever" is the Greek word "pas," which means every single individual of the unregenerate moral type – man or woman: "Whosoever you are who judges." And the word "judges" is "krino." The word "krino" here is going to be a word that comes up again and again in just this one verse. So, get acquainted with it. The word "krino" means "to judge," or "to pronounce a verdict."

We have this word used in different ways in the Bible. In Romans 14:5, you have it used in the sense of selecting or preferring. This is a legitimate kind of judging. It's an expression of your personal choice.

In 1 Corinthians 10:15, it's used in a legitimate sense of judging that is discerning something. You look, and you evaluate, and you come to a discernment. The Bible never condemns the act of "krino" in the sense of discerning; in the sense of having insight; or, in the sense of having the good sense to see something as it is.

In 1 Corinthians 7:37, the same word is used in terms of reaching a decision. This, again, is a legitimate use.

Then a major use of this word in the Greek is as a legal term – to hold court. "Krino" is what the Greeks used when they were describing a court situation. There are many times in the Scripture where this is used in the terms of acting as a judge in terms of a court, to pass judgment upon, or to express an opinion. Now this can be done in the right way, and this can be done in a wrong way. It can be used to criticize and to find fault; that is, in the sense of condemning. That's what you have in Romans 2:1. You have "krino" used in two ways: as discernment; or, as condemnation. "Krino" as discernment is used many times in the Bible as a legitimate use. And Christians should be discerning.

However, "krino," in terms of condemnation, is what the Bible condemns as an act on our part. This is the use that you have in Romans 2:1. It is "krino" used in the sense of critical, carnal, condemning judgment. Only a spiritual Christian can, of course, exercise "krino" as discernment. It takes a spiritual Christian to be able to judge with discernment and not to sin in the process. So, there is the difference between the two meanings or "krino."

It is present tense, so that means it's the constant practice of the moral person to judge. It is the expression here of the self-righteousness which is inherent in good moral unbelievers. The moral unbeliever is quick to look down his nose with condemnation upon people who do not match his standards and his concepts of morality. He establishes his own set of standards, and he condemns those who therefore fail to meet them. Christians themselves may fall into this same error. They practice something that they consider spiritual, and anyone else who does not practice that thing is then brought under their condemnation. This is active voice, which means that it's the personal choice on the part of the moral man to judge in the sense of condemning. It's participle. It's a statement of principle.

So, Paul here, in effect, suddenly shocks the moral man who's been standing by listening to what Paul has been saying in chapter 1, and saying, "That's right, Paul. Amen. Oh, that is so right." And as Paul lists those things down at the end of that chapter, he says, "Terrible, terrible, terrible. Horrible. Can you believe that?" And the moral man just carried on. Now, Paul says, "I'm glad to hear you feel like that, friend, because I want to tell you something about yourself. In God's sight, you're in the same boat." Now that's a bomb to the moral man. This is the last thing on earth that he would be inclined to agree to – that he is as bad as the immoral person.

Now, here is the point. It says, "Therefore, you are inexcusable, O man, whosoever you are that judges" – judges in a condemnatory way. Then we come to the word "for." That's the Greek word "gar." This, grammatically, is called epexegetical, if you want to know the term. It's a term which is used for explaining a previous statement which, here, is about how these people are without excuse. So, all of a sudden, Paul says, "Mr. Moral man, you, before God, are as much without excuse as the immoral man. Immediately, the moral man says, "What do you mean?" Paul comes back with the word "gar" (for)? He says, "I'm going to explain this to you: "For wherein." This in the Greek is the preposition "en," meaning "in," and the relative pronoun "hos," meaning "which." Thus together we have "wherein," or "in the sphere of which." So, it is saying, "In the sphere of which thing."

In some specific area, you have done something: "For in the specific sphere in which you judge." And there you have the word "judge." And again, it is the word we had before, "krino," that we've all looked at. Here it is judging again in the sense of condemning the immoral man. The moral man is condemning the immoral man. It is present tense, which means the continual practice of the moral man in his condemnation. It is active voice. He does it by personal choice. He chooses to condemn people. It's in the indicative mood. It's a statement of fact about moral people.

What is he condemning? He's condemning, it says, "Another," and this is a critical Greek word, because it is the Greek word "heteros." And "heteros" means "another of a different kind." This is the word you have to use. You couldn't use the other word for "another," which is "allos," which means "another of the same kind." This is another of a different kind, because he is a moral man who is condemning an immoral man, who is a different kind of person from himself. The two are not equal to one another. "Heteros" is a different kind of man – moral against immoral. The moral person is very conscious of his superiority over the immoral heather. Therefore, in his view, as he condemns the immoral man, he is condemning someone that he views as totally different from himself.

The apostle Paul recognizes that. He says, "I know what you're doing, Mr. Moral Man. You're bringing condemnation for evil against the immoral person because you view him as a different kind than yourself. But what I want to tell you is that you're both in the same boat." And what he is doing is condemning: "Wherein you judge another, you condemn yourself." And the word "condemn" is a variation of "krino." This time it's "katakrino." "Katakrino" is made up of, first of all, this preposition "kata", which means "down;" and, "krino," which means "to judge." So, what you have is "to judge down," or again, "to condemn." This is an intense form. What you have in the Greek is actually a play on words here between these two. Here you are – a person who is "krino" the immoral man, and when you "krino" the immoral man, you have "katakrino" yourself. This is an intense form. And it almost sounds like the word "cream" in English, which is kind of the same idea. While you're creaming the immoral man, you have put yourself into a batter on the other hand. You have really creamed yourself. That's the comparison between these two – the intensity on the one hand. You're hitting the immoral man, and in the very process of your condemning the immoral man, you have really stabbed yourself through and through.

This is hard for the moral person to take this. He finds this very hard to believe. But Paul makes it very clear that he is doing this to himself. The Greek word is "seautou." It's a reflexive pronoun. It refers back to the moral man. He is doing this to himself. He is bringing his own judgment on his own head. The moral man, in some way, is condemning himself before God's divine viewpoint, in the process of his bringing judgment and condemnation against the immoral man.

Not such an idea is always a shock to self-righteous people like the moral man. He has discernment to know right from wrong. And it's a shock to think that his discernment is condemning himself. Why? That's the next question. Again, you can hear the immoral man say, "Why? I 'krino' him, and you say that I 'katakrino' myself? Why?" So, what does Paul do? He comes back with the word "for," and again it's "gar." It's again the signal word: "I'm now going to explain to you why it is that you condemn yourself: "For you that judge." And again, it is "krino:" "You who are again condemning." It is present tense. They are constantly condemning the immoral practices of the unsaved man. It is active. They are personally opposed to your immorality. It's participle. It's a principle of the way of life of the moral person: "You, who are condemning the life and the practice of the immoral person, do the same things," and the word "do" is the word we've had before, "prasso," from which we get the English word "practice." This is present tense. It is the constant act of the moral man. He's constantly practicing this kind of judgment that condemns himself. He chooses to condemn the immoral person, and thus to judge himself. It's indicative. It's a statement of fact.

What he is practicing is the same thing. It's the Greek word "autos." It refers to the same things that you read in Romans 1:29-31 – the list of evils that we went through in detail. You are doing the same kinds of things.

Notice that he is not implying that they are doing these identical things, because the moral man is making his mistake here at this point. He looks at these things and say, "I don't do these things." But the moral man does not realize that he does not do these specific sins, perhaps, but he does things of this kind. You will notice in verse 32, which says that: "They who commit such kinds of things are worthy of the second death." So, a moral man is condemned because he practices such kinds of things, though perhaps not these specifically those that are listed here.

All of this flows from the old sin nature. So, the moral man has to understand that they are also in him, and that they can be expressed through him just like anyone else. And when he says that something is wrong in another person, it is indeed wrong. But it is thereby also wrong in himself. If he says, "God is going to judge you and condemn you for what you did there," and he does the same kinds of evils, then by that same token, he has said, "God is going to judge and condemn me in my sins, because I do the same kinds of things:" "You condemn yourself." Self-incrimination of the moral man is what has resulted here.

So, the expression of evil will differ between the immoral and the moral person. For example, the immoral person practices sins openly. That's one of the characteristics of the immoral man. He doesn't give a flip. But the moral man prefers to put on a front of respectability. He is not open in his sins. The old sin nature of the unsaved moral man spews out the same kinds of evil that God condemns and punishes in the immoral unbeliever. Both the moral and immoral person are in the same boat relative to the need of salvation, consequently, through the grace of God.

**Self-Condemnation**

There is a fourfold self-condemnation that I want to point out to you in this verse. That condemnation is stressed by the word "you." It keeps coming up – four distinct times in four distinct ways. The moral man condemns himself, and it's signaled by the word "you."

1. **The Moral Man Condemns what is Evil**

It says, "You that judge." This identifies the moral man. This man has an understanding of what is right, and what is wrong. What is wrong – he condemns. He sees someone perform an act of stealing, and he says, "That's wrong." Why? Because he has a moral sense of discernment. So, he is a person who judges; who evaluates; and, who condemns that which is evil. That's point number one that this verse brings to our attention.

1. **The Moral Man's Self-Incrimination**

The verse says, "You condemn yourself." Here is the self-incrimination of the moral man. He isn't condemned because he recognizes sin as sin. He isn't condemned, because he can see sin operating in other people, and that he points out as such. Actually, the Bible says that we are to have a discernment toward evil. We are to have the faculty of moral judgment. But this man is condemned because he was doing the same kinds of sins which he rightly condemned in others. But he didn't recognize that he was doing the same kinds of sins which he was condemning.

**David and Uriah**

This kind of practice is very commonplace in human beings – condemning a sin in others without recognizing that a variation of that sin is within our own practice. And by condemning another for that sin, we have thereby condemned ourselves. If you'll turn to 2 Samuel 12, we have a classic example of this situation. This is the case where the prophet Nathan, on the direction of God, comes to confront David relative to his sin of taking Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah the Hittite, away from Uriah, and actually murdering Uriah through a position in battle in the process.

Mind you that David had many wives. He should not have had many wives, but he did. Uriah, a poor man, had only one wife. That's the background of this story. So, Nathan gives a parable to David in order to say to David, "What is your judgment in this? What do you discern as the moral thing that should be done here?" And he presents it in the parable of a man who had many sheep (as David had several wives), and a man who has one sheep (as Uriah had one wife).

2 Samuel 12: "And the Lord sent Nathan unto David, and he came to him, and said unto him, 'There were two men in one city: the one, rich; and, the other, poor. The rich man had very many flocks and herds, but the poor man had nothing save one little ewe lamb, which he had bought and nourished up, and it grew up together with him and with his children. It ate of his own food, and drank of his own cup, and lay in his bosom, and was unto him as a daughter. And there came a traveler unto the rich man, and he was not willing to take on his own flock, and of his own herd, to prepare it for the wayfaring man who was come unto him. But he took the poor man's lamb, and prepared it for the man who was come to him.'"

David thinks that Nathan is telling him an actual case history, and that Nathan has come to him as king. And remember that, in Israel, the king was the Supreme Court. He was the final judge. He was the chief executor. And in ancient times, the chief executor was the final judge and authority. He thinks that Nathan has come to him to get a judgment concerning an actual case that took place. David was the moral man, and in this case, a born-again moral man, begins to seethe as he listens to this story:

"And David's anger was greatly kindled against the man. He said to Nathan, 'As the Lord lives, the man who has done this thing shall surely die." And he shall restore the lamb fourfold because he did this thing, and because he had no pity.' Nathan said to David, 'You are the man.'"

This is what Paul is doing in a variant form. The moral man is speaking out indignantly; condemning evil; and, pointing a finger at the immoral man, and saying, "That's terrible. It's awful. God should judge it, and God should condemn it, and God should punish it." And Paul says, "You're right. And you're the one who's going to bear the judgment."

The moral man is as shocked by that as David was by the pronouncement of Nathan: "You are the man. Thus says the Lord God of Israel, 'I anointed you to be king over Israel, and I delivered you out of the hand of Saul. And I gave you your master's house and your master's wives into their bosom, and gave you the house of Israel and of Judah. Jesus. And if that had been too little, I would moreover have given unto you such and such things. Why have you despised the commandment of the Lord to do evil in His sight? You have killed Uriah the Hittite with the sword, and have taken his wife to be your wife, and has slain him with the sword of the children of Ammon. Now, therefore, the sword shall never depart from your house; because you have despised Me, and have taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be your wife, thus says the Lord: Behold, I will raise up evil against you out of your own house, and I will take your wives before your eyes, and give them unto your neighbor, and he shall lie with your wives in the sight of this sun. For you did this secretly, but I will do this thing before all Israel, and before the sun.' And David said unto Nathan, 'I have sinned against the Lord.'"

Now remember that David's judgment was: "This man, for having taken the poor man's only lamb, is worthy of death. That's my judgment. As Supreme Court judge, he will die." David hears Nathan saying, "The judgment you have passed will be imposed upon you." So, David, at this moment, expects to die: "David said unto Nathan, 'I have sinned against the Lord.'" David confesses: "And Nathan said to David, 'The Lord also has put away your sin. You shall not die.'"

The one happy part of this sad story is that David lived after this for 23 more years, and they were the most magnificent and fruitful of all of his life.

Here is a classic example of this statement of Paul: "You condemn yourself." This is the self-incrimination of the moral man. While we judge and condemn what others do which is sinful, as David did, we are doing the same kinds of things, as more people ourselves, and thereby are also condemning ourselves. As we say it's wrong in others, it's wrong in ourselves.

1. **The Moral Man does the Same Things**

It says, "You do the same things." This is the inclination of the moral man. Many find it hard to believe that the facade of respectability covers the basis kinds of evil in the moral man. But the old sin nature is the same in everyone. So, the sins which it produces are also the same. That's why I tend to have little patience, and I get a little tired of Christians who like to portray themselves as great spiritual giants who have moved forward in the things of the Lord. There are no such thing. There are no celebrities in the Christian life. There is only one celebrity, and that's the Lord Jesus Christ, because He alone is perfect. And all the rest of us have this old sin nature, and we do the same kinds of things, in one way or another, that the immoral person does.

So, I hope it is deeply ingrained into your thinking such that you have a knee-jerk reaction against that typical Bible church procedure of lauding people as being great spiritual wonders of one kind of another; and, of church officers and church leaders and church administrators and pastors who like to portray themselves before people as being some kind of magnificent paragons of virtue. Well, they may be pretty good people, but at best, they are sinners who are struggling to control a contaminated fracture within their own souls that is spewing out every kind of vile and evil thing.

So, the moral man may not do these overt sins, but he is guilty of the mental attitude sins that lead up to them. The moral man would never think, perhaps, of being guilty of fornication or adultery. But he doesn't mind practicing the mental attitude sins. He would never think of murdering somebody, but the mental attitude of hate is not beyond him. But as a moral man, he can keep up his moral front facade, and hate somebody's innards, and keep his front on, but he can't go openly murdering somebody and keep up his front as being a moral man. However, even the moral person falls into some acts of sin overtly. Their sinning is worse because they're acting against a clear sense of morality.

The immoral man doesn't have any clear sense of morality. He is completely lawless. But the moment is even worse because he does have a sense of morality, and of right and wrong. So, number three is: he does the same things.

1. **The Moral Man is without Excuse**

The last one is what the first started with: "You are without excuse." This is the divine indictment against the moral man, because, after all, there is within him these same qualities of evil that show up in the practice. The immoral man not only practiced evil, but he rejoiced in it. The moral man knows that the immoral man's works are evil, and he doesn't approve them. The moral man is guilty anyhow, however, of these evils mentally (internally), if not overtly. The moral man actually evades labeling his acts as being the same as the gross evils that we have listed in chapter 1. But they are indeed one and the same thing, because all external sins begin with an attitude of mind. And the moral man is guilty of sin in his thinking, but you can't see it. The immoral man is guilty of the actions that you can see.

**Lessons from Romans 2:1**

There are certain lessons that we learn from Romans 2:1 to tie this together.

1. **All Evil Comes from the Sin Nature**

All evil originates from the same source in man; that is, the old sin nature: sins; and, human good. Remember that you can think of the old sin nature as having the form of a diamond. Up at the top, you have a weak area; and, at the bottom, you have a strong area. From the weak area flow one kind of evil, which is sins. From the strong comes another kind of evil, which is human good. But remember that both of these are evil. So, whether they are sins or whether they are human good, both are condemned by God. But the old sin nature is in everyone, and it has a certain pattern of lusts which also are in everyone. And these lusts express themselves in a variety of ways. That's what gets the moral man into trouble. His lusts expressed themselves in different ways than they do in the case of the immoral man. So, all evil originates from the same source in man – the appeal to the old sin nature by either the world or by Satan.

1. **All People are Capable of the Same Evils**

All members of the human race possess an old sin nature, so all are capable of the same evils. All are capable of these same kinds of sins, because of the weakness in them. All are capable of the human good, because of the human righteousness (the strong qualities) in them. The lust patterns are expressed outwardly in the immoral man; and, they are expressed mentally in the moral man. However, both moral and immoral men pursue certain things out of guilt.

A lot of Christians pursue Christian service out of guilt. They want to serve the Lord out of guilt over what their evil practices are. Some seek to produce good works simply out of guilt of their evil practices. Both the moral and the immoral are not above seeking praise, power, and gain. Unfortunately, Christian service in the average local church is based upon appeals to the old sin nature. When you have heard us make derogatory remarks sometimes about the procedures of Christian education, it is because Christian education often comes up with techniques and devices which are deliberate appeals to the old sin nature in order to get people to do things in the local church – purportedly to serve the Lord.

The Word of God condemns anything from the sin nature as being evil. When you appeal to the patterns of lust for praise; for power; or, something of that sort in a human being, you are out of line with the principles of the Word of God. You are falling into exactly the same trap that the moral man does, and we should not appear to the old sin nature. If you can't do a Christian service as unto the Lord, then just don't do it at all. It is your business to find what your spiritual gift is; and, then it is your privilege to exercise it within the context of your life in the ministry of the local church to earn rewards in heaven, as God the Holy Spirit enables you to use that gift. That is the right motivation for Christian service. So, immoral and moral people both possess the old sin nature, so they can do the same kinds of evils: they can do the same kinds of sins; and, they can do the same kinds of human good.

1. **People Often don't Recognize some Things as being Evil**

People are often confused by the manifestations of personal evil. They don't recognize some things as being sinful. We don't recognize that we have different expressions of the same sin. People think that there are good sins and bad sins. And some of the good sins become so good that we lose sight of the fact that they are evil, and we think that sins in certain case are thus justified.

Consequently, some unbelievers think of themselves as being much better before God than they really are, because their sins are in such a context, or in such a form, that they don't see them as being evil things. So, they are confused about the fact that evil is manifested in them. That's a problem with the moral man. He looked at himself, and he didn't recognize that what was coming out of him was evil because of the form in which it was put. He thought, "Well, I give money to help the poor. I support welfare programs, I'm anti-establishment. I'm going to help the people who are failures in our society. I'm going to take away from people who are productive, and I'm going to give it to those who are non-productive." They think that this is a very wonderful thing that they're doing. They're taking people who need to be taken care of, and they don't realize that God says, "That's a dirty piece of human good evil coming out of you, and you think that you're a very fine, moral, wonderful person."

Whereas, when the immoral man sticks a gun under somebody's nose, and says, "Your money or your life," he says, "That's terrible. That's immoral." But what do you do? Well, you get elected to Congress, and you pass a law, and you stick a gun under the citizen's nose, and say, "Your money or your freedom, because we have a lot of people out here that we want to give your money to." That's evil of the same kind, but under such a context that we don't recognize it to label it as such. So, we think we are moral.

1. **Our Values are Determined by Background and Environment**

The values and the standards of conscience are determined by one's background and environment. Some of you have come to moral values because you were taught these in your youth, and you accepted them. That's a better way to learn moral values. Usually, when you learn moral values in that way, you have also recognized that there are immoral qualities within you because of the old sin nature, and you deliberately choose to go with God's standards of morality.

However, some people come to moral values because, in their youth, they have been thrown into such an immoral conditions that they revolted against it. They reacted in disgust against the immorality that surrounded them. They may have grown up in an immoral home, and they react strongly against it, and they are moral people as adults via the route of reaction. The problem, however, is that the person who has responded to teachings of morality, and has received his morality that way, is a much more stable person as an adult when he himself fails. But the person who learns morality by reacting against it out of a context that he grew up in – when he fails is in the moral sense, it breaks him up. This is the person who goes crazy in the head. He gets thrown mentally off because of the emotional tension that he go through, seeing in himself the same vile, evil things taking place that he grew up with, and that he loathed so, and that he reacted against. So, the values and standard of conscience are going to be determined by our background and our environment. And again, sometimes what we are used to, we don't consider evil, so like the moral man, we don't call that for what it is.

1. **We can't Label some Sins as Worse than Others**

God alone has the prerogative of labeling some sins as worse than others. Proverbs 6:16-19 give you a series of sins that God considers the worst. You and I don't have the privilege to say that. But the moral man constantly wants to say that his sins are not as bad as the immoral man's sins.

1. **Each Old Sin Nature is Different**

Each sin nature has different expressions; different trends of aestheticism; different trends of lasciviousness; different weaknesses; different sins; and, different human goods. Some people find it almost impossible to be guilty of certain sins, while other people will revel in those very sins. You can probably think of a sin now that it's just so low of a sin that it would be practically impossible for you to commit it. But somebody else is just itching for a chance to get at it.

You will easily condemn a sin in somebody else that is just too horrendous for you – that you just wouldn't go for at all. That's just not your style of sinning. But somebody else finds that his style of sinning, and you are ready very easily to condemn his style. Some evils simply could not be a temptation to certain people. Your temperament just doesn't go in that direction. But some sins are acceptable to you in a variant form when they're not acceptable to you in a gross form. That is where the moral man makes his mistake. He doesn't realize that his refined sinning is the same kind of stuff as the grossing of the unbelieving immoral man. The moral man will have a trend toward legalism and aestheticism, while the immoral man will go to lasciviousness, but they're both evil.

In fact, I've noticed that the "Let's show others our love for them" crowd are the people who are the most ignorant and the most blinded to recognizing the various forms of refined sinning. And they cover a multitude of their sins by that principle of "Let's show others our love for them." And they are among those who are the most refined kind of sinners.

1. **We Shouldn't Judge Others' Sins**

Judgment of another's sins, while they are to be recognized as such, is to be left with God. It is up to God. It is His prerogative to pass judgment. There are certain areas where people have a right to judge: a judge in a court of law; the employer over his employee; voting on public officials; and, making recommendations. All of these are exceptions. Remember that it was the Lord Jesus Christ who paid with His life. He suffered spiritual death and physical death in our behalf for our sins. He paid the penalty for sins. Therefore, He alone has the right to judge relative to evil.

So, what Romans 2:1 has pointed out right off the bat is that the moral man, who has been saying "Amen" to all that Paul has said in chapter 1, is, as an unbeliever, in the same hopeless, condemned position as the immoral man that he looked down upon. That is because morality will not take you to heaven. Only the person of Jesus Christ can get you there. Hell is going to be filled with moral people. That's what Romans 2:1 tries to make clear to the people who compose the world of morality. May that not be a trap or an error into which you fall.

Dr. John E. Danish, 1975
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