

## **Revisiting the word World...Why it Matters**

Preached first on 11/15/2020 on [www.molibertyradio.us](http://www.molibertyradio.us)

Good morning everyone. Thank you again for taking time to listen to the message this morning - that I believe Yahweh has laid on my heart to bring. I am humbled and honored that you will spend this time with me studying the Word.

Kingdom Conference 2021 will be here before you know it. Lord willing, we will be meeting again at the Maranatha Bible Camp and Retreat Center - which is located in Everton, Missouri - which is about 35 minutes northwest of Springfield, Missouri. As I told you last week, all the hotel style rooms that are on the campus have been booked already. If you want to be added to a waiting list in case someone cannot attend - just let us know. But just because there are no more hotel style rooms at the campgrounds - please - do not let that prevent you from making plans to attend. There are plenty of accommodations within 30 miles of the campgrounds - so if you want to attend - please make plans to do so.

There are so many things on my heart this week, that frankly, I am not sure exactly where to start. There are so many very important issues that need to be addressed in light of Scripture, the Kingdom, and our responsibility to it - it is almost an overwhelming proposition to get through. Pray with me this morning that Yahweh will guide my thoughts and words as I preach the Gospel of the Kingdom - mainly as an encouragement to those already seeking His Kingdom - and equipping you with tools and weapons needed in your daily life - but even to those who are seeking His Kingdom but still lost in the deception of "church" and men's little g governments.

If we could only fully and completely understand the meaning and implications of the "end of the world" - the "end of the age" - we could begin to see meaningful change in bringing men and women, boys and girls into the present day reality of the Kingdom of Christ.

Friends, listen to me this morning, be careful of whose voice you are listening to. There are a lot of smooth talkers out there - way more eloquent than I will ever be - but if they are not living the present day reality of the Kingdom - you better be careful. Their perspective of Scripture and the Kingdom is going to be at the very least - suspect.

Everyone - all the quote "preachers and priests" will tell their flocks - yes, the Kingdom of God is today - but then they'll use their quote "church" buildings as places to allow

the little g governments to hold their sham “elections.” They'll encourage their listeners to vote, to pay taxes, to get all the licenses and paperwork that props up the little g governments giving them credibility to exist - and control men's lives - when that credibility - that power - that false sense of authority - is stolen from the Only One that has true Authority and power to rule over men - and that's Christ and Christ alone.

If you are listening to people who do not preach the absolute Authority - the ONLY ONE who has the Authority to be King - to be President - to be Ruler - to be Judge and Magistrate - then you better be careful who you are listening to. If you are listening to someone telling you that the U.S. CON - c-o-n stitution is a Godly document that established Godly little g government - then you are listening to strange voices.

The heavens and the earth passed away. The Old World ended. The Old Age ended and a New heavens and a new earth were established. A New world - a new age was established - and in the New World - the New Age - men are no longer allowed to have kings like all the other nations. Those days ended. The days where God allowed - so that there would be an everlasting reminder of what a colossal failure it was - the days where God allowed Israel to have a king like the other nations - ended. Those days ended when He - the Father - sent His only begotten Son into the world - to forgive sins - yes - the sin of “We will not have this man to reign over us.” That's what the sin that required the sending of God's Son as King of kings and Lord of lords - to this earth to redeem His people from their awful choices of choosing their own little g governments and denying the entire purpose of Creation - that being - that God would have a people for Himself Who would allow His reign - r-e-i-g-n - His Laws, His Statutes and Judgements as their choice of Government.

Look again with me this morning to I Samuel chapter 8. We'll begin in verse 1. This is not just a quote “Old Testament story.” This is the historical account of what should be understood among true followers of Christ - at the very least - at the very least - as equally important as the fall of Adam and Eve in the garden - but the reality is - rarely does it get the kind of significance placed on it that it should really have. This is possibly the greatest warning that Yahweh ever caused to be written in the pages of Scripture.

[1] And it came to pass, when Samuel was old, that he made his sons judges over Israel.

[2] Now the name of his firstborn was Joel; and the name of his second, Abiah: they were judges in Beer-sheba.

[3] And his sons walked not in his ways, but turned aside after lucre, and took bribes, and perverted judgment.

I've said this before. But these men had reason to be upset about the way the administration of God's Laws were being carried out in their day. The judges were corrupt. Ok. When the judges are corrupt, remove them and put judges in who will do what their required office commands. Instead of getting rid of the bad judges, they chose this:

[4] Then all the elders of Israel gathered themselves together, and came to Samuel unto Ramah,

[5] And said unto him, Behold, thou art old, and thy sons walk not in thy ways: now make us a king to judge us like all the nations.

[6] But the thing displeased Samuel, when they said, Give us a king to judge us. And Samuel prayed unto Yahweh.

[7] And Yahweh said unto Samuel, Hearken unto the voice of the people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them.

Please understand this today. This is not Yahweh's blessing for men to do things that are evil. It is so disturbing to hear men - who ought to know better - point to different things in the first 39 books of the Bible - in relation to the shortcomings and failings of the men described - David, of course being probably the most cited example - and they say, "David did this and David did that. So that means it's ok for us today." No. That's not what it means. David's life the good and the bad is in Scripture to show us to accept the good and walk that way - and acknowledge the bad - and run as fast away from it as we can.

They'll point to evil kings in the first 39 books and say, "See God Himself put evil kings in their places and He's doing the same thing today." NO HE ISN'T. In this World - He has put ONE KING in His place - and that's Christ. And it's the responsibility of every living breathing creature to embrace that King and His Government and walk in that Government and stand against anyone and everything else that does not conform to His Government. That's our job. That's the way generations get turned around. That's the way the world gets turned rightside up - when men and women, boys and girls, preach and live - and have the same testimony in their lives as the apostles had when it was said of them -

These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also;

[7] Whom Jason hath received: and these all do contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus.

[8] And they troubled the people and the rulers of the city, when they heard

these things.

It's ironic that men today will run to the bad things that David did and use them as examples for why they back people like Donald Trump - yet hardly ever have I seen people run to the good things that Peter, James and John and Paul and others did and use them as examples for their own lives. Even when the result of their actions ended up in a turning of the world rightside up.

The road to success in turning our generation to the King and Kingdom is as clear as anything else can be in the Scripture - and it's found in those few verses of Acts 17. But we've got all kinds of better ways of doing it. All kinds of devices and contrivances and plans and schemes - don't we?

This thing going around in some of the patriot circles about quote "authenticating a birth certificate" - then that is supposed to be some route to freedom from men's little g governments - that's supposed to be the new silver bullet. I'm telling you - if it isn't found in Scripture - you better be careful.

A good friend of mine - who already knew the answer I was going to give - emailed me last week and asked me what I thought about this "birth certificate authenticating" scheme that's going around. I responded to him to put himself in the shoes of the disciples - or others that were listening to the greatest freedom fighter and the most successful freedom fighter in the history of mankind - put yourself in the shoes of those listening to Christ in the first century - and see if you can find any of His statements telling those people to go to Caesar for freedom or go to the quote "secretary of state" to get their birth certificates authenticated - or even worse still - go to the Taiwanese quote little g government as part of this process. Come on, people. "Authenticate" a birth certificate.

You are quote "authenticating" the old man that is supposed to die in Christ. The old man is supposed to be dead in Christ. If you do anything with one of their birth certificates - take a big fat red marker and put a big X through it and put on the thing the big red X symbolizes the finished work of Christ on the cross - and send it to the quote "secretary of state" and tell them THE MAN NAMED ON THIS CERTIFICATE IS DEAD. Then, take a new name like the examples given in Scripture and live a life authenticating that new name - that new man - who's new name was written in the book of life.

This Gospel of the Kingdom is not complicated. It's not difficult. It's a matter of

repenting that we have lived a life following the little g governments of men - and then taking up the crown of Christ - and following Him. Follow the King. No wait, Jesus, before I follow you, I need to “authenticate” my Romans birth certificate - that way - Caesar will give me a free pass to follow you instead of following Caesar and all his quote laws. I'm telling you, you better be careful. “But the CON c-o-nstitution is based on the Bible” - okay - then what do I need it for? Can't I just keep the Bible and nothing else?

This is a bit off the subject, but it wasn't until recently that it finally dawned on me what some of these guys are trying to say, when they say, the CONstitution is based on the Bible. They are trying to say that the CON takes some of its elements from the pattern of what they think is Godly Government. But the reality is - it doesn't even do that. And since the document clearly says, This CONstitution and OUR LAWS and OUR TREATIES that shall be made in pursuance thereof - that statement completely nullifies any argument whatsoever where a man might say the CON is based on the Bible.

The Bible says - the problem with man is that man thinks he has the power or authority to make his own laws. The Bible says - “No you don't.” There is only one Lawgiver is what the Bible says. There is no need for anything other than the Word of God as a Lawbook.

This is not difficult. There is nothing that a man can do - as far as sin is concerned - that is not addressed in the Bible. There's no need for another Lawbook. When man thinks that he is smart enough to make his own laws - that's when the downfall begins. When men are born into a system - like every single one of us were - then we need to recognize the sin of living by that system - repent - Come out of it - and into the Kingdom of Christ - where there is One King, One Lawgiver and One Who is able to save. It's really not difficult.

Back to I Samuel 8, verse 8.

[8] According to all the works which they have done since the day that I brought them up out of Egypt even unto this day, wherewith they have forsaken me, and served other gods, so do they also unto thee.

This is not talking about the bushmen in Africa carving elephant tusks into little statues and worshipping them calling them quote “gods.” This gods, as in rulers, magistrates and judges. This is voting for, this is obeying, this paying taxes to, this is fighting in the armies - of men's little g governments. That's what serving other gods means. It means

living in agreement with, giving your consent to be governed by someone or something other than King Jesus.

[9] Now therefore hearken unto their voice: howbeit yet protest solemnly unto them, and shew them the manner of the king that shall reign over them.

Today, in America - and all over the world for that matter - everyone is suffering from the manner of the king that shall reign over them. That suffering, that failure to see Christ ruling and reigning right now - in our generation - must not be interpreted as His failure as King. It is NOT His fault we are facing what we are facing - and have faced is a much better way to say it - but it is not His fault. It is our fault. We are in the shape we are in and have been in - because we have failed to choose Yahweh and His Son as King and we are reaping the manner of the king that the people chose to reign over them.

Turn with me to Matthew chapter 21. And let's look at verse 1. This is Matthew's writing of what Luke wrote about in Luke 19, the passage we looked at over the last couple of weeks. Verse 1.

[1] And when they drew nigh unto Jerusalem, and were come to Bethphage, unto the mount of Olives, then sent Jesus two disciples,

[2] Saying unto them, Go into the village over against you, and straightway ye shall find an ass tied, and a colt with her: loose them, and bring them unto me.

[3] And if any man say ought unto you, ye shall say, The Lord hath need of them; and straightway he will send them.

[4] All this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying,

[5] Tell ye the daughter of Sion, Behold, thy King cometh unto thee, meek, and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass.

[6] And the disciples went, and did as Jesus commanded them,

[7] And brought the ass, and the colt, and put on them their clothes, and they set him thereon.

[8] And a very great multitude spread their garments in the way; others cut down branches from the trees, and strawed them in the way.

[9] And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest.

[10] And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the city was moved, saying, Who is this?

[11] And the multitude said, This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee.

[12] And Jesus went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves,

[13] And said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves.

[14] And the blind and the lame came to him in the temple; and he healed them.

[15] And when the chief priests and scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children crying in the temple, and saying, Hosanna to the Son of David; they were sore displeased,

[16] And said unto him, Hearest thou what these say? And Jesus saith unto them, Yea; have ye never read, Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise?

Let me ask you something. Was this a great day - and I mean this day as in that 24 hour period of time - that brief moment in history - what we just read - was that a great day to be a follower of Christ the King?

Of course it was. The people acknowledged the fulfillment of the prophecies. People were healed. There was a multitude of people acknowledging, crying out in the city streets, Hosanna to the King. Absolutely, this was a great day for the King, the Kingdom and those faithful followers of Jesus, Yeshua the Christ.

Was He King - that day? Even for a brief period of time? Even for just a day? Was He King and was it good to be His follower? Absolutely.

Look at verse 17:

**17]** And he left them, and went out of the city into Bethany; and he lodged there.

[18] Now in the morning as he returned into the city, he hungered.

[19] And when he saw a fig tree in the way, he came to it, and found nothing thereon, but leaves only, and said unto it, Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever. And presently the fig tree withered away.

[20] And when the disciples saw it, they marvelled, saying, How soon is the fig tree withered away!

King for a day - then it withered away. My question is - even though the fig tree withered away - pretty much overnight - does it make Him less of a King? Is the mandate to live in His Kingdom with Him being King - any less than it was the day before?

Absolutely not. Continue with verse 21:

[21] Jesus answered and said unto them, Verily I say unto you, If ye have faith, and doubt not, ye shall not only do this which is done to the fig tree, but also if ye shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea; it shall be done.

[22] And all things, whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive.

[23] And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and the elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?

[24] And Jesus answered and said unto them, I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell me, I in like wise will tell you by what authority I do these things.

[25] The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men? And they reasoned with themselves, saying, If we shall say, From heaven; he will say unto us, Why did ye not then believe him?

[26] But if we shall say, Of men; we fear the people; for all hold John as a prophet.

[27] And they answered Jesus, and said, We cannot tell. And he said unto them, Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things.

[28] But what think ye? A certain man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son, go work to day in my vineyard.

[29] He answered and said, I will not: but afterward he repented, and went.

[30] And he came to the second, and said likewise. And he answered and said, I go, sir: and went not.

[31] Whether of them twain did the will of his father? They say unto him, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you.

[32] For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him.

[33] Hear another parable: There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country:

[34] And when the time of the fruit drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, that they might receive the fruits of it.

[35] And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another.

[36] Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise.



- [37] But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son.
- [38] But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance.
- [39] And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him.
- [40] When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen?
- [41] They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons.
- [42] Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?
- [43] Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.
- [44] And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.
- [45] And when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard his parables, they perceived that he spake of them.
- [46] But when they sought to lay hands on him, they feared the multitude, because they took him for a prophet.

A bit of a side note here...You know, there's a lot there. Two times in these verses we hear of the evil men fearing the multitude. Yes, I know that God can do much with little. But here is a passage of Scripture where it says the evil ones feared a multitude of people. I believe this applies to us today. We need to be trying to turn the multitudes to the King.

Was He any less of a King because He came unto His own, and His own received Him not?

These things were written for one reason. They were written for our learning - so that we would not make the same mistake they did. These things aren't written so that when we make the same mistakes - we can blame it on the Word. They are written to show us what NOT to do - and even greater - what we are supposed to do.

He is not any less a King because those people rejected Him in one day.

Turn to Matthew 27, please and we'll begin in verse 1:

[1] When the morning was come, all the chief priests and elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put him to death:

I'm telling you this morning. You need to make note of this. You need to have this burned into your mind. The chief priests and the elders of the people - got together in a meeting to conspire - to plan - to map out - the death of Jesus. In the recorded pages of Scripture - as far as His dealings with people are concerned - He did nothing but good things to the people. He healed the sick, gave sight to the blind, fed the hungry, even raised the dead - He did nothing but good. But when it came to the religious leaders, the tax collectors - and even Caesar himself - He preached against them in such a way that His Words were determined to be treason against the state - Words that would bring the death penalty under their wicked, godless system.

[2] And when they had bound him, they led him away, and delivered him to Pontius Pilate the governor.

[3] Then Judas, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders,

[4] Saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. And they said, What is that to us? see thou to that.

[5] And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself.

[6] And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood.

[7] And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in.

[8] Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day.

[9] Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value;

[10] And gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.

[11] And Jesus stood before the governor: and the governor asked him, saying, Art thou the King of the Jews? And Jesus said unto him, Thou sayest.

As He stood there - under arrest - kidnapped and being held without bail - was He any less the King? Knowing that a physical beating and execution was near - He was still King. Continuing with verse 12:

[12] And when he was accused of the chief priests and elders, he answered

nothing.

[13] Then said Pilate unto him, Hearest thou not how many things they witness against thee?

[14] And he answered him to never a word; insomuch that the governor marvelled greatly.

[15] Now at that feast the governor was wont to release unto the people a prisoner, whom they would.

[16] And they had then a notable prisoner, called Barabbas.

[17] Therefore when they were gathered together, Pilate said unto them, Whom will ye that I release unto you? Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ?

[18] For he knew that for envy they had delivered him.

[19] When he was set down on the judgment seat, his wife sent unto him, saying, Have thou nothing to do with that just man: for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him.

[20] But the chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude that they should ask Barabbas, and destroy Jesus.

[21] The governor answered and said unto them, Whether of the twain will ye that I release unto you? They said, Barabbas.

[22] Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ? They all say unto him, Let him be crucified.

[23] And the governor said, Why, what evil hath he done? But they cried out the more, saying, Let him be crucified.

[24] When Pilate saw that he could prevail nothing, but that rather a tumult was made, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just person: see ye to it.

[25] Then answered all the people, and said, His blood be on us, and on our children.

[26] Then released he Barabbas unto them: and when he had scourged Jesus, he delivered him to be crucified.

[27] Then the soldiers of the governor took Jesus into the common hall, and gathered unto him the whole band of soldiers.

[28] And they stripped him, and put on him a scarlet robe.

[29] And when they had platted a crown of thorns, they put it upon his head, and a reed in his right hand: and they bowed the knee before him, and mocked him, saying, Hail, King of the Jews!

[30] And they spit upon him, and took the reed, and smote him on the head.

[31] And after that they had mocked him, they took the robe off from him, and put his own raiment on him, and led him away to crucify him.

[32] And as they came out, they found a man of Cyrene, Simon by name: him

they compelled to bear his cross.

[33] And when they were come unto a place called Golgotha, that is to say, a place of a skull,

[34] They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink.

[35] And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots.

[36] And sitting down they watched him there;

[37] And set up over his head his accusation written, THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS.

[38] Then were there two thieves crucified with him, one on the right hand, and another on the left.

[39] And they that passed by reviled him, wagging their heads,

[40] And saying, Thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself. If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross.

[41] Likewise also the chief priests mocking him, with the scribes and elders, said,

[42] He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him.

[43] He trusted in God; let him deliver him now, if he will have him: for he said, I am the Son of God.

With all this said and done, I ask you today, was He any less a King? In just a few short days, it went from a great time for Him as King, a day where the people lined the streets crying out, Hosanna to the King - to a day where His Kingship was mocked violently - and He was finally murdered, executed by the state. Was He any less a King?

I submit to you that He was absolutely King regardless of whether or not it was the good day or the bad day - He was King.

Today, He is mocked again. For those who try to preach and live His Kingship today - they are met with - "Well, just look around you, whose government is in charge? Where is Christ's Kingdom today? If He's King, where's His Kingdom?"

When men say those things today, they are saying exactly the same thing that was said about Him when they were murdering Him:

He saved others; Himself He cannot save. If He be the King of Israel, let Him now come down from the cross, and we will believe Him.

[43] He trusted in God; let Him deliver Him now, if He will have Him: for He said, I am the Son of God.

Ha. If He's King today, then why do men have all the power to do whatever they want to today? Because it's the same thing today that it was back then.

On the first day of the week - men have the choice to call Him King. And on the last day of the week, men have the choice to revile Him and murder Him. Whichever day of the week it is - it does not make Him any less the King. Men can do and say whatever they want to say or do - but it does not make Him any less the King.

He will be King in the lives of all those who allow His reign in their lives. And when the community agrees to His Kingship and lives accordingly - then His Kingdom will flourish and prosper. And when His Kingship is rejected - then this will be the manner of the king that reigneth over them.

Each generation can have the Kingdom of God flourish and provide blessings and prosperity. It's there for the taking. It's a gift. It's a free gift.

I'm telling you today - the reason - there are two main reasons we don't have this today - in our generation - and you can take your pick which is more important - in fact - a man probably can't discern which is more important of the two - but the two reasons we are in the shape we are in - where the King's rule is not seen - is because men do not know that the English word "church" should not be in our Bibles - and because men do not know what the Bible phrase, "the end of the world" means. Take your pick. They are 1 and 2. Maybe they should be combined, I don't know. But until "church" comes down - and until the "end of the world" is understood as the end of the Old Covenant age - our generation will continue to decline and will move farther and farther away from the King and His Kingdom and we will continue to suffer more and more from the consequences of choosing a king like all the other nations - and this will be the manner of the people's choice.

A couple week's ago I told you I wanted to get into a discussion concerning the divine right of kings. This is the major consequence of failing to understand the implications of the Old World passing away - the Old World where God allowed the nation to have kings like all the other nations - the Old World where God allowed the nations to walk in their own ways. But when the Messiah came - He put an end to that era for humanity. He put an end to the days where men were allowed to have their own kings. Those days are over. They are no longer allowed to function with the ordination or

permission from God. The experiment is over. The time period where God allowed it for the purpose of example to future generations - those days are over.

Well, during that time period, we can plainly see from Scripture, that God set up good kings and He set up evil kings. And, an honest survey of this time period shows that there were more evil kings than good kings. And even when there was a good king set up - even in the life of the good king - there are examples that even the good ones can do bad things. So, the example is overwhelming that when men are in a system where earthly quote "kings" are ruling - it's mostly bad times for the people. God did it - and He did it on purpose to show us what happens when that's our choice.

Out of this Old World system, derived a mindset commonly known as "the divine right of kings." And, unless a man understands the implications of the passing of the heavens and the earth, the end of the Old Covenant World - and then with the advent of the Messiah, His Kingdom and Kingship - the establishing of the New World - it is possible, probable, pretty much a guarantee - that that man will fall into the trap of the doctrine of the divine right of kings - which will pretty much guarantee that the man will not see and understand Who Christ is and what His purpose was in coming.

Reading from [brittanica.com](http://brittanica.com), this what it says concerning the doctrine of the divine right of kings:

*Divine right of kings, in European history, a political doctrine in defense of monarchical absolutism, which asserted that kings derived their authority from God and could not therefore be held accountable for their actions by any earthly authority such as a parliament. Originating in Europe, the divine-right theory can be traced to the medieval conception of God's award of temporal power to the political ruler, paralleling the award of spiritual power to the church. By the 16th and 17th centuries, however, the new national monarchs were asserting their authority in matters of both church and state. King James I of England (reigned 1603–25) was the foremost exponent of the divine right of kings, but the doctrine virtually disappeared from English politics after the Glorious Revolution (1688–89). In the late 17th and 18th centuries, kings such as Louis XIV (1643–1715) of France continued to profit from the divine-right theory, even though many of them no longer had any truly religious belief in it. The American Revolution (1775–83), the French Revolution (1789), and the Napoleonic Wars deprived the doctrine of most of its remaining credibility.*

*The bishop Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627–1704), one of the principal French theorists of divine right, asserted that the king's person and authority were sacred; that his*

*power was modeled on that of a father's and was absolute, deriving from God; and that he was governed by reason (i.e., custom and precedent). In the middle of the 17th century, the English Royalist squire Sir Robert Filmer likewise held that the state was a family and that the king was a father, but he claimed, in an interpretation of Scripture, that Adam was the first king and that Charles I (reigned 1625–49) ruled England as Adam's eldest heir. The anti-absolutist philosopher John Locke (1632–1704) wrote his *First Treatise of Civil Government* (1689) in order to refute such arguments.*

*The doctrine of divine right can be dangerous for both church and state. For the state it suggests that secular authority is conferred, and can therefore be removed, by the church, and for the church it implies that kings have a direct relationship to God and may therefore dictate to ecclesiastical rulers.*

Read this from wikipedia:

*The divine right of kings, divine right, or God's mandate is a political and religious doctrine of political legitimacy in a monarchy. It stems from a specific metaphysical framework in which a king (or queen) is pre-ordained to inherit the crown before their birth. Under this theory of political legitimacy the subjects of the crown are considered to have actively (rather than merely passively) turned over the metaphysical selection of the king's soul – which will inhabit the body and rule them – over to God. In this way, the "divine right" originates as a metaphysical act of humility or submission towards God. The divine right has been a key element for legitimizing many absolute monarchies.*

*Consequentially, it asserts that a monarch is not accountable to an earthly authority (such as a parliament) because their right to rule is derived from divine authority. The monarch is thus not subject to the will of his people, of the aristocracy, or of any other estate of the realm. It implies that only divine authority can judge an unjust monarch and that any attempt to depose, dethrone or restrict their powers runs contrary to God's will and may constitute a sacrilegious act. It is often expressed in the phrase "by the Grace of God", attached to the titles of a reigning monarch; although this right does not make the monarch the same as a sacred king.*

*Historically, many notions of rights were authoritarian and hierarchical, with different people granted different rights, and some having more rights than others. For instance, the right of a father to respect from his son did not indicate a right for the son to receive a return from that respect; and the divine right of kings, which permitted absolute power over subjects, did not leave a lot of room for many rights for the*

*subjects themselves.[1]*

*In contrast, conceptions of rights developed during the Age of Enlightenment often emphasized liberty and equality as among the most important aspects of rights, for example in the American Revolution and the French Revolution.*

Under the heading

*Pre-Christian European conceptions*

the article continues:

*The Imperial cult of ancient Rome identified Roman emperors and some members of their families with the "divinely sanctioned" authority (auctoritas) of the Roman State. The official offer of cultus to a living emperor acknowledged his office and rule as divinely approved and constitutional: his Principate should therefore demonstrate pious respect for traditional Republican deities and mores. Many of the rites, practices and status distinctions that characterized the cult to emperors were perpetuated in the theology and politics of the Christianized Empire.*

Under the heading

*Christian conceptions*

*During early and middle ages*

the article continues:

*Outside of Christianity, kings were often seen as either ruling with the backing of heavenly powers or perhaps even being divine beings themselves. However, the Christian notion of a divine right of kings is traced to a story found in 1 Samuel, where the prophet Samuel anoints Saul and then David as mashiach or king over Israel. The anointing is to such an effect that the monarch became inviolable so that even when Saul sought to kill David, David would not raise his hand against him because "he was the Lord's anointed".*

*Although the later Roman Empire had developed the European concept of a divine regent in Late Antiquity, Adomnan of Iona provides one of the earliest written examples of a Western medieval concept of kings ruling with divine right. He wrote of the Irish King Diarmait mac Cerbaill's assassination and claimed that divine punishment fell on*



*his assassin for the act of violating the monarch. Adomnan also recorded a story about Saint Columba supposedly being visited by an angel carrying a glass book, who told him to ordain Aedan mac Gabrain as King of Dal Riata. Columba initially refused, and the angel answered by whipping him and demanding that he perform the ordination because God had commanded it. The same angel visited Columba on three successive nights. Columba finally agreed, and Aedan came to receive ordination. At the ordination, Columba told Aedan that so long as he obeyed God's laws, then none of his enemies would prevail against him, but the moment he broke them, this protection would end, and the same whip with which Columba had been struck would be turned against the king. Adomnan's writings most likely influenced other Irish writers, who in turn influenced continental ideas as well. Pepin the Short's coronation may have also come from the same influence.[3] The Byzantine Empire can be seen as the progenitor of this concept (which began with Constantine I), which in turn inspired the Carolingian dynasty and the Holy Roman Emperors, whose lasting impact on Western and Central Europe further inspired all subsequent Western ideas of kingship.*

*In the Middle Ages, the idea that God had granted earthly power to the monarch, just as he had given spiritual authority and power to the church, especially to the Pope, was already a well-known concept long before later writers coined the term "divine right of kings" and employed it as a theory in political science. For example, Richard I of England declared at his trial during the diet at Speyer in 1193: "I am born in a rank which recognizes no superior but God, to whom alone I am responsible for my actions", and it was Richard who first used the motto "Dieu et mon droit" ("God and my right") which is still the motto of the Monarch of the United Kingdom.*

*With the rise of nation-states and the Protestant Reformation in the late 16th century, the theory of divine right justified the king's absolute authority in both political and spiritual matters. Henry VIII of England declared himself the Supreme Head of the Church of England, and exerted the power of the throne more than any of his predecessors. As a political theory, it was further developed by James VI of Scotland (1567–1625), and came to the fore in England under his reign as James I of England (1603–1625). Louis XIV of France (1643–1715) strongly promoted the theory as well.*

Under the heading:

*Scots texts of James VI of Scotland*

*the article continues:*

*The Scots textbooks of the divine right of kings were written in 1597–1598 by James VI of Scotland despite Scotland never having believed in the theory and where the monarch was regarded as the "first among equals" on a par with his people. His Basilikon Doron, a manual on the powers of a king, was written to edify his four-year-old son Henry Frederick that a king "acknowledgeth himself ordained for his people, having received from the god a burden of government, whereof he must be countable". He based his theories in part on his understanding of the Bible, as noted by the following quote from a speech to parliament delivered in 1610 as James I of England:*

*The state of monarchy is the supremest thing upon earth, for kings are not only God's lieutenants upon earth and sit upon God's throne, but even by God himself, they are called gods. There be three principal [comparisons] that illustrate the state of monarchy: one taken out of the word of God, and the two other out of the grounds of policy and philosophy. In the Scriptures, kings are called gods, and so their power after a certain relation compared to the Divine power. Kings are also compared to fathers of families; for a king is true parens patriae [parent of the country], the politic father of his people. And lastly, kings are compared to the head of this microcosm of the body of man.[4]*

*James's reference to "God's lieutenants" is apparently a reference to the text in Romans 13 where Paul refers to "God's ministers".*

*(1) Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. (2) Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. (3) For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: (4) For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. (5) Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath but also for conscience sake. (6) For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. (7) Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honour to whom honour.[5]*

Now, I want to read to you an excerpt from an article from the Rutland Herald Online concerning the divine right of kings written by John Nassivera is a former professor who retains affiliation with Columbia University's Society of Fellows in the Humanities. He lives in Vermont and part time in Mexico.

The reason that I am reading this to you is because the doctrine of the divine right of kings has been taken over by little g governments such as the one in the U.S. The people, the little g government - nearly universally believe that God has given those people all power and authority - and even when they do wrong - they are not be questioned, they are to be removed, they are to be obeyed no matter what.

This is from Dec 7, 2019 quote:

*About a week ago, preacher Franklin Graham and U.S. Department of Energy Secretary Rick Perry dropped bombshells that are causing me to write about something I would have never dreamed needed to be addressed in this country.*

*Mind you, they are not alone. Others of their ilk have been saying similar things over the last few years. Perry stated point blank that God has chosen Trump to carry out His plan. Graham stated that those opposed to Trump may be acting under demonic influence.*

*Graham and Perry are, knowingly or not, displaying a belief in something that used to be called the Divine Right of Kings. The Divine Right of Kings was something that had its roots, to some degree, in the medieval period. Both Augustine and Aquinas affirmed the rule of emperors and kings was authenticated by God. However, it is crucially important to note they also said all secular rulers' powers must be exercised in ways that were never counter to Christian teaching and morality — meaning the power of the Pope and the Church trumped (pardon the expression) the power of kings. There were two types of authority: sacred and secular, and the pre-Reformation Church taught and demonstrated that these two were often at odds with each other.*

*However, with the arrival of Martin Luther in Germany and then King Henry VIII in England, the two-pronged understanding of ultimate authority went out the window. Luther opened a window for the ruler of Saxony and in 1534, Henry VIII opened the door and rode the horse out of the barn, shutting down the Catholic Church in England and declaring himself the supreme head of the Church in England. By being king, he thereby held supreme secular and sacred authority. A little over 50 years later, King James I published his essay "The True Law of Free Monarchies," in which the full-blown Divine Right of Kings theory/theology was presented: namely, the power of the king comes directly from God and is subject to no other figure of earthly authority.*

*To no small degree, the American Revolution was fought over this exact issue.*

Now listen to this. For those who still think Jefferson's Declaration of Independence is a great thing...

*A central point in the Declaration of Independence is rulers derive their authority from the people and not from God, and governments “derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.” This bold statement was an explicit, and clearly understood, rejection of Divine Right and the right of the King of Great Britain to rule over the colonies.*

Ok. I don't have a problem with that at all. I absolutely reject the doctrine of the divine right of kings. But it's for a completely different reason. The doctrine of the divine right of kings says that mere men can be kings and rulers and they get their power to do so from God. In the New Covenant World - there is a King - One King - Only One King - and His name is Jesus, Yeshua. He is the Only One Who is divinely appointed to be King. There are no others. No more rulers. No more kings. No more presidents. No more CONstitutions - there's One King - and that's Jesus Who is called the Christ. And there will never be another one. The article continues.

*This was also one of the reasons why God is not mentioned in the Constitution and we were never to have a king (and his attendant Divine Right) under the laws of our new government.*

*Nonetheless ... here we are in 2019, and we find ourselves listening to Republican politicians and evangelical preachers proclaim [their] current president has received his ultimate authority, his Divine Right, directly from God — and to oppose him is tantamount to opposing the will of God.*

Now, the writer of this document apparently does not claim to be a follower of Christ - it doesn't seem so - but he makes an observation that has more insight than just about anything coming from the mouths of modern churchite quote “preachers.” Listen to this:

*There has been a human tendency, seen over thousands of years, to affirm heavenly authority for rulers. It was true in ancient Egypt, for example, and also during the formative centuries of Christianity, when the Roman emperors were declared to be “sons of god” and they received worship in temples. However, the simple fact is not everything our ancestors did was a good idea. Claiming that secular rulers rule from divine authority was a really bad idea. As a matter of fact, the early Christians refused to participate in the Roman Cult of the Emperor and a fair number of them were killed*

*for it. All they had to do was offer a handful of grain at a temple, but thousands of them refused. It was a matter of principle.*

*I'm well aware that in Paul's Letter to the Romans (13) he says, "Obey the rulers ... only God can give authority to anyone and He puts these rulers in their places of power." But simplistic, literal, "inerrant" reading of a passage like this misses the whole point: Context is crucial. He was writing to early Christians who had to get along in society without getting themselves killed. Moreover, his advice here didn't work: Shortly after, he wrote this letter the imperial government started killing Christians. In fact, they killed Paul himself — even though he was a Roman citizen.*

*Today's evangelical fundamentalist voting block needs to remind itself that Jesus, Peter and Paul, and many early Christian martyrs were all killed by secular governmental authorities. The early Church, even after the reign of Constantine the Great, was respectful but always wary of secular government — for good reason. If American fundamentalists want to stay true to "the fundamentals" of Christianity, then they need to stay far away from claiming any form of Divine Right for any politician. Nothing is more un-Christian or more unpatriotic than that. Nothing.*

**Absolutely! NOTHING IS MORE UN-CHRISTIAN THAN THAT. Nothing.**

The doctrine of the divine right of kings is a carry over from the Old Covenant World and it has NO PLACE in the New Covenant World. Men do not have authority from God to create quote "laws" and then force other men to obey them or else.

Until we get people to understand the meaning of the "end of the world" that this phrase means the end of the Old Covenant World - but not just the end of the sacrificial system - that part is as obvious as can be - but it means the end of the days where God allowed the people to have little g governments like all the other nations - until we get people to understand that that days where God allowed the nations to walk in their own ways ended - we will not see our generation turn to Christ.

This is first and foremost a matter of Biblical instruction. But we must instruct not just by word - but by example. We have to live and preach - No King But Jesus.

Hey, I didn't sign up to live on land where people who do not know Christ rule over me. I didn't sign up for their statues and their c-o-n stitutions and the laws made in pursuance thereof. I did not sign up for mandates from the ungodly. I didn't vote for any of this stuff. My vote was for King Jesus and none other.

I'm not telling you today that if you choose your life to follow the King that life is going to be like it was on the day the people cried out Hosanna to the King. In our generation - it may be more like the following weekend when the King was hanging on a tree.

But I'm telling you that today - He is every bit the King that was announced early on in that week. He's every bit the King that was preached by His apostles when they flatly declared they would NOT obey the laws of Caesar because there IS another King One Jesus. He's not coming back here to be shown to the world as King again. He's already done that. He does not have to be here to be King. Men and women, boys and girls need to embrace His reign in their lives today and live and preach just like the apostles did in the first century. That's our job. That's our commission.