

The Commonwealth of Israel

Preached first on 2/23/2020 on www.molibertyradio.us

Well good morning everyone, again. I am so excited to be with you today. I have some things to share with you that I believe will be a blessing and a source of encouragement to you. I know that as I have been thinking and praying and studying about today's message - to put it bluntly - I've been overwhelmed myself with what I am about to present.

Life's little blessings continued again this week. Oh boy. I've been battling a tooth issue now with a particular wisdom tooth - and I've been fighting this thing for more than 10 years. I would go through some periods of intense pain with it - then the pain would gradually subside and I'd think maybe it was over. I decided that the pain was when the tooth was pushing itself up - then - when it finished doing what it wanted to do - the pain would go away and I'd be spared the expense and the trip to the dentist.

Well, this would actually flare up on me about once a year. The pain would last several days, maybe a week or so, then it would gradually just go away. About 6 months ago, I woke up one morning and just overnight - that tooth was about an 1/8 of an inch higher than the tooth next to it. It was pretty bizarre.

It felt really awkward and well, just plain weird in my mouth. I couldn't help but push on it with my tongue - and - I'll spare you all the details - I know that Teresa is just cringing that I'm even telling you this story - but long story short - after continually pushing on that silly thing - I actually broke it. The tooth never hurt, not at all. But I broke it. This past week, we were visiting with our oldest son - who - by the way - got engaged on his birthday this past week - but as we were visiting - the tooth broke again.

This time, though, it was a disaster. Ok, enough with the details - this time though - the pain was unbearable. Not my tooth. My tooth did not hurt - but I was in some pretty intense pain. So, we scheduled a visit with the dentist and the tooth got removed. Thank the Lord. I'm so happy to be done with part of my life. What a blessing.

I was so concerned that I was not going to be able to preach this weekend - but - as you can hear - I'm hear today and ready to preach!

Again, I have some emails that I want to cover and also I have a comment from my wife - that I want to share with you. You know, my heart just aches for those of you men out there who want to walk in the Kingdom of God and you are doing it alone.

My observation has been for more than 35 years now - that the quote unquote "churches" are filled with and driven by - now you women that have been faithfully listening to my messages - you are absolutely forbidden to be offended by this statement - you need to hear me out.

But it is the women who drive the quote unquote "churches." I saw for myself when I was involved in that, and I see from the sidelines watching today.

But, in the Kingdom of God, it is the men who are trying to lead - and in many many cases - the women refuse to follow their husbands. And sadly, the women - many of them - are in the so-called "church" and they receive ungodly, wicked encouragement from the quote "church" and the "churchmen" to disobey their husbands. This is one of the most despicable things that I've ever seen the "church" and the "churchmen" do - and I've seen it many times in my lifetime.

The narrative goes something like this.

The man - the one who is supposed to be the head of the wife - clearly taught from the Word - because he sees problems with the quote "government" he was born into - and because at that time - has not fully recognized that he has a choice in which Government he will be a citizen of - begins to complain about the government of his birth. He picks on the corrupt politicians. He picks on the awful decisions of the judges. He picks on the quote "laws" - he harps on abortion - he might even complain about the endless wars. He wants to talk about every conspiracy theory circulating - from 9/11 to the moon - and everything in between.

And before long - because the wife has been engrained in her mind that the quote "government" is quote "ordained of God" - she begins to see her husband asd borderline delirious - and just plain rebellious.

So she begins talking to the quote "church" people and the "churchmen" about her problems at home. And instead of the "church" people and the "churchmen" telling her to obey her husband like the Scriptures clearly teach - not just from Ephesians 5 - which should be all it takes - but from the principles learned from cover to cover in the Book - so instead of teaching the "churchwomen" to obey her husband - this is what happens.

The "churchmen" counsel the women that since her husband is rebelling against the U.S. government - whether he is or not - he may just be questioning the antics - or exposing the evil - but since her husband will not conform and basically worship the

U.S. government like everyone else - then she is somehow magically released from the clear command to Submit to and Obey her husband in all things - because her husband is not worshipping man's government.

I've seen this many many times in my ministry throughout the last 30 plus years.

Yes, it is the Gospel that separates like a sword. Jesus/Yeshua the Christ said so - but Yahweh is still not the author of divorce. He would much prefer unity and joy and peace and harmony in a Godly marriage where both the husband and wife are walking together in the Kingdom of God raising their children to be committed followers of Christ and His Kingdom.

Now, sadly, again, it is a two way street. Sometimes, not everytime, but sometimes these marital issues begin because the husband gets on a rant about the CONstitution. A lot of times, hey, even in my own life, for a period of about 6 months, when I was maybe 20 years old, I think, I thought the CONstitution was godly, based on the Bible and America's problems would be fixed by a return to the CON.

So when a man tries to build a family foundation with the CON - he is destined for problems. Friends, I'm going to put it out there. A manmade document is not worth going to jail over. It's not worth losing your wife and children over. A manmade document is certainly not worth dying for and it absolutely is not worth sending your precious sons and daughters to die for - especially - especially - when a few things in that document which might be stretched into Biblical truths - are not even obeyed.

I've said this before and I'll say it again - as wicked and ungodly as America is - if it would obey one thing - just one thing - in its CON - wickedness and evil would abate tremendously overnight.

It was not my intention at all to even touch on this, this morning, but during this brief period of time in my early adulthood where I thought the CON was the answer, I came upon a paperback book written by George Bancroft, I believe that was his name. And he was talking about the evils of a nation's currency - when it was not silver and gold. In his book, he wrote about Roger Sherman. Now Roger Sherman was the only man to sign the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation and the U.S. CON.

I want to read something to you from Sherman's booklet entitled, *A Caveat Against Injustice or, An Inquiry into the Evils of a Fluctuating Medium of Exchange*

Keep in mind that I'm saying that a manmade document - the CON is not worth dying for, or losing your family for - especially when the people who claim to worship the document themselves will not obey even just one Godly sentence in the document.

This booklet is on my website. For historical purposes, I recommend that everyone go and read that if you haven't before. But there was a quote in this booklet that profoundly impacted me years ago. This was written in 1752. Here it is, listen to the opening paragraph:

§1 Forasmuch, as there have many Disputes arisen of late concerning the Medium of Exchange in this Colony, which have been occasioned chiefly by Reason of our having such large Quantities of Paper Bills of Credit on some of the Neighboring Governments, passing in Payments among us, and some of those Governments having issued much larger sums of Bills than were necessary to supply themselves with a competent Medium of Exchange, and not having supplied their Treasuries with any Fund for the maintaining the Credit of such Bills; they have therefore been continually depreciating and growing less in their Value, and have been the principal Means of the Depreciation of the Bills of Credit emitted by this Colony, by their passing promiscuously with them; and so have been the Occasion of Much Embarrassment and Injustice, in the Trade and Commerce of the Colony, and many People and especially Widows and Orphans have been great Sufferers thereby.

Interesting that he specifically noted that Widows and Orphans were great sufferers - why? Because of paper money. I hope that statement, or my emphasis of it drew your mind to James 1:27

Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.

Go on with Sherman. In his booklet, he has gone through some excellent proof as to why paper money was destroying the colonies. He said this:

§45 And now I have gone through with what I first proposed, But perhaps some, may be ready to say, that we are sensible that it is of bad Consequence to have a fluctuating Medium of Exchange, but what can be done to Remedy it?

§46 I answer take away the Cause, and the Effect will necessarily cease.

§47 But it may be further objected, that if it were not for the Bills of Credit on the Neighboring Governments, we should have no Money to Trade with, and what should we do for a Medium of Exchange? or how could we live without?

§48 To this I answer, that if that were indeed the Case, we had better die in a good Cause than live in a bad one. But I apprehend that the Case in Fact is quite the reverse, for we in this Colony are seated on a very fruitful Soil, the Product whereof, with our Labour and Industry and the Divine Blessing thereon, would sufficiently furnish us with and procure us all the Necessaries of Life and as good a Medium of Exchange as any People in the World have or can desire.

§49 But so long as we part with our most valuable Commodities for such Bills of Credit as are no Profit; but rather a Cheat, Vexation and Snare to us, and become a Medium whereby we are continually cheating and wronging one another in our Dealings and Commerce.

§50 And so long as we import so much more foreign Goods than are necessary, and keep so many Merchants and Trader employed to procure and deal them out to us: Great Part of which, we might as well make among ourselves; and another great Part of which, we had much better be without, especially the Spiritous Liquors of which vast Quantities are consumed in this Colony every Year, unnecessarily to the great Destruction of the Estates, Morals, Health and even the Lives of many of the Inhabitants.

Now, this takes me back to George Bancroft from the 1800s. Bancroft was a major player in the U.S. in the 1800s. Ambassador to the UK, Secretary of the Navy, Senior American Diplomat, historian, scholar, blah blah blah, bigwig in the U.S.

Wrote a book in 1884 because he saw all these problems in the U.S. at that time - and was trying to solve the problem - so he wrote this book called,

A PLEA FOR THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Wounded in the House of Its Guardians

You see, this tripe about America's problems can be solved by a quote "return to the CONstitution" have been around for a long long time. Still today. But, funny thing, nothing changes. Well, in this book for a Plea for the CON, is where I learned about Roger Sherman. In Bancroft's opening paragraph, he says this:

Good money must have an intrinsic value. The United States of America cannot make its shadow legal tender for debts payable in money without ultimately bringing upon their foreign commerce and their home industry a catastrophe, which will be the more overwhelming the longer the day of wrath puts off its coming. Our federal constitution

was designed to end forever the emission of bills of credit as legal tender in payment of debts, alike by the individual states and the United States; and it will have that effect, if it is rightly interpreted and firmly enforced.

Thomas Paine said in his treatise, Common Sense:

"The laws of a country ought to be the standard of equity and calculated to impress on the minds of the people the moral as well as the legal obligations of political justice. But tender laws, of any kind, operate to destroy morality, and to dissolve by the pretense of law what ought to be the principle of law to support, reciprocal justice between man and man; and the punishment of a member who should move for such a law ought to be DEATH."

Back to Roger Sherman he said this:

§20 But if what is used as a Medium of Exchange is fluctuating in its Value it is no better than unjust Weights and Measures, both which are condemned by the Laws of GOD and Man, and therefore the longest and most universal Custom could never make the Use of such a Medium either lawful or reasonable.

The aggravating thing about this statement is that why did it take catastrophe, calamity, despair for these guys - at least Roger Sherman - to finally make their way back to the Laws of God realizing that it was a violation of the Laws of God regarding economy that was the source of their misery?

John Adams is quoted as saying, in 1787, supposedly in a letter to Thomas Jefferson:

"All the perplexities, confusion and distress in America arise not from defects in their Constitution or Confederation, nor from want of honor or virtue, so much as downright ignorance of the nature of coin, credit, and circulation."

So began their debates on their new CONstitution and in that document, they expressly forbid anything but gold and silver coin to be used in payment of debts. Washington supposedly said:

Washington, in his circular letter of June, 1783, to the governors of the several United States, wrote that "honesty will be found on every experiment to be the best and only true policy," being convinced that "arguments deduced from this topic could with pertinency and force be made use of against any attempt to procure a paper currency."

Hamilton supposedly said,

In June, 1783, Alexander Hamilton, in resolutions for a new constitution of the United States of America, set forth explicitly: "To emit an unfunded paper as the sign of value ought not to continue a formal part of the constitution, nor ever hereafter to be

employed; being, in its nature, pregnant with abuses, and liable to be made the engine of imposition and fraud; holding out temptations equally pernicious to the integrity of government and to the morals of the people."

Then Bancroft wrote:

The overwhelming evils of paper money formed the subject of universal deliberation as affecting domestic, inter-state, and international relations, which could be effectually remedied only by a central government.

From end to end of the whole country its best men were seeking remedies for what Madison called "the epidemic malady" of paper money.

In the summer of 1785 Richard Henry Lee, then president of congress, warned Washington of a plan formed for issuing a large sum of paper money in the next assembly of their state, adding as his opinion: "The greatest foes in the world could not devise a more effectual plan for ruining Virginia. I should suppose every friend to his country, every honest and sober man, would join heartily to reprobate so nefarious a plan of speculation." "I never have heard," answered Washington, in August, "and I hope never shall hear any serious mention of a paper emission in this state. Yet ignorance is the tool of design, and is often set to work suddenly and unexpectedly."

In the same year, George Mason wrote: "They may pass a law to issue paper money, but twenty laws will not make the people receive it. Paper money is founded upon fraud and knavery."

Let me interject here. He said that 20 laws wouldn't make people accept paper money - founded on fraud and knavery. But when the "church" and the "churchmen" compel a dumbdowned group of people to blindly obey anything and everything someone who calls themself government says - it doesn't even require law for those people to fall down and submit to the most horrific acts - that ultimately will lead to their own destruction.

As the danger drew nearer, Washington, on the 1st of August, 1786, wrote to Jefferson: "Other states are falling into very foolish and wicked plans of emitting paper money."

For all intents and purposes, the only thing in the entire CON that if obeyed today - would abate the proliferation of evil - is completely ignored. Why? Because the Scriptures says, "The love of money is the root of all evil." Who created gold and silver? God did. Who created paper money? Man did. The use of Gold and silver requires prudence and wisdom in its use. The creation of fictitious money comes with every evil imaginable. 23 trillion dollars in so-called national debt - are you serious? Absurd.

If the citizens in America would force their states to obey this part of their CON - I mean, how can you pay a traffic ticket? I can you pay a tax? How can you do any

interaction with a quote unquote "state" if their supreme law of the land says, "No state shall make anything but gold and silver coin a tender in payment of debt?"

So a piece of paper - the CON - who the people who have bound themselves to it - and the quote "government is supposed to be bound by the chains of it" refuse to obey even one single thing that - as I said - could be stretched into being based on the Word of God.

If those men were such Godly men, as they are so often held out to be, why didn't their document include chapter and verse as to why Sherman said "The Laws of God condemn the use of paper money?"

Here's my point in every bit of this. Men, those of you who are having marital problems, because of disagreements, we must lead our wives in love, pointing them only to "Thus saith the Lord."

The argument then from the wife or the dissenter becomes an argument with God Himself. Many men through the years have just marveled at the testimony of my wife, who is committed to the Kingdom of God and has been for more than 30 years.

When I began sharing with her about the way I live and the things I believe, the Word of God was opened. There was no CONstitution. There was no conspiracy theories. It was look, this is what God's Word says.

Do we believe that

the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart?

Yes, we do. The Word of God is the only thing capable of producing lasting change in the hearts of those who hear it.

I'm not telling any of you guys out there today that are suffering and heartbroken because your wife is rebelling against God - I'm not saying these things to further compound your misery - I'm encouraging you to make sure your conversation is coming from the Word of God. My words will not change someone. Your words will not change someone. But the Words of Almighty God can.

The truth is, the Godly marriage begins first with the command for the husband to love his wife.

Ladies, you may not know this about us men. But one of the most bristly things a woman can do is challenge the authority of her husband. The wise woman has figured this out at some point. I believe my wife is one that has figured this out. When I'm wrong - of course the very few times that has occurred in 30 years - that was a joke -

please laugh now - when I'm wrong - she has a Godly, gentle way of asking me to rethink my conclusion.

Wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands, yes. But - unlike the way the "churchman" has devilishly counseled the "churchwoman" against her Kingdom husband - the Godly wife will not disobey her God if her husband wants her to.

So again, the dilemma. The "churchman" would be right in counseling the wife not to obey a wicked command of the husband - but in the instance of the Kingdom husband and the "churchian wife" the Kingdom husband is not commanding evil of the wife. She must obey. For the "churchian wife" to rebel against the Kingdom husband - she is bringing to herself damnation.

Let me add one more thing in relation to the horrendous counsel from the "churchman."

When the "churchman" counsels the "churchwoman" to rebel against her husband - he is violating another passage of Scripture in relation to marriage. The Scriptures - because they cover every single thing that can occur in life - state very clearly - that if a "churchwoman's" husband - does not want to quote "go to church" - but the husband wants to remain married - then the "churchwoman" is commanded from the Scriptures to remain faithful to her unbelieving husband. These principles, however, are not taught from the "churchmen" - at least in the instances I have known about for many years now - when the husband desires life in the Kingdom - and the wife desires life in the so-called "church" the "churchmen" release the woman from the Scriptures commanding her to obey and submit to her husband - this is despicable.

So, hang in there Kingdom husbands. Gently, but firmly, do your best to lead your family with the Word of God. Don't use it like a whip or a board to beat someone over the head - but let the Word of God work knowing that faith cometh by hearing and hearing by the Word.

As I said a minute ago, when the wife rebels against the authority of the husband - it's in our nature - we can't help it but get bristled up and defensive - but we need to be aware of this and guard against it. Let God work.

Alright, now, if I can contain myself, let's get back to the commonwealth of Israel.

I am still answering some emails - and as I've said before - it's okay - ask as many times as you need to - continue giving me the opportunity to help you understand what I'm trying to say.

The people in the Middle East - those who call themselves Jews or Israelis - if they do not believe that Jesus / Yeshua - the One Who was sent by God to physically walk this earth in the first century - if they do not believe that Jesus was the Messiah - they are

antichrists. They are not the Chosen people of God. They are imposters, liars, deceivers - antichrists. There is no way possible that someone can be the quote "Chosen people of God - and not be a follower of Jesus Christ."

The promise of land that Yahweh promised to the Israelites according to the flesh and blood of the Old Covenant - Joshua chapter 21 clearly shows that Yahweh fulfilled His promise.

And Yahweh gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein.

[44] And Yahweh gave them rest round about, according to all that he swore unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; Yahweh delivered all their enemies into their hand.

[45] There failed not ought of any good thing which Yahweh had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass.

Concerning the promises of land, Yahweh fulfilled His promises. He owes no one any particular piece of land.

So what does Yahweh have now, as far as land goes?

Psalm 24: 1

The earth is Yahweh's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein.

Psalm 89:11

The heavens are thine, the earth also is thine: as for the world and the fulness thereof, thou hast founded them.

He owns it all - and He has given every single square inch of it belongs to those who have embraced the Son.

For he hath put all things under his feet.

That in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him:

Giving thanks unto the Father, which hath made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light:

Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son:

In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins:

Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature:

For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth,

visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or

powers: all things were created by him, and for him:

And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.

And he is the head of the body, the ecclesia: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.

For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell;

And he is the head of the body, the ecclesia: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.

And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.

Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him.

And how is that I say these things equally apply to those who have come to Christ, those who have become citizens of the commonwealth of Israel?

And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together.

And what is our job supposed to be today?

Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.

Turn with me please to Ephesians 2 again, please, and let's begin in verse 10.

For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.

[11] Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands;

Once again. These are those who did not follow Abraham in the custom of circumcision. But greater still, listen to verse 12

[12] That at that time ye were without Christ,

In my ministry, I have purposely stayed away from the arguments concerning the flesh of Abraham, the flesh of Adam. Not because I do not believe they are important - they are important. They are extremely valuable in understanding the Laws of God concerning adultery. Race mixing, I believe this with my whole heart, race mixing violates the Laws of God concerning Thou shalt not commit adultery. But hold on to your seats - I believe the same thing about seed mixing - as in the plants, the animals,

hold on tighter - artificial insemination of cattle - we have to understand the elements of flesh and blood as they teach us the Mind and Will of God in relation to how we are to obey His Laws. But for the administration of the Gospel of the Kingdom, for the salvation of men's souls, for repentance of sin - the issue is what do you believe about Jesus / Yeshua?

Does a man have Biblically correct faith - a Biblically correct system of belief in regards to who Jesus / Yeshua was and is?

[12] That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world:

[13] But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.

Ok. So coming into Christ involves becoming a citizen of the commonwealth of Israel and because our faith - our system of belief is based on truth - we who - if it were possible could trace our flesh and blood to Adam - and those who cannot trace their flesh and blood to Adam - now - because of faith - we have been grafted into the nation of God - the people of God - and that nation has a name - the commonwealth of Israel.

For the last 30 years of my life - once this became real to me and I understood that the commonwealth of Israel is the only legitimate Government that God allows for men today - I have carried identifying documents on me - that say that I am a citizen of the commonwealth of Israel. I don't do this because God commands it of His people. I do it simply because virtually every interaction with the world today - asks for identification. So I have id that says I'm a citizen of the commonwealth of Israel.

When Teresa called the dentist for me this week, the last thing that lady said was, "Be sure your husband brings a photo id with him." Huh? A photo id to get a tooth pulled? Crazy. But, I had one. They never did ask for it, but I had one for them just in case.

Before I stray to far, I was talking about what these things mean for us today, in the New Covenant World.

I had just finished quoting II Corinthians 5:20 where Paul said he was an ambassador for Christ.

What type of word is ambassador? I ask you this morning. What type of word is it?

In Strong's Dictionary, he says it's 4243 from the Greek word presbyo. Meaning, act as a representative, (figuratively, a preacher) - be an ambassador. Other close Greek words are presbeia which means an embassy, ambassage, message.

Webster's 1828 says:

1. A minister of the highest rank employed by one prince or state, at the court of another, to manage the public concerns of his own prince or state, and representing the power and dignity of his sovereign. Ambassadors are ordinary, when they reside permanently at a foreign court; or extraordinary, when they are sent on a special occasion. They are also called ministers. Envoys are ministers employed on special occasions, and are of less dignity.

Frankly put, and where I'm driving at today, the word is a political term. That, of course, should not come as a surprise to us at all. In order to be an ambassador - and man has to be employed (as Webster put it) by a prince or a state.

It is not surprising at all - to see Paul using a political term in regards to what his responsibility as a follower of Christ was - and is our example today. Paul was an ambassador from the commonwealth of Israel - to the nations. He was representing the commonwealth of Israel and delivering the message that every living, breathing creature was to conform to the Kingdom of God - to turn from their respective domains of darkness - the governments they had created for themselves - with their laws, their statutes, their ways - and be translated into the Kingdom of God's dear son.

Paul did not pull the word ambassador out from his hat thinking it would be a clever thing to call himself - or a fun fact - or a cool thing to do - this was serious business. Paul was a citizen of a real nation, a real country, now listen - A PHYSICAL NATION - with physical Laws, with physical Statutes and Judgements and a PHYSICAL KING.

This is what I've been preaching about for all these many years. Christ is not King of the heavens only. The Kingdom of God is for the heavens and the earth.

When the quote "churchmen" say that quote "Satan is the ruler of this present world" - they are quite possibly committing an unpardonable sin. Attributing the work of God or the work of Christ to the enemies of God - quite possibly could be an unpardonable sin.

There is no spiritual demonic angel in existence today - if there ever was one. There is no spiritual demonic devil in existence today. Whatever those entities were - Christ destroyed them and to resurrect them and say that whatever those powers were are the rulers of this world today - is the height of blasphemy. In the New Covenant world, God has taken it all back. In the Old Covenant world, He did allow men to have their own governments. In fact, He set them up and managed them according to His good will and to bring about His ultimate purpose. But in the New Covenant World, it isn't so any longer.

But thou, O man of God, flee these things;

Interestingly enough, the "these things" that Paul was referring to here was paper money, the stock market, etc.,

But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness.

[12] Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses.

[13] I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession;

[14] That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ:

[15] Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords;

[16] Who only hath immortality, dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see: to whom be honour and power everlasting. Amen.

In the New Covenant World, Yahweh has reclaimed it all. He's taken it all back to Himself. He finally had a nation, a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, and He built His Kingdom on those who had embraced Christ - and that nation is the only legitimate nation in existence from that day until now. And it is the responsibility of we who are ambassadors of the commonwealth of Israel to proclaim to the rest of the world their need to "Come out from among them and be separate."

The word ambassador is a political term.

Quite possibly the most political term in the entire Bible is found in the passage we are reading in Ephesians 2. And that word is commonwealth.

I discovered something this week while preparing for this message that was quite disheartening to me. I have told you before that I do not believe we can trust the online version of Strong's Concordance. I have found definitions online that do not match definitions from my 1977 copy of Strong's. My guess is that even my Strong's 1977 does not match the original. Not that Strong's is the Word of God, it is not. But if the enemies of God changed the Bible, we should not be surprised that they would alter a tool such as Strong's Concordance.

I went online to the 1828 Webster's Dictionary to quickly get the definition for the word commonwealth. I'm sorry to report to you that the word commonwealth is not found in the 1828 online edition. If it is, if I've made a mistake, it must be hidden in there somewhere, because I could not find it by searching any variation of the word common, common-wealth, commonwealth or otherwise.

So, I picked up my old printed reproduction and went right straight to the word commonwealth. This is what Webster's 1828 says:

1. *An established form of government, or civil polity; or more generally, a state; a body politic, consisting of a certain portion of men united by compact or tacit agreement, under one form of government and system of laws. This term is applied to the government of Great Britain, which is of a mixed character, and to other governments which are considered as free or popular, but rarely or improperly, to an absolute government. A commonwealth is a free state; a popular or representative government; a republic; as the commonwealth of Massachusetts. The word signifies strictly, the common good or happiness, and hence, the form of government supposed best to secure the public good.*

2. *The whole body of people in a state; the public.*

3. *The territory of a state; as all the land within the limits of the commonwealth Massachusetts. End quote.*

There can be no doubt that the word commonwealth is political. Webster, no doubt because he did not seem to understand Ephesians 2 and/or its implications - was not totally complete or totally accurate in his definition as it relates to the commonwealth of Israel - but at least for the purposes of this message - there is no doubt that the word is a political word.

If we go to the modern day authority on truth, the Internet, and type in the word commonwealth, this came up for me first in the search:

an independent country or community, especially a democratic republic.

From another popular source, an absolute bastillion of truth, Wikipedia, quote:

*A commonwealth is a traditional English term for a political community founded for the **common good**. Historically it has sometimes been synonymous with "**republic**". The noun "commonwealth", meaning "public welfare general good or advantage", dates from the 15th century. Originally a phrase (the common-wealth or the common wealth – echoed in the modern synonym "public wealth") it comes from the old meaning of "**wealth**", which is "well-being", and is itself a loose translation of the Latin **res publica** (republic). The term literally meant "common well-being". In the 17th century, the definition of "commonwealth" expanded from its original sense of "**public welfare**" or "**commonweal**" to mean "a state in which the supreme power is vested in the people; a republic or **democratic state**".*

*The term evolved to become a title to a number of political entities. Three countries – **Australia**, the **Bahamas**, and **Dominica** – have the official title "Commonwealth", as do four **U.S. states** and two **U.S. territories**. Since the early 20th century, the term has been used to name some fraternal associations of nations, most notably the **Commonwealth***

of Nations, an organization primarily of former territories of the British Empire, which is often referred to as simply "the Commonwealth". End quote.

Now again, these secular sources of definitions dance all around the real meaning of the commonwealth of Israel, but, there is enough information here to reinforce the simple truth that we are talking about a political term.

When Paul was talking about the commonwealth of Israel, he was talking about a nation. A PHYSICAL NATION - made up of citizens with a common belief - a common compact, a tacit agreement - that being Christ is King, the Laws of His Father, the Perfect Will of His Father, is their Lawbook and citizenship in the commonwealth of Israel was a requirement - otherwise - one would be an alien - an illegal alien - another political term - they would be without hope and they would be without God in the world.

By proper reasoning and understanding of what is being said in Ephesians 2 - a man loses his alien status, a man gains hope, and a man receives God in the world - when by faith - a Biblically correct system of belief - he embraces Christ as King - and he gains citizenship in the commonwealth of Israel - clearly - a real nation - with a real King - with real Laws - with real ambassadors - and if you want to say that the letters referred to in Acts 22:5, Acts 28:21. I Corinthians 16:3, II Corinthians 3:1 - if you want to say that those letters referred to identification documents - you wouldn't get an argument from me.

Citizenship in the commonwealth of Israel - is real. And until God's people - those who claim to truly be followers of Jesus the Christ - understand this - and begin to act like the nation of God - we are going to continue to be trampled upon. We're salt that's lost its savour. We are a light hidden under a bushel.

Like I said last week, being born as a citizen of the U.S., now today - that U.S. debt is over 23 trillion - debt per taxpayer is now 188,578 dollars - who in their right mind would say - sure, sign me up? I'll be more than happy to take on that debt.

I received another excellent email from Michael after last week's message. And again, if you are not reading Michael's Minutes on the website, I strongly encourage you to do so. But in relation to citizenship in the U.S. versus citizenship in the commonwealth of Israel, he wrote the following to me that I want to share with you this morning.

I want to share this with you because we need to start getting at the nuts and bolts, the nitty gritty of citizenship with the world vs citizenship in the commonwealth of Israel. And Michael has touched on the state of it - one of the roots of the issues. Quote:

"I researched, 'What is the purpose of a birth certificate?' Here is what I found:

[Wikipedia has it thusly:](#)

A birth certificate is a vital record that documents the birth of a child...

Succinctly stated. And it's Wikipedia, so it must be true.

In essence: 'A child was born' (to such and such, on this day, in this place). Fair enough. If a couple wishes to record this as a public document, that's their prerogative. Sounds innocuous enough, and maybe even a good thing.

But, there's more, of course...

*"The right of every child to a name **and nationality**, and the responsibility of national governments to achieve this are contained in Articles 7 and 8 in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child: "The child shall be registered immediately after birth and shall have the right from birth to a name, [and] **the right to acquire a nationality...**"*

Interesting. We have a right to a name—AND a nationality. How about that? I'm betting the name isn't as important as the nationality, since the name can be changed or ignored with an alias or nickname at whim. For example, my wife never went by her given name--but by her middle name, her entire life. No one cared or challenged it. Do you think they really care what your name is after all? Is that in itself the focus? We'll see shortly that in fact it isn't, and they don't... Continuing:

*"Statelessness, or the lack of effective nationality, impacts the daily lives of some 11–12 million people around the world. Perhaps those who suffer most are stateless infants, children, and youth. Although born and raised in their parents' country of habitual residence, **they lack formal recognition of their existence.**"*

Oh, the horror... Statelessness equates to the "lack of formal recognition of one's existence". Those who do not identify with a State, "suffer" from non-existence.

Turns out, we were all suffering from conscious oblivion—and finally the government stepped in and relieved our suffering by granting us "existence"! They accomplished this with a piece of paper.

Charlie, I believe you are suffering from "non-existence". The State would like to remedy that... to help you. Why else would you be appearing before them in their court?

*Don't miss the sleight of hand—it's cunning and effective. It's asserted that the official registration of one's birth is primarily to grant them their inherent "right to acquire a nationality". That's the twist. We had a RIGHT to it. In reality, the State is claiming as **it's right** the ownership of your person, notably for the righteous purposes of taxation, conscription, and census (numbering)...*

From the [American Bar Association website](#),

*A birth certificate "establishes who you are and gives access to the rights and privileges, and the **obligations of citizenship**."*

And how about that. When every infant bursts forth from the womb, it is issued a State Writ, signed by the parents and midwives, establishing "the OBLIGATIONS of citizenship". Day One, baby... Your first obligation—you become a "citizen" of the State.

And what are those "obligations"?

*Why, none other than "**tax, military, and census purposes**"... And there you have it—a proper definition of what THEY mean by "nationality". Nationality is equivalent to ownership—the purpose of the birth certificate is only to determine WHICH "nation" you shall serve, all the days of your slavish life. And nothing more. All else is a subterfuge.*

But, what about the "right" to your own name (is it really yours)? Somehow we lost track of that promise. Well, back to Wikipedia—here now we see the following:

*In the United States, when an adoption is finalized, the government seals the original birth certificate and will issue a replacement birth certificate substituting the individual's birth name with the [NEW] name selected by the adoptive parent(s), and **replacing** the birth parent(s) name with the adoptive parent(s). In those cases, adopted individuals are **not** granted access to their own original birth certificate upon request. Laws vary depending on the state where the birth was originally registered and the adoption was finalized. Some states allow adopted people unrestricted access to their own original birth certificate, while in others the certificate is available only if the biological parent(s) have given their permission or a petition has been granted by the court of jurisdiction. Other jurisdictions **do not allow adopted people access to their own original birth certificate under any circumstances**.*

So, it appears your name is subject to others' interpretation. Your actual parental heritage and your given name at birth, in reality, are NOT RELEVANT. You have no legal right to that information. In fact, you as a citizen may even be barred from ever seeing it! People who were "adopted" (and let's remember, adoption is a State function in modern society), whose birth parents were "replaced", likewise had their name replaced and the original certificate of record EXPUNGED from the public sphere! So much for "your name is what's on your birth certificate". No, that was a charade. Your "birth certificate" assigns your State ownership, period. End quote.

And yes. It's all about citizenship. Now we know why there has been all out war on trying to destroy the Gospel. All out war on destroying the Bible. All out war on destroying people's intellect's and their abilities to think for themselves. This is why the Kingship of Christ and the Kingdom of God is relegated to the future or exclusively in the heavens. This is why very few people know that God has a nation - it's called the commonwealth of Israel - and citizenship is exclusive - it is only available to those who have embraced Jesus / Yeshua as the Christ. And for ALL others - those who are not citizens - they are aliens, they are without hope and they are without God left to fend for themselves in a world that is bent on rebelling against the One True King.

My friends, Israel is Real. Israel - I S R A E L is R E A L. God's people are supposed to be citizens of Israel. This is not a game. This is not reserved for the heavenlies. This is God's Will being done on earth as it is in heaven.

Followers of Christ were never meant to be citizens of any government not named the commonwealth of Israel. Followers of Christ were never meant to be place themselves under men who are not followers of Christ. Judges who refuse to rule according to the Law of God. Men who believe they have the power to redefine good and evil. It was never the plan of God for followers of Christ to be united together with such things.

Today, there are quote governments all over the world who call themselves commonwealths. Massachusetts, Kentucky, Virginia - you know I lived in Virginia at one time. And do you know that when I lived there, if I ever referred to Virginia as a state to some of the older locals there - they rebuked me. "We're not a state, we're a commonwealth."

Just amazing that these quote governments call themselves commonwealths and everyone believes they have legitimate power to exist - but the commonwealth of Israel

- so named for the followers of Christ who came out from the commonwealths of men - is the one that people believe is not legitimate. Well friends, the homos came out of the closet and demanded recognition - and in a very short period of time - they got it. Now, their wickedness is forced down the throats of people all around the world.

It's time for God's people to come out of the closet, quit being ashamed of Christ and His Kingdom - and begin spreading the word that God does have a nation. And that nation doesn't have elections where queers, perverts, liars, thieves and adulterers are all debating to see which one of the freaks will be the next to quote "rule in America."

It's time for God's people to separate themselves from the clown show and let the world know that this Jesus, Who was crucified and hung on a tree, this Jesus hath God made both Lord and Christ.

Well, I didn't get to my wife's comment that I wanted to address. Hopefully, we'll get to it next week.

I want to remind you again of Kingdom Conference 2020. It's coming up. March the 26th through the 29th. Please visit the website at www.godsendusmen.com and you can click on the link at the top of the Home page for more information.