

Message# 226- 1-29-2023 - No Man that Warreth Entangleth Himself with the Affairs of this Life

Preached first on 1/29/2023 on www.molibertyradio.us

Good morning everyone. Thank you for tuning into the message this morning.

Before we get into today's message - if we actually get there - once again, I feel like I need to clear the air on something. I have a problem. It's a problem I've had for a long time and though I try to consciously guard against it - I'm not always successful. Such is the case again.

I have told you before and most of you already know this. I have believed, taught, and lived Fulfilled Bible Prophecy for close to 40 years. Pretty much since I became an adult. It's, for all intents and purposes, all I've ever known. Yes. I grew up in, and played "church" for the first 20 something years. I was entrenched in "church" - I've told all of you that. But at a comparatively young age - I left all of that when I began to understand Fulfilled Bible Prophecy and I've never turned back. So for roughly two-thirds of my life - and for basically my entire adult life - Fulfilled Bible Prophecy - and the implications of that belief - are all I've ever known.

It's like the back of my hand.

I told you how that when I was in my trials, the persecutors just looked at me, and early on, said, "If you'll just do this simple thing - all of this will go away." But what they thought was simple, was as foreign to me as, well, they could have just as easily have said, "If you'll just walk out of this courtroom today and start speaking Chinese, all of this will go away." To them, their offer was just as simple and easy as could be. What they were saying and what I was hearing - was simply an impossibility to me. This life is all I've ever known.

One day I asked Sam and Trish the question. "If there was some procedure you could undertake that would give you eye-sight, would you...." And before I could finish the question, Trish blurted out, "No way." Almost in a way where someone would say, "Are you crazy? Why in the world would I do that?" And, of course, an answer like that to a sighted person is just a head-scratcher. Then, Trish said, "We'd have to learn everything all over again. It would be like starting all over again."

Well, same for me. What the persecutors thought was such an easy solution to them - was an impossibility for me. I wouldn't know how to live that life if I wanted to. And the thought of all the requirements that most people live under - I just couldn't imagine wanting to be involved in all that. I really don't know how people do it.

I said all that to say this. Because Fulfilled Bible Prophecy and the implications of living exclusively as a simple Citizen of the Commonwealth of Israel is pretty much all I've ever known - when I try to communicate these things to other people - what seems just so easy to me - I sometimes - most times, probably - fail to realize what others are hearing. Yes. It's simple to me. It's all I've ever known. But for others, who have known nothing other than the other way - I realize it's not that easy.

I just plow right on thinking that everyone is understanding what I'm trying to say - and that's just not the reality of it.

When I was in the Water Works of the Law series - which still isn't concluded, by the way - I referred to the jews. I brought up a lot of teachings from rabbis, the Talmud, their historians, etc. We talked about mikveh and how it is inseparable from the jewish religion. But friends, I wasn't talking about them authoritatively. I wasn't recommending them and I certainly wasn't saying they were correct. What I was saying was that if someone today believes that "water baptism" - physical "water baptism" is a required element for conversion - then the person who teaches that - believes and teaches exactly the same thing the jew does.

"Christian Identity" has claimed for as long as I've known about it, which my first introduction to "Christian Identity" was back in 1984 - "Christian Identity" has claimed to be "on to the jew" and has called the jew an impostor - and rightly so - but for those in "Christian Identity" to command physical "water baptism" - they are teaching the exact same thing the jew teaches. The only difference is, the jew does not claim to be doing their "water baptisms" in the Name of Jesus. They are still doing their "water baptisms" in the name of Moses.

The mikveh. We talked for weeks about the mikveh. And I was criticized for talking about mikveh. I asked each and every one of you to do your own study on what the mikveh is. The first reference to mikveh is Genesis 1:10. But there's not one out of a million who call themselves "Christians" have never even heard of mikveh. There are thousands and thousands of pictures on the internet of mikvehs. They are basically the same thing as the "baptistry" in the "churches." The "churches" have never left judaism.

They are still practicing judaism - but doing so - they claim - in the Name of Jesus Christ. And what I was trying to get people to see what the heresy of it. I certainly was not promoting it.

There is nothing that the jews do today - same as the first century - those jews that rejected Christ - there is nothing they do today - or then - that Christians - true followers of Jesus Christ - should be doing today that even resembles what they do.

Mikveh = baptistry. Baptistry = mikveh. Physical “water baptism” is judaism. It is a denial that Jesus was the Christ - that Jesus Christ was what the mikveh of the Old World pointed to. The Old World mikveh was an instrument that was used to point people to the Living Water that was Jesus Christ. Jesus was the Living Water. Jesus was what the Old Covenant mikveh pointed to. It wasn't going to be a new-style or new way of “baptism” in water - it pointed to Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ was the Living Water.

The jews continue today with their physical “water baptisms” in their mikvehs - because they do not believe that the Messiah has come. They do not believe that the Law and the prophets were fulfilled in Christ. They don't dare openly perform their blood sacrifices - but they absolutely demand their physical “water baptisms” for salvation. And I just wanted you to educate yourselves, so you could see what I was saying for yourself.

Just like the “churches” don't perform physical blood sacrifices - but they absolutely demand physical “water baptisms.” Of course they do. Why not? They have denied that Jesus Christ was the Messiah in pretty much every single thing they do - so - of course - continue with the physical water aspects of the blood sacrifices - but we'll tell everyone we are doing them in Jesus' name - and that will cloak our judaism in a shroud so we won't get exposed.

The teachings concerning mikveh was done - exclusively - for the purpose of showing people that if they believe in physical “water baptisms” today - they are performing the acts of the jews. Well I said exclusively, that isn't totally correct. I was showing from the Old Covenant world - the mikveh - Old Covenant washing in physical water - was there to point people to the coming Messiah.

The jews missed it. The jews missed the Messiah. They continue on with whatever works of the Old Law they think they are doing - and it is wrong.

I referenced Eckhard Schnaubel. I did not reference him authoritatively. I identified him as a "churchman." Everyone listening to me should clearly know my position on "church" and the "churchmen." I was not referencing Schnaubel for the purpose of recommending his teachings - other than to say - "Look, here is a 'churchman' - a 'churchman' for goodness sake - that is presenting evidence that physical "water baptism" is not for the New Covenant."

Other than to cherry-pick - and that's exactly what I was doing with Schnaubel - cherry-picking some of the things he was saying for the purpose of exposing the error of physical "water baptism" today - I thought I had made it clear that I did not recommend Schnaubel and was definitely not pointing people to him authoritatively.

Again, my fault for failing to adequately communicate this. In my haste, thinking that I had set up a proper foundation for sharing Schnaubel's work - apparently I did not do a very good job in letting people know I was not supporting him.

And last. The Catholics. This was/is at least as painful as the jews - maybe even more. I have not been nearly as obsessed with the jews as a lot of people are. The jews, the jews, the jews, it's all about the jews. Well, it's a lot about jews, I will agree to that. But the way I see things, it's been lily white catholics, baptists, church of christ, lutherans, methodists, mormons - all lily white "Americans" - that have done more to destroy God's creation that any jew has ever done. Don't get me wrong. {I'm talking modern day - not the first century.) When you hear names like Rothschild and Warburg and Schwab - sure - they are/were powerful jews that have done much harm to God's Creation. But what they have done has only been done because the lily white "American" religions have enabled them - by lying to a naive world that they are "God's chosen people."

And again, telling people that a group of people who have not embraced Jesus Christ as the Messiah, the King, the Son of God - telling people that someone that has refused Jesus are God's Chosen people? That's crazy. That's just plain crazy. And it's the lily white "church" in America that does this. They are led by the catholics and the baptists, the church of christ, etc. Yes, there are jews in the American CONgress. There are muslims in the American CONgress - but there are more catholics, baptists and so-called "christians" than all of them combined.

Pewresearch.org said that about the 2022 CONgress, quote:

<https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2021/01/04/faith-on-the-hill-2021/>

When it comes to religious affiliation, the 117th U.S. Congress looks similar to the previous Congress but quite different from Americans overall.

While about a quarter (26%) of U.S. adults are religiously unaffiliated – describing themselves as atheist, agnostic or “nothing in particular” – just one member of the new Congress (Sen. Kyrsten Sinema, D-Ariz.) identifies as religiously unaffiliated (0.2%). Nearly nine-in-ten members of Congress identify as “Christian” [they didn't put it in quotes - but I have to](88%), compared with two-thirds of the general public (65%). Congress is both more heavily Protestant (55% vs. 43%) and more heavily Catholic (30% vs. 20%) than the U.S. adult population overall.

Members of Congress also are older, on average, than U.S. adults overall. At the start of the 116th Congress, the average representative was 57.6 years old, and the average senator was 62.9 years old. Pew Research Center surveys have found that adults in that age range are more likely to be Christian than the general public (74% of Americans ages 50 to 64 are “Christian”, compared with 65% of all Americans ages 18 and older). Still, Congress is more heavily “Christian” even than U.S. adults ages 50 to 64, by a margin of 14 percentage points. End quote.

The truth is - if it were not for the lily white churchites in America - the jews would not be controlling things the way they are today. When your message is, “Don't touch the jews, they are God's Chosen.” And I am not speaking “touch” as in physical. I mean as support. When your message is “Support the jews because they are God's Chosen people...” and that message is coming from the “churchman” to the common man - what do you think is going to happen?

From the BBC.

<https://www.bbc.com/news/57170576>

Israel-Gaza: How much money does Israel get from the US?

In 2020, the US gave \$3.8bn (£2.7bn) in aid to Israel - part of a long-term, yearly commitment made under the Obama administration. [Again, doesn't matter if they are 'democrat or republican'] Almost all of this aid was for military assistance.

This support came as part of an agreement signed by former president Barack Obama in 2016 for an overall package of \$38bn (26.8bn) in military aid over the decade 2017-2028.

Then Trump comes along. All they do is pave the way for the next one. Trump claimed to be the most pro-jew president there ever was. This is just what they admit to as going straight to Israel. Who knows how many jewish organizations around the world are funded by lily white Americans.

I couldn't find out whether or not the World Economic Forum receives direct funding from the U.S. - but who cares? The World Economic Forum website is filled with lily white Americans in powerful - and I only use that word in relation to power that comes only from guns and threats and violence - the World Economic Forum is littered with lily white Americans all over it.

When I quoted from the Catholics - it was not for the purpose of advocating for them or legitimizing them. I quoted from the Catholics for this purpose: It was to say, "If you are someone who demands physical "water baptism" for salvation - you teach the same thing the catholics teach. I never quoted Catholics for the purpose of trying to legitimize their teachings or recommend them.

This has been one of the most painful things I think that has happened in all my years of ministry. That being, that some apparently have misunderstood the purposes for me citing the jews, the catholics and other churchians and deceivers.

Here's what I recommend for those out there that are searching for truth. If I am not mistaken - this is in my book "The Religion of the New World Order" which first came out in the late 1980s or early 1990s - I forget. It might be in "They All Call Him King."

I recommend your Bible. A concordance like Thayer's Greek Lexicon, or Strong's, and an 1828 Webster's Dictionary. Thayer's, Strong's and Webster's are only aids. They aren't inspired. They absolutely have mistakes in them - but they are still pretty good aids.

Our Bibles. Well, as much as I hate to admit it, we need to be aware that people have - and I used to say - "Tried to tamper with our Bibles...." But that's not correct. No. They have tampered with our Bibles. We have no idea what people have done to what we believe are our Bibles. This we do know. The word "church" should not be in our English Bibles. In the very first completed English Bible - the word was not there.

The word “baptism” - just read the introduction of the 1611 KJV. They did not have the authority to use the word “baptism” but they did it anyway. Same for the word “church.” This week, Teresa was speaking with some people in one of the forums she's a member of. I believe she told me it was a forum called them “Keepers of the home.” That's what Godly women are supposed to be.

Anyway, it all started with a woman posting something about her not needing to “go to church, she could study the Bible by herself and get all she needed.” And of course, there were many who jumped on her for that.

Teresa put out a simple post saying that the English word “church” should not be in our English Bibles and wasn't in the first completed English Bible. This started a dialog with someone in the group who wanted to know more.

In our English Bibles, whenever we see the word “church”, with the exception of one time - the one time it was actually translated correctly - the Greek word from which the majority of English Bibles have wrongly used the word “church” - the Greek word is ekklesia.

A simple reverse study of the etymology of the word “church” - will show someone - anyone - in the first two minutes of a research - that the Greek word from which “church” actually comes from is kurias or kuriakon. The English word “church” does not come from ekklesia. This is so simple to find out and see - yet there still - is not one person out of a hundred thousand that knows it.

Ekklesia - not the “churchman's” definition - the Greek. From the Greek, the word means this. This is from britannica.com:

<https://www.britannica.com/topic/Ecclesia-ancient-Greek-assembly>

Ecclesia, Greek Ekklēsia, (“gathering of those summoned”), in ancient Greece, assembly of citizens in a city-state. Its roots lay in the Homeric agora, the meeting of the people. The Athenian Ecclesia, for which exists the most detailed record, was already functioning in Draco’s day (c. 621 BC). In the course of Solon’s codification of the law (c. 594 BC), the Ecclesia became coterminous with the body of male citizens 18 years of age or over and had final control over policy, including the right to hear appeals in the hēliaia (public court), take part in the election of archons (chief magistrates), and confer special privileges on individuals. In the Athens of the 5th and 4th centuries BC, the

prytaneis, a committee of the Boule (council), summoned the Ecclesia both for regular meetings, held four times in each 10th of the year, and for special sessions. [Note: It wasn't weekend social organizations.] Aside from confirmation of magistrates, consideration of ways and means and similar fixed procedures, the agenda was fixed by the prytaneis. Since motions had to originate in the Boule, the Ecclesia could not initiate new business. After discussion open to all members, a vote was taken, usually by show of hands, a simple majority determining the result in most cases. Assemblies of this sort existed in most Greek city-states, continuing to function throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods, though under the Roman Empire their powers gradually atrophied.

Does this sound like “church” to you? When we see ekklesia in our Bibles - we are to understand this as a called-out community of believers - who are called-out of the city-states, the “governments” of men, the domain of darkness, and into a new city-state, a new Government (capital G) that Governs themselves according to the Laws, Statutes, Commandments, Judgements, and Perfect Will of God - with King Jesus as the King of kings and Lord of lords - reigning Supremely with His Father. *That* is what ekklesia is and the “church” doesn't even remotely resemble this.

“Seek ye first.....” before anything else.....Seek ye first the Kingdom of God is what Jesus Christ told His disciples. Kingdom. For us, it is better understood as Government. Seek ye first the Government of God and ITS Righteousness.

We were never told this in “church.” First of all, we were told from babies up that the Kingdom of God was nothing but spiritual today - and physical tomorrow. And of course, when tomorrow comes, it gets pushed back until another tomorrow. The physical Government of God - and what I mean by that is simply this. The Government of God that controls the physical movements of men - when they Govern their lives by God's Laws - that is always in the future. It is NEVER for right now. Men are never expected to obey the Laws of God right now. It's always a future generation. We are just here to prepare another generation - it's never that we are actually to live the Government of God right now. And, of course, that's because the Government of God that will demand that men obey God's Laws - only occurs when some “Jesus” returns to the earth to set up a one-world “government.”

So, the spirituality of the Kingdom of God for today is nothing other than some pie-in-the-sky mystical “kingdom” that only tells you to be nice to everyone and obey men's “governments.” As long as you are nice to everyone and obey men's “governments” then you are a good citizen of the kingdom of God.

Because the Government of God is 1) Spiritual and 2) Futuristic; the only thing that “Christians” are supposed to do today is smile, obey the cops and pay taxes. It doesn't matter that the Scriptures forbid obedience to any statues that are not God's. It doesn't matter that labor taxes make God so angry He wants to declare war. The Government of God has no say so in how people are to Govern their lives because the Government of God is only spiritual and IF it would ever have anything to do with the way people physically live their lives - that is for a future time. Never for today - always for the future.

Recently I had a preacher say to me, quote:

While I certainly agree with a LOT of what you believe, teach and live, there are some issues that I strongly disagree with for sure. Just one that I will mention is one that you brought out in your email. The fact that you believe that all prophecy was fulfilled in AD 70.

[It's not what or said, but that's what he said. I believe that all Bible prophecy was fulfilled when the temple came down - whenever that was.]

If that is so, what are we doing here? What's our purpose? If you think that we are going to rebuild the world and society to completely usher in paradise on earth and a world society that will follow the laws of God and "reclaim" what mankind lost from the beginning of creation I'm afraid that you are living an illusion built on the humanistic doctrine that man can "heal" himself by converting the world to following God's righteous kingdom laws. That just isn't Bible Charlie. End quote.

This email is from a preacher that I actually like and care for a lot. But we need to examine this some.

He asks, “What is our purpose?” For some reason, he seems to think that because I teach that Jesus fulfilled the prophecies - somehow that means we have no purpose here? I don't get that. I understand what he's saying, but I don't get it. He then says it is

an illusion build on the humanistic doctrine that man can "heal" himself by converting the world to following God's righteous kingdom laws.

Now wait a minute. It is a humanistic doctrine that man can “heal” himself by converting the world to following God's righteous kingdom laws?

What I want to know is this. Since when is it NOT our purpose to convert the world to following God's righteous kingdom laws? If we are not supposed to convert the world to following God's righteous kingdom laws - then whose laws are we to tell people to obey? This is exactly what I have been trying to get people to see for almost 40 years.

If we are not supposed to obey God's Laws - then that only leaves man's "laws."

Men are going to obey "laws." Men are going to organize themselves into associations and agree - supposedly for the betterment of themselves and their children - to abide by a certain set of "laws." And it is an illusion to think that we should tell people to associate themselves together - think "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together" - and decide to Govern that assembly - that association - that ekklesia - according to God's Righteous Kingdom Laws?

That's what we are up against. And this came from one of the "good guys."

Alright, getting back to studying and learning and Seeking the Government of God.

I recommended your Bible, a Greek dictionary and an old Webster's dictionary. I also believe you should be reading old English Bibles, too. The KJV has it's known issues. But I believe it's definitely better than modern translations. Irregardless, if we are using an old English Bible - and we are approaching the Scriptures from the understanding that the Government of God is right now - and that the prophecies were fulfilled in the first century - regardless of man's attempts to cover up and keep the Government of God from people - by whatever method they used - the Holy Spirit of God will lead us into truth.

I've told you this before. When I was playing "church." Basically when I was growing up at home, then for some years at "Bible college" then for some years working at "churches" - for the most part - I believed what I was told. There were some things said to me that I just didn't believe - but for the most part - I was a pretty good "toe-the-party line" kind of guy. I didn't believe the jews are God's Chosen people bit - that was a major issue and a couple other less important things.

But when I became an adult. And began to slowly realize that were some very important issues that adults deal with - for instance - dealing with men's little g "governments" via licenses, taxes, oaths, etc., something dawned on me one day that changed my life forever. And that was this. "Am I willing to trust my eternity - whatever

that may be - to the teachings of another man? Am I going to believe what I believe because another man told me what to believe, or am I going to study the Scriptures for myself so that my beliefs are from my own studies?"

At a comparatively young age, I realized there is no way I was going to trust my eternity to things that mere men told me I was supposed to believe.

So I fell on my face before God and begged Him to make Himself real to me. It was almost right then - sometime at least within that next two weeks - when I was reading Matthew 16 - turn there with me for just a minute. Begin in verse 24. But my beliefs concerning Fulfilled Bible Prophecy, concerning the Government of God, concerning living according to the Government of God. That did not come from listening to a bunch of other men. That came from directly studying the Word of God.

Then said Jesus

This "then said Jesus" was very important to me. Those three Words hit me that evening like they had never hit me before. I had been pleading with God to make Himself real to me. I had to know what I believed and why I believed it. It wasn't good enough for my beliefs to come from another man. Men will let you down. Men will fail you. But not Jesus. I was reading this - as if it was for the very first time. Actually, you might say it was for the very first time. It was definitely the first time where I was approaching the Scriptures with almost a life and death attitude. In response to my pleading for truth -

Then said Jesus unto His disciples, If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me.

Friends, I shared another similar passage with you some weeks ago. Jesus did not tell His disciples to take up His cross - Jesus' cross - He had not been murdered on that cross yet. He told His disciples to take up *their* cross. The cross - a symbol of execution by the state. How many today are willing to take up that cross? Not many. Main reason is because of the willy-nilly, never really think about it, phrase from the "churches" that "Jesus died for my sins. Jesus died on the cross so I don't have to." In the final analysis, I'm not going to argue against that - except to point out that you and I could never die on the cross that He died on. That was not then - nor ever was or will be - our cross. He did things on His cross that no man could ever do.

He wasn't telling His disciples to take up *that* cross. He was telling His disciples to take up *their* cross. They killed Jesus because from the time of His birth on - men called Him King. He allowed men to call Him King - and He called Himself King.

Friends, how do you think that would end up today? I'll tell you how. Exactly the same way it ended up back then. With the religious "leaders" declaring they had no king but Caesar - and whosoever maketh Himself a King is not the friend of Caesar - therefore - Crucify Him, crucify Him. Execute Him. He is a seditious traitor to the state. That's how that would end up today. Exactly the way it did back then.

Do you think it wasn't dangerous for His disciples to follow Him around while He was telling people that He was the King? I just don't think people think this through. At His trial - keep your finger here for just a minute and turn to Luke 23. Let's begin in verse 1:

[1] And the whole multitude of them arose, and led Him unto Pilate.

[2] And they began to accuse Him, saying, We found this fellow perverting the nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, saying that He Himself is Christ a King.

[3] And Pilate asked Him, saying, Art Thou the King of the Judahites? And He answered him and said, Thou sayest it.

[4] Then said Pilate to the chief priests and to the people, I find no fault in this man.

So the accusation was that Jesus was a traitor. He was a tax rebel. He called Himself King and allowed others to call Him King. Pilate asked Him, "How do you plead? Are Thou the King of the Judahites?" Jesus answered. "You said it."

Then, the next thing Pilate says is, "I find no fault in this man." Was there more said than Jesus saying, "Thou sayest it?" The text doesn't say so. But when Pilate made His initial choice to accept that Christ was in fact - the King of the Judahites. Think about it for just a minute. Do you think Pilate knew of all the miracles that Christ had done? Do you think he didn't know that just a day or so before this trial - there were thousands of people lining the streets of Jerusalem screaming, "Hosanna to the King?" Do you think Pilate didn't know this? Do you think that Pilate had not heard that this Jesus had raised the dead, healed the sick, gave sight to the blind? Do you think Pilate didn't know how that Herod had caused many baby boy infants to be slaughtered because the wise men from the East knew the time of the birth of the Messiah King?

The Bible says the fame of Christ spread throughout the whole region and increased with every miracle He performed. At that instant in Jesus' trial - I believe Pilate knew that Jesus was the Promised King that was sent to Israel and He wanted to let Him go. But verse 5 tells us that His accusers became angrier at Pilate's initial decision.

[5] And they were the more fierce, saying, He stirreth up the people, teaching throughout all Jewry, beginning from Galilee to this place.

[6] When Pilate heard of Galilee, he asked whether the man were a Galilaean.

[7] And as soon as he knew that He belonged unto Herod's jurisdiction, he sent him to Herod, who himself also was at Jerusalem at that time.

[8] And when Herod saw Jesus, he was exceeding glad: for he was desirous to see Him of a long season, because he had heard many things of Him; and he hoped to have seen some miracle done by Him.

By the way, "historians" for whatever that's worth, do not say this Herod is the same Herod that massacred the babies around the time of Jesus' birth.

[9] Then He questioned with Him in many words; but He answered him nothing.

I don't know why, but there must be good reason why Jesus answered Pilate but wouldn't answer Herod. It's probably got something to do with that big word in verse 7 - jurisdiction. Not that Jesus was under any of their "jurisdiction" but there might be something there for us to learn. But He wouldn't speak to Herod. There's probably something to learn about a time to talk and a time not to talk. Verse 10:

[10] And the chief priests and scribes stood and vehemently accused Him.

The religious men and the lawyers vehemently accused Him. It was intense. It was almost violent. They fiercely accused Him. The Greek for accused here is kat-a-gor-ayo - which means to be a plaintiff in court. To make an accusation before a judge in court.

Which again, just amazes me at the fact that today - people who call themselves "Christians" are just be horrified at the idea of someone being hauled into "criminal court". Well, Jesus was in criminal court. Before He "died for the sins of the world" the process that day involved criminal court.

This week Teresa and I heard the old song, The Old Rugged Cross. And I just thought to myself, when I heard them sing about how they cherished and loved that Old Rugged

Cross - if the symbol of execution by the state would have been the electric chair - would they write songs about how they love that ole' chair? I'm not all making light of the cross - that's not my purpose. It's again, that people throw those phrases around, "He died for my sins on the cross" and they never think about what that actually means. He was arrested. He was handcuffed, taken to court, had a trial, and sentenced to death - Jesus was executed by the state after receiving the death penalty. The cross has become nothing more than a religious trinket that has lost its value and meaning today.

Back to Luke 23, verse 11.

[11] And Herod with his men of war set Him at nought, and mocked Him, and arrayed Him in a gorgeous robe, and sent Him again to Pilate.

[12] And the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together: for before they were at enmity between themselves.

This is men's little g "government" and their politicians in a full-blown expose. For the life of me, I can't see how, when this is so clearly the same things that go on today - how people have concluded that Christians are supposed to be a part of this in our day and age. This was the democrats and the republicans supposedly hating each other then behind closed doors making deals with each other.

[13] And Pilate, when he had called together the chief priests and the rulers and the people,

[14] Said unto them, Ye have brought this Man unto me, as one that perverteth the people: and, behold, I, having examined Him before you, have found no fault in this man touching those things whereof ye accuse Him:

[15] No, nor yet Herod: for I sent you to him; and, lo, nothing worthy of death is done unto Him.

[16] I will therefore chastise Him, and release Him.

So what does all this mean? It's just compromise. It's what politicians do. If Pilate and Herod had found nothing worthy of death in Him, then why do anything to Him? Remember Herod had already put a robe on Jesus. Mark and John recorded it as a purple robe. Purple being the color of richness and royalty. I believe we can learn from the context that Pilate was intending to boldly tell Jesus to quit calling Himself King.

"You can go on and continue with your miracles. Just don't call yourself King and allow

others to call you King.” Chastise means a little more than just that - and can actually mean to beat someone. I don't think that's what Pilate's intention was. But I do believe it was all about the issue of Christ being King or being called King and allowing others to call Him King. But, the religious men and the lawyers would not have it. Verse 17.

[17] (For of necessity he must release one unto them at the feast.)

[18] And they cried out all at once, saying, Away with this Man, and release unto us Barabbas:

[19] (Who for a certain sedition made in the city, and for murder, was cast into prison.)

[20] Pilate therefore, willing to release Jesus, spake again to them.

[21] But they cried, saying, Crucify him, crucify him.

[22] And he said unto them the third time, Why, what evil hath He done? I have found no cause of death in Him: I will therefore chastise Him, and let Him go.

[23] And they were instant with loud voices, requiring that He might be crucified. And the voices of them and of the chief priests prevailed.

The religious men prevailed. I'm telling you - when the religious men have a voice in men's little g “governments” you better watch out. Same today as it was back then.

[24] And Pilate gave sentence that it should be as they required.

[25] And he released unto them him that for sedition and murder was cast into prison, whom they had desired; but he delivered Jesus to their will.

[26] And as they led Him away, they laid hold upon one Simon, a Cyrenian, coming out of the country, and on him they laid the cross, that he might bear it after Jesus.

[27] And there followed him a great company of people, and of women, which also bewailed and lamented Him.

[28] But Jesus turning unto them said, Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for Me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children.

[29] For, behold, the days are coming, in the which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the paps which never gave suck.

[30] Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us.

Again. This is a reference to Bible prophecy being fulfilled in the first century on those who killed Jesus. This is another reason why when people say that the prophecies have not been fulfilled - they are denying that this Jesus, that this Jesus, was the Messiah,

the Son of God.

[31] For if they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?

[32] And there were also two other, malefactors, led with Him to be put to death.

[33] And when they were come to the place, which is called Calvary, there they crucified Him, and the malefactors, one on the right hand, and the other on the left.

[34] Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do. And they parted His raiment, and cast lots.

[35] And the people stood beholding. And the rulers also with them derided Him, saying, He saved others; let Him save himself, if he be Christ, the chosen of God.

[36] And the soldiers also mocked Him, coming to Him, and offering Him vinegar,

[37] And saying, If Thou be the king of the Judahites, save Thyself.

[38] And a superscription also was written over Him in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JUDAHITES.

All of this is about Jesus being King. At this point, this is far less about “Jesus dying for my sins” as it is about Jesus being executed by the state because He said He was King.

Calling Jesus King - then trying to live accordingly - means - you are taking up - what could potentially be - a cross - a symbol of execution by the state. This is what Jesus meant when He told His disciples in Matthew 16 - that His followers had to deny themselves, take up their own crosses - and follow Him. Do you really think He didn't know that He was telling them that they would be following Him to the same type of fate He was getting ready to go through?

How has everything changed from this? To denying yourself and taking up your cross, to submit to the police, obey the “laws of the land” and obey earthly “kings” even when they tell you to disobey God. I don't understand. I don't see how Christ is telling His disciples - you no longer have a life to live the way you want to live it - you must be willing to pick up a symbol of execution by the state and follow Him. Again, follow Him where? We know where. We know where He wanted them to follow Him to.

Friends, I'm telling you this morning, Jesus Christ was sent to be King. That's what His purpose was. He was sent to bring people back to following the Laws of the Righteous Kingdom of God. That's what His purpose was. That's what our purpose is now. It is to point people to the Government of God and away from the governments of men who would do exactly the same thing to Jesus today that they did back then - if He were

here on this earth drawing men to Himself and to His Father's Government.

I'm sorry, but there is no way that Jesus went through all He went through, with everything said about Him being King - even being killed for it - then - just a few years later - it is the purpose of followers of Christ to obey and follow "caesar" - even when "caesar" demands the execution of Christ.

I'll just tell you today, if that is what is meant by, for instance, I Peter 2:13, that Christians are to obey earthly kings - even when those "kings" tell them to live contrary to the Laws of God, if that is what is meant by I Peter 2:13 - then I'll put the book on the shelf and never open it again.

For the last several weeks, we've gone through passages of Scripture in what most people call the Old Testament - and we've seen passage after passage after passage where God demands His people to obey His Statutes - and His alone. If you want to understand Romans 13 and I Peter 2 - then those passages must be in agreement with the rest of the Bible. We can't read everything up to those two passages - including all that was written concerning Christ being King - then arrive at Romans 13 or I Peter 2 and throw out everything else that was said up to that point.

Those passages must be in agreement with the rest of the Book. And, I'll say this - if - if - if it isn't so - but if - I Peter 2 was Peter commanding Christians to obey Caesar - then that would be another instance where men tampered with the Word of God in order to lead people away from the Government of God and into the domain of darkness - men's little g "governments."

And I'll say this, too, IF, IF, IF - and again - I do not believe it's so - but IF - it was the same Peter in I Peter chapter 2 instructing Christians to obey Caesar - then that Peter was once again - as was clearly in his nature - that Peter was once again denying Jesus Christ. Just like He did on execution day and just like he did in the book of Acts.

I'm trying to get back to Matthew 16 to finish my original thought - but I may not be able to. Turn with me first to I Peter chapter 1. Look at verse 1.

[1] Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,

Now, turn to II Peter chapter 1, verse 1.

Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained like precious faith with us through the righteousness of God and our Saviour Jesus Christ:

I don't know if you caught that or not. It may be nothing. I don't know. Were these two books written by the same Peter? I don't know. And I also want you to know that I am not at all trying to cast doubt on our Bibles. For instance, I'm not setting us up to say that I Peter 2:13 was an attempt to tamper with the Scripture by changing it to make us believe that Peter was telling Christians to obey Caesar. I do not believe that at all. I am as firmly convince today as I have been years ago - that the King of I Peter chapter is Jesus Christ. I simply do not believe that after everything written concerning God's people exclusively obeying His Laws and Statutes - that then - after the coming of the Messiah King - just a few short years later - Peter is now telling Christians to once again forsake the Laws and Statutes of God and submit to the statues of men. I don't believe that at all. Matthew, Mark, Colossians, II Thessalonians, I Peter, Hebrews, etc., must be in agreement with the rest of the Bible and if it is found not to be so - then - we either to force into agreement - or toss it out.

We do not serve a God that told His people to do one thing in the Old Testament in regards to His Statutes - and obeying them exclusively - and not obeying the statues of the heathen - then that same God turning right back around - sending His Son to die a torturous death at the hands of the state - only to tell His people that they are no longer to obey His Statutes - but instead - do the exact opposite of what He said earlier - and submit to the heathen. It makes no sense.

I've read probably just about everything written by the "churchmen" in relation to I Peter 2:13 and none of what they say makes sense.

The God of the Old is the same as the God of the New. He wants His creation to know His Laws and Statutes and to obey them. He does not want His people obeying the statues of the heathen.

If you recall, I started this whole thing out by telling you how I study the Bible and how I have come to the conclusions I have come to. Study the Bible. Use a concordance and an old English dictionary. Be on the lookout for tampering.

We know the word "church" shouldn't be there. How? The word is ekklesia which

means government. "Church" comes from kurias or kuriakon. It's a totally different word and a totally different meaning than ekklesia.

I came across something this week in my studies that I had never really considered before - at least not to the depths I have gone this week. In the water series, I showed you how James and Peter and some others were at odds with Paul in the Book of Acts.

The Scriptures show us plainly that Peter had a pretty major character flaw. He tended to be a chameleon. Remember, "I'll never deny you, Jesus. Not me, never." Then, the Scriptures only detail one of them who denied Christ - that was Peter. "Aren't you one of the followers of Jesus?" "No way, not a chance. Not me. No 'blankety blank' way am I a follower of that man." We know they all forsook Jesus. But the story of Peter's betrayal is front and center. Turn to Galatians chapter 2.

I will just tell you right up front, I'm not totally sure what to make of this. It's an awesome thing - as in very serious - but the text is quite clear. Paul does not talk in riddles - the text is clear what he is saying. Let's just begin in verse 1:

Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also.

[2] And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.

[3] But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised:

I am still saying, and can say it with confidence, at that time, there was things that were demanded of the Israelites living at Jerusalem - and then there were things that were expected of other believers outside of Jerusalem - who did not have access to the temple. I believe this is what is meant here by the "circumcised" in other places called the "circumcision." The Law God gave Moses was still in effect while the temple was still standing in Jerusalem. Those who were still keeping the Law were called the "circumcision" - those who were not under the Law - were uncircumcised or the uncircumcision. Now watch verse 4:

[4] And that because of false brethren unawares brought in,

Notice Paul calls them brethren. Not only that, he calls them false brethren. This is

concerning to me, that Paul calls someone false brethren.

who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:

[5] To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.

[6] But of these who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me:

I want to stop here for just a second concerning this phrase "God accepteth no man's person." I've been thinking about this a lot lately and it goes to the concept of one man telling another man how to live. In what we call the New Testament, over and over, we are told that God is "no respecter of persons" and neither should we be. In other words, no man is better than another. No man is above another. In some of the commentaries that I looked at from 1 Peter 2 this week, nearly every single one of these "churchmen" were saying that some men were better, or greater than others and that the lesser was supposed to submit to the greater. Again, makes no sense whatsoever when we look at the other passages that say things to the contrary. And this Galatians 2:6 is one of those.

This idea of kings, and queens and dukes and earls, etc., is anti-christ, it's anti-God and anti-Bible. The concept of the divine right kings - which just seemingly has a trickle down effect on the rest of Creation - is not of God. I'm not submitting to another man - and what I mean by that is - I'm not going to submit to having another man tell me how I'm supposed to live my life. God is the One that tells me how to live. Jesus told me how to live. Just because Klaus Schwab has managed to obtain who knows how much "wealth" - that does not mean that God has ordained him to make "laws" - and anyone that doesn't think he is a "law-maker" isn't one because he's not in "office" has their head in the sand. People like him aren't going to stoop to being held to a 9 to 5 or more. He's going to "rule" by paying others to do what he wants. I wish people could understand that this idea of states and nations is not anything like most people think they are.

What is going on today as far as people's lives being controlled by "laws" is way beyond what goes on in Jefferson City and way beyond what goes on in Washington, D.C.

A while back I was thinking about people who were concerned about the overthrow of

the U.S. and the CON. Things are way way past that and very few people know it. The world is not being controlled by Washington, D.C. - it's way way beyond that. Oh, I'm running out of time, let's move on quickly. Verse 7:

[7] But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter;

Once again, those that think I'm crazy for speaking of a Gospel to those in Jerusalem and a Gospel to those not in Jerusalem - well - there you go. Verse 8:

[8] (For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles (the uncircumcision, those outside of Jerusalem:))

This is where I begin to wonder whether or not there was more than one Peter. He just clearly said that Jesus worked in Peter's life to the circumcision, just as Christ worked in his life to the uncircumcision. Stay with me now.

[9] And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.

Notice that Peter was left out of that. James, Cephas and John. Very important that we understand this. Paul to the heathen - those outside of Jerusalem. Peter to the circumcision - those in and immediately around Jerusalem.

[10] Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do.

Now watch this close very closely.

[11] But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

The Greek is anth-is-to-me. It means **to set against**; as in Greek writings, in the middle, and in the perfect pluperfect [having present and imperfect force, Winers Grammar, 274 (257)] and 2 aorist active, **to set oneself against, to withstand resist, oppose**:

I think this is the same Peter. It's not clear. There are some things to consider. For one, the circumcision was not in Greece. In fact, the exact opposite was so. Peter was sent to the circumcision, the text is clear. Irregardless, Paul is having a face to face confrontation - and not a very pretty one - with someone named Peter. It seems like it might be the same Peter. But look what's said.

[12] For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision.

Now this certainly seems like chameleon Peter. The one who denied Christ and had a tendency to be more concerned about his own neck than staying true to Christ. But here, we see another instance where Peter failed. Verse 13:

[13] And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.

Now watch. This was said about this man named Peter. Was it the Peter which was a disciple of Christ at the time of Christ? Sure seems like it.

[14] But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel,

What? Did you read what Paul just said? This wasn't being said only about the people Peter was hanging around with - this included Peter.

[14] But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel,

I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Judahite, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Judahites, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?

[15] We who are Judahites by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles,

[16] Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

Friends, this Peter had some pretty big issues that he needed to deal with. I always thought that Peter's character flaws were cleared up after the Resurrection of Christ - but if this is the same Peter - apparently it is - he was still a man with some pretty big problems.

And, this text shows that his chameleon character was still the source of his problems.

So, what I'm saying is this. We have seen Peter deny Christ three times. We have seen Peter and Paul wrestling in the Book of Acts. Now, we see Paul saying that Peter was not walking uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel.

Funny how there's so many people that want to attack Paul these days - but no one seems to have much of a problem with Peter.

And again, I'm not saying we should consider I Peter 2 as being tampered with - and I'm not saying that we should be looking seriously at Peter's character flaws when people tell us that Peter is commanding obedience to Caesar. I do not believe that's what I Peter is about. All I'm telling you is that there is more evidence than ever to say that I Peter 2 is consistent with the rest of the Bible - in that God wants His Creation obeying His Laws and Statutes exclusively - at not the statues of the heathen.

I realize this message has kind of been all over the place this morning. Next week, we'll try to get back on track. My hope and prayer is that you heard something this morning that God wanted you to hear.

What I have learned from Fulfilled Bible Prophecy, the understanding of the word "church." Those things came from the study of the Word. Not by listening to other men.

I was led to the understanding of "church" by another man. But this man believed Fulfilled Bible Prophecy. He was living according to the Government of God. He was teaching against living according to the little g "governments" of men.

I was not speaking of the jews, the catholics, or the "churchman" Schnaubel authoritatively - as if we receive our faith from them - and if anyone perceived that is what I saying - then I certainly hope this morning cleared that up.