

## Message# 248 7-16-2023 - Having Done All, Stand

Preached first on 7/16/2023 on [www.molibertyradio.us](http://www.molibertyradio.us)

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

I want to remind you that we are just about 1 month away from our pre-fall gathering that is scheduled for the 20th of what the world calls August. We are meeting from the 20th to the 23rd in Mt. Vernon Missouri at a campground that we have reserved. We would love for you to come and be a part of us for a few days of fellowship. There are details on the website at [www.godsendusmen.com](http://www.godsendusmen.com)

Alright, let's give an update on Jeff. They finally - after more than 168 hours of being held in a cage - and why is that significant? I mean, what's the big deal of being held in a cage for 168 hours? Besides the obvious. Most people that are listening to this message have probably never been held in a small cage against your will - so you really can't identify with what I'm saying. So, just picture yourself confined to your walk-in closet for 168 hours and see what you think about that.

Reading from the Revised Statutes of Missouri - which to me - and to God - and to the Bible - and to Jesus Christ - are a rebellious slap in the face of the God of Heaven Who said men are not to create their own statutes - but since man is of all created beings - the most rebellious - and they have decided to create books and books of their own statutes - and have then put men and women in flashy suits with guns to go around the community and force others to rebel against the God of Creation - finally - listen to this:

<https://revisor.mo.gov/main/OneSection.aspx?section=544.170>

*544.170. Twenty hours detention on arrest without warrant — twenty-four hours detention for certain offenses, rights of confinee — violations, penalty. — 1. All persons arrested and confined in any jail or other place of confinement by any peace officer, without warrant or other process, for any alleged breach of the peace or other criminal offense, or on suspicion thereof, shall be discharged from said custody within twenty-four hours from the time of such arrest, unless they shall be charged with a criminal offense by the oath of some credible person, and be held by warrant to answer to such offense.*

*2. In any confinement to which the provisions of this section apply, the confinee*

*shall be permitted at any reasonable time to consult with counsel or other persons acting on the confinee's behalf.*

*3. Any person who violates the provisions of this section, by refusing to release any person who is entitled to release pursuant to this section, or by refusing to permit a confinee to consult with counsel or other persons, or who transfers any such confinees to the custody or control of another, or to another place, or who falsely charges such person, with intent to avoid the provisions of this section, is guilty of a class A misdemeanor.*

What is interesting about all this, is that with their “statutes” because they are constantly changing, constantly evolving, going back and forth, floating in the wind, one day they are this, the next day they are something else. One judge says, this, then another judge says that - you can rarely get a straight answer for anything you are looking for. Typically, in Missouri, for instance, if they kidnap you off the street and take you to one of their cages, this is what is said, quote:

*For defendants who are in custody, states specify how quickly a defendant must be arraigned, usually within two business days. Keep in mind that in Missouri, you and your defense attorney may choose to waive arraignment, and you will not be required to make a court appearance.*

Usually within two business days. Well Jeff was in there for 168 hours. Well, that would probably be so if you were a real criminal, like a rapist, or a thief, or a murderer, but not if you are a follower of Jesus Christ. If you are a follower of Jesus Christ and you have been put in their cage because you refuse to follow any one other than King Jesus, well, the rules may not apply to you the same as they might apply to the murderer, or the thief or the rapist. So, you might be held for 168 hours - just so that - well - they can get their pound of flesh one way or another.

And this, of course, is certainly nothing new with men's little g “governments.” Oftentimes murderers will be treated better than the sons of God. Speaking of nothing new, take a look at this for just a minute. Turn to Mark chapter 15 before we get going this morning. Begin with verse 1:

[1] And straightway in the morning the chief priests held a consultation with the elders and scribes and the whole council, and bound Jesus, and carried Him away, and delivered Him to Pilate.

[2] And Pilate asked Him, Art Thou the King of the Jews? And He answering said unto him, Thou sayest it.

[3] And the chief priests accused Him of many things: but He answered nothing.

I find great interest in the fact here that Jesus answered Pilate when Pilate asked Him about His Kingship. But when it came to the accusations from the chief priests, Jesus didn't even respond. I'm sure there's quite a lot there that needs to be explored. Verse 4:

[4] And Pilate asked Him again, saying, Answerest thou nothing? behold how many things they witness against Thee.

[5] But Jesus yet answered nothing; so that Pilate marvelled.

[6] Now at that feast he released unto them one prisoner, whomsoever they desired.

[7] And there was one named Barabbas, which lay bound with them that had made insurrection with him, who had committed murder in the insurrection.

Here we see in relation to Jesus Christ, the Son of God, a man not accused of violence - there were no accusations against Jesus that He was a murderer, or a robber, or a rapist, or anything like that - then there's Barabbas. A man accused of murder during an insurrection. Which one of these was treated better by man's little g "government?"

[8] And the multitude crying aloud began to desire him to do as he had ever done unto them.

[9] But Pilate answered them, saying, Will ye that I release unto you the King of the Jews?

[10] For he knew that the chief priests had delivered Him for envy.

[11] But the chief priests moved the people, that he should rather release Barabbas unto them.

Yes. Again. Even Barabbas - who was actually an enemy of the state - the text says that he was accused of a murder during an insurrection - but Jesus was also accused of insurrection. But with no murder, of course. Why then was Jesus' insurrection so much worse than Barabbas insurrection? Because Barabbas was also accused of murder? Maybe, maybe not. I believe, and it's only my personal opinion, and it's based on my own life experiences - but to be seen as an enemy of the state because you are claiming to be a follower of Jesus Christ and Jesus Christ demands obedience to Him and not the state - I believe Jesus was treated worse than Barabbas because Jesus preached

obedience to His Father exclusively - and that was what was such an affront to the religious men of that day. And the same is today. When you appear to be an enemy to the state - because you teach that Jesus expects this of His followers - you are going to be treated harsher - most times - maybe not always - but most times you'll be treated harsher - than even those who have committed actual sins - actual crimes against the Laws of God. I hope that makes sense. Verse 12:

[12] And Pilate answered and said again unto them, What will ye then that I shall do unto Him whom ye call the King of the Jews?

[13] And they cried out again, Crucify him.

[14] Then Pilate said unto them, Why, what evil hath He done? And they cried out the more exceedingly, Crucify Him.

This word evil ought not to be overlooked. We should discuss it for a minute. Mr. Thayer defines it this way in his lexicon.

*κακόσ, κακῆ, κακόν, the Sept. for כָּרַ (from Homer down), bad (A. V. (almost uniformly) evil);*

*1. universally, of a bad nature; not such as it ought to be.*

The Greek word kakos is translated in other passages as:

*evil (40x), evil things (3x), harm (2x), that which is evil (with G3458) (2x), wicked (1x), ill (1x), bad (1x), noisome (1x).*

While Pilate is probably not purposely referring to the definitions of evil as defined by God in the Bible - that is definitely what he is talking about. He's asking:

*what bad nature, what things not such as it ought to be of a mode of thinking, feeling, acting, what base, wrong, wicked; what troublesome, injurious, pernicious, destructive, baneful act are you accusing Jesus of? Where's a victim? Where is an injured party? Who did He murder? Who did He steal from? That's what Pilate is asking.*

Why, what evil hath He done?

[15] And so Pilate, willing to content the people, released Barabbas unto them, and delivered Jesus, when he had scourged Him, to be crucified.

This is an example of man's little g "government" treating a real criminal, a real man who has caused physical harm to someone else - man's little g "government" treating that man better - than someone whose only real offense - has been of desiring to live and teach other men to follow the Commandments of God.

[16] And the soldiers led Him away into the hall, called Praetorium; and they call together the whole band.

[17] And they clothed Him with purple, and platted a crown of thorns, and put it about His head,

[18] And began to salute Him, Hail, King of the Jews!

In the eyes of the state, it's far worse to offend the state by claiming the Authority of God - than it is to offend the state by committing even an act of murder. Why is that?

In my opinion, it's actually very simple. It's because the state claims - wrongly claims - rebelliously claims - to do what they do - to exist - because they believe they are gods and if it suits their purpose - they will claim even the God of Heaven has given them Authority to create their own "laws and statutes" and enforce them against other men. It's competition.

And friends, nothing can be further from the truth. God has never given man the Authority to define good and evil, right and wrong, lawful and unlawful.

Men's "statute books" are their definitions of good and evil, right and wrong, lawful and unlawful. And they create those "statute books" - the Revised Statutes of Missouri, for instance, the Revised Statutes of Nebraska, etc., and those "statute books" are their definitions of right and wrong, good and evil, lawful and unlawful and God has never given man that right to do such a thing.

The definitions of good and evil are found in the Word of God. There's not even that many of them. They don't change. They don't need to be Revised. They work from one generation to the next. You won't find one of them that was good 100 hundred years ago - then needs to be modified, changed, amended, or altered later on. It's actually very very easy and it works.

It is the Laws of God - the few Laws of God that brings peace, prosperity, success. Turn to Joshua chapter 1 for a minute. I learned this a long, long time ago. It's so simple. It's so easy. I've been trying to do this in my life for at least the last 40 years and encourage

others to the same. Joshua chapter 1, verse 8:

[8] This Book of the Law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success.

Which Book of the Law? Friends, it's God's Law. It's the Law that God said over and over and over - you must keep this Law, you must keep these Statutes. You must not have your own laws, you must not have your own statutes. Laws and Statutes come only from God and you are to Govern yourselves according to this Book of the Law.

For the life of me, Christian brothers and sisters, how did we ever move away from this so simple, so clear Command of God - and how did we ever get deceived into replacing this - with the laws and statutes of men? Especially when God made it so clear so early on in His instructions to Israel? We know how it happened. We know when it happened. We know why it happened - and now - we had better get on our horses and get back to Joshua 1:8 as fast we we possibly can.

The civilization that has been built around us is on the verge of collapse - and it is so because of the little g "governments" that men have built out of rebellion against the King - and we have been duped into believing that this was God's doing. It wasn't God's doing. God's doing is Joshua 1:8

[8] This Book of the Law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success.

And He's still standing there with His hands in the air asking, "What was so hard about this? Why would you choose rebellious men's books and books and books of "laws and statutes" when this is what I told you to do?" Now verse 9. For those who have marched right back to Joshua 1:8 and have declared that Joshua 1:8 will be implemented in their lives - no matter what another man wants to do to them - verse 9 is what we need to stand on.

[9] Have not I commanded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the LORD thy God is with thee whithersoever thou

goest.

What did He Command?

[8] This Book of the Law shall not depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is written therein: for then thou shalt make thy way prosperous, and then thou shalt have good success.

Friends, this should not be hard. This is the central theme of the whole Bible. This is in 100% agreement with what we read last week in Ecclesiastes chapter 12. This is what men and women who are followers of God and His Son Jesus Christ - this is what they believe and this is what they try to live according to.

For those who want to rebel against this so simple, clear instruction from the Word of God - it's way past time to reevaluate. Because a belief that God has Ordained men to have their own governments and create their own statutes and their own laws - then send armed agents into the community to enforce those statutes and laws - is 100% total rebellion to the God of the Bible.

This is what Jesus tried to teach the Israelites in the first century. This is what the apostles tried to teach in the first century. This is what is meant by the Kingdom of God, the Government of God, the Kingdom of Heaven. Jesus Christ came, was sent by His Father in Heaven, yes, to remove certain elements of the Law God Moses - but to confirm certain elements of the Law God gave Moses that would never pass away. And those were the Laws, Statutes and Judgments concerning how men are to Govern themselves.

Listen, friends, when the "church and the churchmen" - which are the religious arm of the state - when they tell you that God sent Jesus to do away with the Laws of God - what they are telling you is that Jesus did away with the Laws of God so that men could compel other men through violence and threats of violence - to bow down and submit to their laws and their statutes. Something that is totally opposite of what the whole duty of man is. Turn to Luke chapter 19, please. Begin with verse 1.

[1] And Jesus entered and passed through Jericho.

[2] And, behold, there was a man named Zacchaeus, which was the chief among the [tax collectors], and he was rich.

[3] And he sought to see Jesus Who He was; and could not for the press, because he was little of stature.

[4] And he ran before, and climbed up into a sycomore tree to see Him: for He was to pass that way.

[5] And when Jesus came to the place, He looked up, and saw him, and said unto him, Zacchaeus, make haste, and come down; for to day I must abide at thy house.

[6] And he made haste, and came down, and received Him joyfully.

[7] And when they saw it, they all murmured, saying, That He was gone to be guest with a man that is a sinner.

Now wait a minute. The only mention of anything in the life of Zaccheus prior to this was that Zaccheus was a tax collector and he was rich. And the Scripture says that they murmured among themselves saying that Zaccheus was a sinner. It does not take mastery of the Greek and Hebrew to understand what the Bible is saying to us. Indeed, Zaccheus was a sinner. And he was meeting Jesus. And Jesus - because He came to seek and to save that which was lost - is going to tell Zaccheus of his sin.

[8] And Zacchaeus stood, and said unto the Lord; Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have taken any thing from any man by false accusation, I restore him fourfold.

Keep your finger here, please and turn to Exodus chapter 22. Begin with verse 1. This is the Law of God concerning theft and these principles show people all of generations, throughout all time, that they are to or how they are to Govern themselves whenever a thief is discovered.

[1] If a man shall steal an ox, or a sheep, and kill it, or sell it; he shall restore five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep.

[2] If a thief be found breaking up, and be smitten that he die, there shall no blood be shed for him.

[3] If the sun be risen upon him, there shall be blood shed for him; for he should make full restitution; if he have nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft.

One of these days we'll spend a lot more time on this. We don't have time today. but there's a lot here we need to understand about the Laws of God concerning theft.



[4] If the theft be certainly found in his hand alive, whether it be ox, or ass, or sheep; he shall restore double.

[5] If a man shall cause a field or vineyard to be eaten, and shall put in his beast, and shall feed in another man's field; of the best of his own field, and of the best of his own vineyard, shall he make restitution.

[6] If fire break out, and catch in thorns, so that the stacks of corn, or the standing corn, or the field, be consumed therewith; he that kindled the fire shall surely make restitution.

[7] If a man shall deliver unto his neighbour money or stuff to keep, and it be stolen out of the man's house; if the thief be found, let him pay double.

[8] If the thief be not found, then the master of the house shall be brought unto the judges, to see whether he have put his hand unto his neighbour's goods.

[9] For all manner of trespass, whether it be for ox, for ass, for sheep, for raiment, or for any manner of lost thing, which another challengeth to be his, the cause of both parties shall come before the judges; and whom the judges shall condemn, he shall pay double unto his neighbour.

This is how you live. This is how you Govern by the Laws of God. Under the Laws of God, if a man is found guilty of theft, he is to pay restitution. He pays double what he stole, sometimes he pays four times of what he stole, other passages say as much as five times of what he stole. If he cannot pay back, then he becomes the slave of the one he stole from. That does not necessarily mean the physical slave - although it could be. It depends on what a Godly judge deems is fair and what the circumstances are. But in most cases, it means that the thief is indebted to the one he stole from - and he is indebted to him until he can pay off - either two-fold, four-fold or five times the amount he stole in the first place. In other words, his wages may be garnished until his debt is paid.

Now, if the thief refuses to make restitution, that's pretty simple. He incurs the death penalty. It is my personal belief that the thief would choose restitution over the death penalty, but if he is so stupid to rebel against the Laws of God, then so be it. But in the Law of God, there is no jail for theft - other than possibly awaiting trial if it comes to that. But there is no penalty of jail. All that does is further punish the one who got stolen from in the first place - because someone has to pay for the thief to be in jail and that's just stupid, too. "I get stolen from. I lose what I had because the thief probably disposed of what he stole from me, so I suffer that loss, then, I have to pay to house the thief in jail?" That's stupid. The thief makes restitution, or else. Pretty simple. And if that was instituted, your instances of theft would drop by a ton. Anyone should be able

to reason that out without much effort. Restitution or death penalty for theft. That should be an easy choice.

So Jesus finds Zaccheus. He goes to Zaccheus house and tells Zaccheus that because he is a tax collector - he is a thief. Zaccheus repents. Friends, Zaccheus gets "saved" - and he gets "saved" because he repents of violating the Laws of God - and in this instance - he "accepts Jesus." Jesus told him of his sin. Told him how to repent of that sin. And Zaccheus embraces the Laws of God and gets "saved."

It also needs to be noted that Zaccheus did not go under the water, either. Why not? In the Laws of God concerning theft, there is no blood sacrifice, neither is there a water washing. We just read it from Exodus 22. And don't you dare be swayed by the "church and the churchmen" with their false teaching on "baptism for the remission of sins." Zaccheus was clearly called a sinner. Zaccheus was a sinner. Zaccheus had his sins forgiven by Jesus - and there was no "baptism" in physical water. And there was no "baptism" in physical water because Exodus 22 shows how to have the sin of theft forgiven. And it is not with an animal sacrifice and it is not with a water washing. It is with restitution. Really neat to see how that transcends all generations - even coming to our day. In our day, restitution is the way for a thief to be forgiven. There's no animal sacrifice. That was done away with. There's no water washing. That was done away with. The same judgment applies today as it did back then. That part of the Law God gave Moses is the same today as it was back then. Back to Zaccheus, Luke 19, verse 9:

[9] And Jesus said unto him, This day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham.

[10] For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.

[11] And as they heard these things, He added and spake a parable, because He was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the Kingdom of God should immediately appear.

[12] He said therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return.

[13] And he called his ten servants, and delivered them ten pounds, and said unto them, Occupy till I come.

[14] But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us.

Right after this incident with Zaccheus, Jesus begins a parable of the Kingdom. The King and His Kingdom. Jesus had just told Zaccheus to repent of violating the Laws of God

and Jesus also told Zaccheus how to make it right - by applying the Judgment of God in his life. Jesus is saying, "This is the way. This is how men are supposed to live." Then He gives the parable that includes, "We will not have this man to reign over us."

And that is exactly how it is today. Pointing men to the Kingdom of God, the Government of God with His Laws, His Statutes and His Judgments - and men will either repent and choose His Government - or - they will continue in their rebellion and say, "We will not have this Man to reign over us."

"No, it is OUR CONstitution, and our laws, and our treaties, and our laws that are made in agreement thereof - and none other [has] with standing." And that is exactly where we find ourselves today. And friends, this has happened because we have fallen for the lies of the "church" and the "churchmen."

When I spoke with Jeff from the place his kidnappers were holding him, he asked about last week's message. I told him to read Ecclesiastes 12, I Peter 2, Matthew 21, I Kings 18 and Psalm 118. To which he replied, "I'd like to, but none of the Bibles here in the jail have the the first 39 books in them."

All there was in the jail there in Cole County, Missouri - was books containing only the last 27 books of what we call our Bibles. Was this the work of the Cole County sheriff? Maybe. But friends, you need to understand that all these counties with their jails and their prisons, they all have relationships with the local "churches." It is the local "churches" that typically supply the jails and the prisons with Bibles. It is no innocent oversight as to why the Bibles in the Cole County jail only contain the last 27 books.

The "churches" - which are the religious arm of the state - do not believe that the first 39 Books have any standing in our civilization today. The only thing that matters is Luke 20, "Render therefore unto Caesar" which if given alone - can be twisted into making people believe that Jesus demanded that people obey "Caesars." The only thing that matters in I Peter 2:13, Submit yourselves to every ordinance that man can think of - and that is twisted into making people believe that men are to bow down to and submit to other men's definitions of good and evil - because without the first 39 Books of the Bible - the last 27 have been twisted into one giant perversion and rebellion to the God of Heaven, His Son, and the Bible.

There is no way a man can properly understand I Peter 2:13 if he does know where the precepts originated in the first 39 Books of the Bible. How a man can read Joshua 1:8 -

and friends - I first read Joshua 1:8 while I was playing "church." But the difference is, I read Joshua 1:8 - allowed that to burn into my conscience like a hot knife - and then I proceeded to read the rest of the Book - all the way to the end of Revelation chapter 22 - making sure that everything in between agree with Joshua 1:8.

If what someone told me about the Bible contradicted Joshua 1:8 - then it had to go. If what someone told me about the Bible contradicted Ecclesiastes 12:13 - then it had to go. God did not tell His people to submit ONLY to His Laws, His Commandments and His Judgments - and then send His Son to tell them the exact opposite. That is just one of the craziest arguments that men have ever come up with.

Romans 13 is not Paul telling people to submit to evil men. It is not Paul saying that the God of the New Testament wants people to live the exact opposite way that the God of the Old Testament told them to live.

The whole duty of man is to Fear God and keep His Commandments.

That has never changed, will never change and anyone who teaches otherwise is a liar and a deceiver.

Turn to Acts chapter 17. Yes, we know exactly where we are headed when we cite Acts 17, verse 1, please:

[1] Now when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews:

[2] And Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures,

[3] Opening and alleging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus, whom I preach unto you, is Christ.

Of the many times we have talked about this chapter, there is something here that I have not pointed out like I should. It is extremely important, besides just the obvious. Verse 3 declares Jesus to be the Christ. Jesus is the Christ, the King of Israel. If you were to look at Mr. Thayer's Greek lexicon for the word Christ - as it appears in what we call the New Testament. He does something that is very interesting. Though we have talked about many times before, I think if you go back and look at it again in light of what I'm telling you now, you'll see some renewed, awesome importance to this. As he begins to try to explain what the word Christ means, christos, the Anointed, and he reverts to his

Bible definitions as opposed to Greek definitions and that's fine, look at what he does:

*STRONGS G5547:*

*χριστός, χριστή, χριστόν (χρίω), the Sept.*

He refers to the Septuagint when he starts defining christos. And he says this. Remember, the Greek Septuagint is the “Old Testament” written in Greek:

*for ἡγιασμένος, anointed: ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός, Leviticus 4:5; Leviticus 6:22; οἱ χριστοὶ ἱερεῖς, 2 Macc. 1:10; the patriarchs are called, substantively, οἱ χριστοὶ Θεοῦ, Psalm 104:15 (Ps. 105:15); the singular ὁ χριστός τοῦ κυρίου ( ἡγιασμένος) king of Israel (see χρῖσμα), as 1 Samuel 2:10, 35; (1 Samuel 24:11; 1 Samuel 26:9, 11, 23); 2 Samuel 1:14; Psalm 2:2; Psalm 17:51 (Ps. 18:51); Habakkuk 3:13; (2 Chronicles 22:7); also of a foreign king, Cyrus, as sent of God, Isaiah 45:1; of the coming king whom the Jews expected to be the saviour of their nation and the author of their highest felicity:*

So what am I saying? I'm saying that using the Greek word christos in reference to Jesus is to be understood that we are talking about the succession of the Anointed Kings of Israel. Christ is not His last name. It is his appellation, it his description, it is Jesus, the Anointed King of Israel. Just like Solomon, just like David, and just like foreign kings like Cyrus. Jesus is King. When people ask me all the time, “Am I a Christian?” And I tell them I'm not your judge. You need to nail that down for yourself. But I will tell you - generally speaking - Christians understand and believe what it means to call Jesus - Christ. Do you understand that Jesus was the Anointed King of Israel, just like Solomon, just like David? Do you understand that Jesus became King in the first century? Do you understand that? Do you believe that? Does your understanding and what you claim to believe, has it changed your life? Are you living according to the Kingship of Christ?

That is what Christians believe. This Acts 17 passage is but one that makes it very clear Who this Jesus is. Have you, or do you believe that Jesus is only a coming king? Well, if that's what a man believes, then that is not Christian belief. “So, you *are* telling me I'm not a Christian, Charlie?” No. I'm not going to tell you that. But I am showing Scriptures that show what a Christian believes. Now verse 4 - keeping in mind as we continue - that Jesus is the Anointed King of Israel.

[4] And some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few.

There you have it. Some believed. Those who believed were called Christians. Now verse 5:

[5] But the Jews which believed not, moved with envy, took unto them certain lewd fellows of the baser sort, and gathered a company, and set all the city on an uproar, and assaulted the house of Jason, and sought to bring them out to the people.

[6] And when they found them not, they drew Jason and certain brethren unto the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also;

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

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

Friends, of all the many things that we see, week after week after week, that are just as clear as crystal from the Word of God, how can this be any clearer? The believers, the Christians, the ones who believed that Jesus was the Christ, the Anointed King of Israel - how would they not be doing contrary to the decrees of Caesar? Of course they were doing contrary to the decrees of Caesar, they plainly said that there is another King and His name is Jesus.

As I was preparing this message, I thought about going to the “history books” and report to you some of the things that have been recorded about the caesars of the first century. After reading for a while, I decided against it. The Bible says we shouldn't talk about the evil that men do concerning certain things. If you want to know what the caesars were like during this time - I think you should do some research of your own. Then, after you have done your research, if you still believe that Jesus was telling the Israelites in the first century to turn from God and to the caesars - if that is the conclusion you hold to - then I just don't know what else could be said to you. If you refuse the clear teachings of the Bible - such as what we see here in Acts 17 - and you then believe what the “history books” say about the caesars - and then conclude that Jesus is demanding obedience to them instead of obedience to God - I just don't know what else to say.

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

We already saw from verse that Jesus is called christos - the Anointed King of Israel. But now, in verse 7, we see Him referred to as "another King." The Greek word here is bas-il-yooce'. Mr. Thayer says this. This is what is meant by "another King, One Jesus."

*βασιλεύς, -έως, ὁ, leader of the people, prince, commander, lord of the land, king; universally: οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, Matthew 17:25; Revelation 16:14 [L T Tr WH omit τῆς γῆς], etc.; τῶν ἐθνῶν, Luke 22:25; of the king of Egypt, Acts 7:10, 18; Hebrews 11:23, 27; of David, Matthew 1:6; Acts 13:22; of Herod the Great and his successors, Matthew 2:1ff; Luke 1:5; Acts 12:1; Acts 25:13; of a tetrarch, Matthew 14:9; Mark 6:14, 22 (of the son of a king, Xenophon, oec. 4, 16; "reges Syriae, regis Antiochi pueros, scitis Romae nuper fuisse," Cicero, Verr. 2:4, 27, cf. de senectute 17, 59; [Vergil Aen. 9, 223]); of a Roman emperor, 1 Timothy 2:2; 1 Peter 2:17, cf. Revelation 17:9 (Revelation 17:10),*

This is all inclusive. An argument could be made that christos is all-inclusive. Not just exclusive to the Anointed Kings of Israel. But the use of bas-il-yooce' here nails it down as solid as can be. The Bible calls Jesus the all-inclusive - the universal - the leader of the people, the commander, the lord of the land, the king.

This should be as easy as can be. This is in total agreement with Ecclesiastes chapter 12. Total agreement with Joshua 1:8, total agreement with the Laws God gave Moses that were not clearly replaced in the New World. The animal sacrifices of the Law God gave Moses. Clearly done away with in Christ in the end of the world when the temple came down. The physical washing requirements of the Law God gave Moses, clearly done away with in Christ in the end of the world when the temple came down. But that's it. All else remains and Jesus Christ and His Father are the universal, all-inclusive Kings of the world.

And followers of Jesus Christians, Christians understand and believe - and because of their understanding and because of their belief - they do all they can do in their lives to live that there is another King, One Jesus. They don't just do contrary to the decrees of caesars, saying there's another King, One Jesus, they live contrary to anyone or anything else that attempts to put them self in the place of God. Anyone or anything that declares power to define good and evil, right and wrong, lawful and unlawful, is putting them self in the place of God. And Christians will not follow them. We can't follow them. We must follow only the Voice of our Shepherd. Just like these Christians in Acts 17. They are an example to us and they are the definition of what it means to be a Christian - and if we are to be Christians - there it is.

When no one else wanted Joshua 1:8 in their life. When no one else wanted Ecclesiastes 12:13, when no one else wanted Genesis 26:5 - these men and women not a few - who believed that Jesus was the Christ - embraced those truths and walked in them.

How we ever have arrived at the place we are today - that Christians are not expected to live this way - is beyond me. Well, it's not beyond me. I know exactly how it has happened. It has happened once again - because people have chosen to take the last 27 Books of the Bible and then create to themselves a religion that does not hold to the truths and the foundations of what are found in the first 39 Books. They call it "New Covenant Water Baptism" and it has nothing whatsoever to do with the foundations of the water requirements of the Law God gave Moses. And if you will just commit this act, this work of New Covenant "law" - you will then be placed under the blood of Jesus - free to live anyway you want to live - including - including - according to the decrees of the caesars. Once you have been dunked in some physical H2O water - then you are released from the Law of God and free to live comfortably according to the decrees of Caesar - as opposed to what these men and women of God declared when they lived contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying there is another King, One Jesus.

The "church" is the religious arm of the state. It is in place to make sure that men and women boys and girls obey the state - with its CONstitution, its "laws and treaties" and it makes sure that nothing else has standing.

I felt like last week's message was one of the most important messages that I believe God has given me and I do not feel as if as many as I had hoped understood what I got out of that message. Because of this, I want to go over this again this week. I want you to understand the awesomeness of what I got from this. So, I want to go over it again.

I want you to turn to I Peter chapter 2 again. As you know, I Peter chapter 2 is the benchmark, it is the foundation, it is, even more importantly than Romans 13 - it is used by the "church and the churchmen" to establish men's little g "governments" and to compel men and women to believe that God has Ordained it to be so. No matter whether men's governments are pure evil or not - whether someone was living during the time of Caligula or Nero - doesn't matter - God commands Christians to obey every single "ordinance" that they create. Of course, the "church and the churchmen" have said, "Well, unless they tell us we can't 'preach the gospel.'" Even though that is not what they teach I Peter chapter says - nonetheless - they have to give up a little in order to make sure every has some satisfaction with their deception.



So I Peter chapter 2 is it. Rock solid. No ifs ands or buts - God demands "Obey the laws of the land" even if the "leaders" are bad. I want you to look specifically with me to I Peter chapter 2, reading only verses 4 through 8.

[4] To Whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious,

[5] Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.

[6] Wherefore also it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on Him shall not be confounded.

[7] Unto you therefore which believe He is precious: but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner,

[8] And a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, even to them which stumble at the Word, being disobedient: whereunto also they were appointed.

Can we agree that this is talking about Jesus Christ? The living stone. Disallowed of men, but precious to God? Whoever believes on Him shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe He is precious? Is this speaking of Jesus? I do not know of anyone, anywhere, that claims to be a believer of the Bible, that would not immediately say that these verses are speaking about Jesus. Verse 6 tells us these things are contained in the Scripture. Jesus is called the stone. He's called the head of the corner. He's a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense. He was the stone which the builders disallowed.

I need you to remember these things. Verses 4 through 8 are the keys to understanding the rest of this chapter. If we do not know that these verses, descriptions of Jesus Christ, are found elsewhere in the Bible, we will not understand the context of what is being said in I Peter chapter 2. If we do not understand that this is not the first time what we need to understand from I Peter 2 but that it's actually in other parts of the Bible - that tell us from what foundation the writer of I Peter 2 is using - we won't understand what we need to know from the chapter.

You can't just open a passage of Scripture from the last 27 books and start building a religion or a theology or a teaching. It doesn't work that way. The Bible is one whole book and it is in agreement all the way through. When we have Joshua 1:8 burned into our minds, when we have Ecclesiastes 12:13 burned into our minds, when Genesis 26:5

is burned into our minds - as we move on through the rest of the Bible - through the end of Revelation - it all must be in agreement. If it's not, we've got problems.

Turn now to Matthew 21. I am saying that I Peter 2 is not about obeying man's little g "governments." It is about obeying the Government of God. It is about the exclusive Government of God and no other. Fear God and keep His Commandments. Keep THIS Book of the Law - the Bible does not tell people to obey men's "laws." Man is not allowed to make their own "laws." Matthew chapter 21. Last week, I believe we started with verse 33. This week, let's start in verse 1. As we read, do not forget what we read from I Peter 2. Jesus is the stone. Jesus is the One approved by God - but rejected - actually - the word in I Peter 2 is disallowed indeed of men. We are going to see something related to that that is very powerful in just a few minutes. Jesus is the stone. Did you read from the Scriptures, Jesus is the stone? Verse 1:

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

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

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

The Lord hath need of them;

We are talking about Jesus and the word is Lord. The One Who is Supreme in Authority. We are not talking about men and their "governments." Verse 4, now watch.

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

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

Keep your finger here and go right back to I Peter chapter 2, verse 6.

[6] Wherefore also it is contained in the scripture, Behold, I lay in Sion a chief corner stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on Him shall not be confounded.

We are talking about the same thing. I Peter chapter 2 and Matthew 21:5 - we are

talking about the same thing. Verse 6:

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

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

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

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

Do you see what is happening? These people are acknowledging that Jesus was in the process of fulfilling the Davidic Covenant that there would be an everlasting King that would sit on David's throne. We are talking about Jesus as King. And I Peter chapter 2 is pointing us directly to what we are seeing here in Matthew 21. I'm telling you I Peter chapter 2 is not telling Christians to obey men's little g "governments" and it is a denial that Jesus Christ came in the flesh to say it is.

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

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

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

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

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

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

What? Are you kidding me? The text says they saw the wonderful things He did. Filled with wonder. Filled with amazement. Overwhelming, unbelievable, amazing things He did. And the children crying out in the temple - "This is the King, this is the Promised Son of David" - and the religious men and the lawyers - were sore displeased. Of course they were. Because that's what religious men and lawyers, judges, persecutors, etc., do when they find people crying out that Jesus is King.

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

Once again. Have you never read from the first 39 Books? You can't possibly understand what is going on when all you do is read from the last 27. You fill your jails with "Bibles" that only have 27 Books in them? Really? The last 27 without the first 39 is where and how the doctrines of devils have originated from. Telling someone only a partial truth is the same as telling them a lie. Tell the truth, the whole truth. Teach the whole counsel of God. Giving someone in dire need of salvation only half the Book and potentially you are making them more-fold the children of the devil.

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

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

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

That's symbolic language for the passing of the Old World where God allowed the nations to have their own kings, their own governments, their own ways. He allowed it. But it wasn't to last forever. An argument could be made that this was also a direct reference to Jerusalem. I believe that to be so, but I also don't believe there is anything wrong with expanding that principally speaking. This was the end of man having their own "governments."

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

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

I don't have time to go there this morning, but mountains have always been symbolic for "governments". If you don't believe me, just do a search for the word mountains in the Bible and look at the passages. Verse 22.

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

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

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

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

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

Sidenote. What does that mean? Was he an Old Covenant prophet? Of course he was. And one of the most important jobs of the Old Covenant prophet was to show the people how they were violating the Laws of God and teach them of their need for repentance. That's why John was "baptizing." It's because washing in physical water was a Commandment of the Law God gave Moses and the people of the first century were not doing it - either at all - or not according to the Law God gave Moses - and John the Washer prophet - showed them their sin and how to obtain the remission of sins according to the Law God gave Moses. That's why he was instructing them and using the flowing, living water of the Jordan river to do it. That's not hard to understand when you understand the Bible is one book. And you can't take the last 27 without first understanding the 39 others.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[33] Hear another parable: There was a certain householder, which planted a vineyard, and hedged it round about, and digged a winepress in it, and built a

tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country:

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

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

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

[37] But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son.

[38] But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance.

[39] And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him.

[40] When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen?

[41] They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons.

Now watch. Remember I Peter chapter 2. Jesus is the stone. He's the stone which the builders disallowed - is what it says in I Peter 2:4.

[42] Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?

Friends, this is nearly word for word what we read in I Peter chapter 2. I Peter 2 and Matthew 21 - which is talking about the Kingdom of God. It's talking about the way things were in Jerusalem at that time - being taken away from those people and given to another people who believe in Jesus. Verse 42 is nearly word for word I Peter chapter 2, verse 4.

[43] Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.

[44] And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.

[45] And when the chief priests and Pharisees had heard his parables, they perceived that He spake of them.

[46] But when they sought to lay hands on Him, they feared the multitude, because they took Him for a prophet.

Jesus was condemning their governmental system. Jesus was condemning the chief priests and the lawyers. Jesus was not telling those people to continue with their system - with their "government" He was saying that their "government" was going to be crushed. It was going to be replaced with the Kingdom of God built with people who believe in Jesus as King. The whole story, about the parables of the man sending his son, it's all about God sending His Son to be King.

The other day I was meditating on this and I was and the thought came to my mind as I'm trying to get people to see that I Peter 2 and Matthew 21 are the same thing. In I Peter 2:4, it says that Jesus was disallowed indeed of men. In Matthew 21:42, Jesus tells them to read the Scriptures,

the stone which the builders rejected,

I Peter 2 uses the English word disallowed. Matthew 21, uses the English word rejected. You may not see this significance of this, but to me, I got a big kick out of it. As I was meditating on this passage, I got excited. I couldn't wait to get a hold of my Greek concordance. Why? Because before I even looked it up - I knew that the writers in the Greek used the exact same Greek word for disallowed in I Peter 2, for the word rejected in Matthew 21:42. Why? Because the two chapters are talking about exactly the same thing. And guess what? Go look it up for yourself. You will find those words - even though they are translated differently in the English - come from the exact same Greek word. Of course they do. I Peter 2 and Matthew 21 are talking about the exact same thing.