

Message# 252 8-13-2023 - The Stone is the Foundation

Preached first on 8/13/2023 on www.molibertyradio.us

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

I want to remind you that we are just a week away now from our gathering. We are meeting from the 20th to the 23rd in Mt. Vernon Missouri at a campground that we have reserved. There is plenty of room. We would love for you to come and be a part of us for a few days of fellowship. If you are coming, please let us know so we can plan for food. There are details on the website at www.godsendusmen.com.

I've got a lot to cover this morning. I am going to get right to the message.

As you know, I have been preaching for more than 35 years now - almost 40 years - that pretty much the entire world has completely missed the proper understanding of I Peter chapter 2.

I would expect some people to immediately stand up and maybe even get angry at such a statement because it certainly sounds like one man is saying, "I am teaching the right way - and everyone else in the world is teaching it wrong." I can certainly see how my statement can come off as arrogant. I can see how - without knowing me or how I came to that conclusion - someone might just turn me off and say, "That guy just thinks he's a 'know-it-all'" and then just tune out. I get that. But I need to remind you *again*. Those of you who have known me for a long time, get it. For those of you who are new to me - let me explain again.

My mother, for most of my life, told me that I was physically born in what the world calls 1962. Now, that would, if my math is correct, make me almost a month more now than 61 years old. This past birthday, both my mom and my dad, told me I was 60 - and not 61. So, with those two witnesses now seemingly correcting the record - I'm going to have to go with 60. My wife refuses that and says that I have to stay with what's been told to me for all the other years of my life - so I'm a bit conflicted right now. Anyway, my children think I'm ancient - so what's a year give or take when you get to be this old. So, I've been around for at least, 60 years now.

For my entire adult life - I have not been a participant with man's little g "governments." I don't have their identifications, I don't claim their citizenship, I don't take any of their

supposed “benefits” - I don't have or use a social security number - in fact - those of you who know me - know that I have preached - vehemently - and have lived - not just preached - against those things for my entire adult life.

For more than 35 years now - I have lived as an exclusive Citizen of the Commonwealth of Israel - so named in Ephesians chapter 2. Ask what happened to 5 years of my adult life. From 20 to 25, or 19-24 depending on who you believe about the date of physical entry into this world - I did not fully understand the implications of the Commonwealth of Israel - and I was a stateless man during that time. I was stateless - a very precarious place to be - but for the protection of God - until I realized that Israel - was REAL. Israel - is - I-S-R-E-A-L. The day that fully sunk in on me was one of the happiest days of my life.

God has a Nation. How in the world could I have read my Bible for over 20 years at that time and just realize that God has a Nation and all believers - all those who claim to be in Christ - are supposed to be exclusive Citizens of that Nation. Grafted into Israel - grafted into the Commonwealth of Israel - Ephesians chapter 2. Almost every “churchman” I had ever known had actually thrown water on that idea - and had worshiped the “state in which they were born” - instead of the Nation of God - so clearly defined and named in Ephesians chapter 2.

Anyway. At roughly 25 years old - give or take a year possibly - I left statelessness - I was not a member of any state (earthly state) - but publicly declared my Citizenship to be exclusively in the Commonwealth of Israel.

During my entire adult life - I have been reading the same Bible everyone else in the world has been reading - but because I had renounced all earthly citizenship - and claimed only Citizenship in the Nation of God, the Commonwealth of Israel, for anyone, not just me, but for anyone who has done the same thing - reading the exact same Bible - the exact same words on the pages - will bring about an understanding that many times, most times, in fact, will have entirely different understandings from two people reading the exact same words - but from two different perspectives - and the understandings will be the exact opposite one from another.

Now, simple. When two people read the exact same thing and they come away with totally opposite understandings - this is the conclusion. Either they are *both* wrong. Or, one is right and one is wrong. It's really simple.

I have never read - even when I was playing “church” - I Peter 2:13 - even when I was

young - not ever - even when I was a stateless man - in my teenage years and earlier - playing "church" - I have never understood I Peter 2:13

Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme;

I have never understood that to mean what nearly every other person in the world believes it to mean. Particularly, that people are supposed to obey "the government" - the "government" that they happened to be born around. The "government" that was in place around them when they were physically born into this world.

I remember, I probably wasn't more than 16 years old. And I was arguing with someone who was saying that I Peter 2:13 was demanding unquestioned loyalty and obedience to anything that happened to claim to be a "government." And I remember saying, trying to reason, "Ok, so you have 'Christians' living in Germany in World War II - and you have 'Christians' living in the U.S. in World War II - and the "government" of the U.S. told their 'Christian army men' to go to Germany and kill the Germans - whose "government" told their 'Christian army men' to kill the U.S. 'Christians.'" "Christians" killing "Christians" and God is the One who commanded it to be so - because - well you know - I Peter 2:13.

That's ridiculous. Followers of Jesus Christ killing each other - because one happened to be physically born in Germany and the other happened to be physically born in the U.S. - but each - were to be more faithful, more loyal to earthly "governments" - than they were to the One that was supposed to be their Supreme Leader - Jesus Christs. Of course, that's what they had been taught in their "churches." Jesus is King. Jesus is Above All. No other name given under Heaven among men - but then when their earthly "government" tells them to do something so repugnant, so clearly opposite of the teachings of the Word of God, so clearly opposite of the teachings of Christ - well, you know - I Peter 2:13.

In the "civil war" in America. The "Christians" from the north, killing the "Christians" from the south - brothers killing brothers - uncles and nephews - maybe even dads against their own sons. Unbelievable how messed up that whole thing was. And why? Because nearly the entire world - *even back then* - did not understand what I Peter chapter 2 actually means.

I've been preaching the exact opposite of the way the rest of the world has been

teaching this for pretty much my entire life. I have a different perspective because I have not been a state citizen for my entire adult life. This is not arrogance. It's just stating simple facts. With that said, how many other preachers do you know of that have lived the same way? We're reading the same Bible. We're reading the same words on the pages - but because of perspective - the conclusions are totally opposite one from another. The preacher who loves his u.s. flag, the preacher who loves the fact that he served in the military, the politician who swore an oath that the u.s. CONstitution is the supreme law of the land - with no other law having standing. Their perspective of the exact same words in the Bible - are going to be totally different from the preacher who says - "flags of the world's nations are symbols of idolatry, it is a blatant violation of the Laws of God to place men's laws and statutes above God's, it is totally wrong to swear allegiance to men's laws and statutes - in fact - it's wrong to swear at all - that's what Jesus said. That's what James said. Yet, nearly every interaction between a citizen of the world and their "government" involves swearing an oath. Jesus said, "But I say unto you, Swear not at all." Yet, every single day in this country, people who call themselves "Christians" swear oaths like they were drinking a glass of water. But none of that matters - because well - I Peter 2. I Peter 2:13 somehow supercedes every thing else in the Bible. God commanded,"

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man"

and that - total misrepresentation of what that actually means - nullifies every preceding Word of God - because it says - EVERY ordinance of man - which includes even those "ordinances" that are repugnant to God's.

After that statement, let me say again, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man" does not mean what the "churchmen" have said it means. I don't care if I'm the only preacher in the world that speaks the opposite - I will say it again and again and again - they are 100% wrong if they are saying that means Submit to ordinances that men create. That is not what that means.

Ordinances are God's Laws. They are not man's "laws and statutes." Ordinances are God's and His alone - and they were created *for* men. They were created by God *for* men. And all men are to submit to His Ordinances. They are "ordinances of man" - because they are for all men. It does not mean that man created them - and then God is telling other men to obey other men's "ordinances."

Man does not - has not - has never been given permission from God to define good and

evil, right and wrong. Men's "laws and statutes" are their definitions - created out of their own hearts and their own minds - to tell other people what they can and cannot do - what is right and what is wrong - what is "legal and what is illegal." And God NEVER gave men that authority over other men.

Listen to me, the only Authority God gave - *one man over another* - is to hold each other accountable to the handful - the very few Laws of God - that He created as Government for all men. No man is free to violate the Laws of God. Thou shalt not commit murder, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, and just a few other "briefly comprehended Laws."

Friends, we must help the world come to the proper understanding of what I Peter chapter 2 means - because I'm telling you - we are in the shape we are in today - because the "church and the churchmen" have completely butchered this chapter and the whole world is in deception because of this. The chapter is commanding all men to obey the Laws of God - and pretty much the entire world believes that the chapter is God telling men to obey other men and obey their CONstitutions, their laws, their statutes - and no others are to have standing.

I want you to closely listen to a very respected "theologian" from all the way back in the 1800s - in England - of course in England - and this is what he had to say regarding I Peter chapter 2. I'm telling, this madness has been around for a long, long time - even before the 1800s - and it finds its origins in the despicable divine right of kings - which is still in effect because people do not understand that Jesus Christ fulfilled the prophets - *all of them* - they do not understand kings in the historical record of the Bible - and they do not understand that Jesus Christ was born to be King - that was His main purpose in being born. Listen, this is Charles John Ellicott, Commentary on I Peter chapter 2.

Ellicott's Commentary for English Readers

<https://bibleportal.com/commentary/section/ellicott-s-commentary-for-english-readers/197302>

(13) To every ordinance of man.--Second prudential rule, subordination. Literally, to every human creation, i.e., to every office or authority which men have established.

Really?

Literally, to every human creation, i.e., to every office or authority which men have established.

When I first introduced Mr. Ellicott, I emphasized that he was from England. I want to remind you that when the 1611 KJV Bible came out, there is a letter which can be easily found online - that is supposedly from the king of England to Richard Bancroft who was named the archbishop of Canterbury and who was supposed to oversee the translation of the 1611 KJV Bible. Now. Let me say this. I have never seen - not even a photocopy of this letter. The original letter is supposedly in a library of the kings in England - but I've never seen the actual letter or a photocopy of it. But there are lots of people who have reproduced what they say is in the letter. I wish I could see a copy of the original - but I can't find one - maybe you can- but I can't. And I have looked for many hours.

But in that letter, supposedly the king of England told the archbishop of Canterbury that the translators were not to include the margin notes of the Geneva Bible. And of course. The margin notes of the Geneva Bible went against the despicable divine right of kings doctrine that the kings of England ruled by. And specifically, as I've shown you in the past, the notes on I Peter 2.

Every ordinances of man is not meant to be understood that ordinances were invented by men. They were not. Ordinances were invented by God and they were made for men - for all men to obey. Ordinances are not the inventions of men. They are the inventions of God and they are *for* men - for them to obey.

The influence on the KJV Bible by the king of England - and his despicable claim to the divine right of kings simply cannot be overlooked. For instance, you are probably not aware of this little known nugget. Do you know that pretty much every single English translation prior to the KJV had the word tyrant in it?

Listen to this, this is interesting, quote, and this is a different quote from Ellicott:

Many people may be unaware of the fact that the earlier English Bibles sometimes had the word "tyrant" or the word "tyranny" in the text. At Isaiah 13:11b, the 1599 Geneva Bible reads: "I will cause the arrogancy of the proud to cease and will cast down the pride of tyrants." The Geneva Bible at Job 6:23 stated: "And deliver me from the enemies' hand, or ransom me out of the hand of tyrants?" Again at Isaiah 49:25, it noted: "the prey of the tyrant shall be delivered." At Job 27:13, the Geneva Bible read: "This is the portion of a wicked man with God, and the heritage of tyrants, which they

shall receive of the Almighty." Its rendering at the beginning of Job 3:17 stated: "The wicked have there ceased from their tyranny." The Geneva Bible also has the word "tyrant" or "tyrants" in other verses such as Job 15:20 and Psalm 54:3. The 1535 Coverdale's Bible and the 1540 edition of the Great Bible also used these same renderings in several verses. The Bishops' Bible has "tyrants" at Job 6:23, Job 15:20, Job 27:13, and Psalm 54:3 and "tyrant" at Isaiah 13:11 and 16:4. At 1 Timothy 1:13, Tyndale's, Coverdale's, Matthew's, and Great Bibles all had the word "tyrant." At James 2:6, Whittingham's, the Geneva, and Bishops' Bibles had "oppress you by tyranny" while the Great Bible has "execute tyranny upon you."

Concerning Genesis 10:8-9, Ovid Need wrote: "Both the text wording and the notes of the Geneva speak harshly against oppressors and tyrants, such as we have today. As I have used the Geneva and compared it with the KJV, I understand why King James wanted to rid Christians of the Geneva" (Biblical Examiner, January, 2007, p. 2). Ovid Need added:

Listen very closely to this. This is very interesting. Changing a word from "the" to "a" - can change the entire meaning. Listen.

"An example is found in Matthew 2:6, KJV says a governor, where the Geneva says, the governor [in reference to Jesus Christ]. The strong wording that demands that only one Sovereign, Jehovah God in the form of Jesus Christ was removed from the KJV" (Ibid.).

It is interesting that those Bishops that heard King James complain about the marginal notes in the Geneva Bible did not mention that the Bishops' Bible had some similar marginal notes. The Bishops' Bible had some marginal notes that condemned tyrants or tyranny. The marginal note at Exodus 1:15 in the 1595 edition of the Bishops' was the following: "Tyrants try divers ways to oppress the Church." [The word "church" they didn't get it all right.] At Exodus 1:17, the Bishops' note stated: "It was better to obey God than man."

Is it possible that King James I did not want believers to read how strongly God's Word condemns tyranny and tyrants? Did King James think that some might regard some of his actions as being those of a tyrant? Alexander McClure referred to King James as "the tyrant" (KJV Translators, p. 50). Why did the KJV translators remove the words "tyrant," "tyrants," and "tyranny" from the text of the English Bible? According to the first rule given the translators, what "truth of the original" demanded this change? Is it possible that the KJV translators agreed with the view of civil government held by King James?

Did the translators avoid using the word "tyrant" to keep from offending King James or were they perhaps instructed to remove it? What was wrong with the use of the word "tryant" in the English Bible? William Pierce asserted: "Tyrannical rulers have ever found support from prelates" (Historical Introduction, p. 36). Samuel Rutherford maintained that "tyranny, being a work of Satan, is not from God" (Lex, Rex, p. 34). Edwin Bissell commented: "Whatever else James I might tolerate he would not allow any weakening of the doctrine of the supremacy of kings. And no other version of the English Bible betrayed such definite leanings toward that tenet as the one made under his own direction" (Historic Origin, p. 78).

The 1611 KJV's contents chapter heading at Ecclesiastes 10 for verse 20 is "Men's thoughts of kings ought to be reverend." That comment was still found in a KJV edition printed at Cambridge in 1769 although it has one spelling change of "reverend" to "reverent." The same form of this comment as found in the 1769 Cambridge was still found in editions of the KJV printed at Cambridge in 1872 and 1887 and at Oxford in 1868, 1876, and 1885. In the dedication to King James in the 1611, Thomas Bilson referred to him as "the Most High and Mighty Prince." Jonathan Stonis asserted: "We completely and fully reject the blasphemy of referring to King James as "The Most High" (Juror's Verdict, p. 130). Stonis asked: "Can you imagine the public outcry if a modern version had such a dedication?" (p. 131).

So, of course, so all those prior English Bibles had the words tyrant and tyranny in it - so guess what - the 1611 KJV Bible does not have the words tyrant or tyranny in it. Getting back to Ellicott's notes on I Peter 2:13 - he was an English "theologian". He was a professor at the king's college - this is something we should expect from someone with these credentials. Go back to how he started his commentary.

(13) To every ordinance of man.--Second prudential rule, subordination. Literally, to every human creation, i.e., to every office or authority which men have established.

It is not only to ordinances of directly Divine institution that we are to submit. Mind that he does not say we are to submit to every law that men may pass. This passage is most directly modelled on Romans 13:1, et seq., where the reason assigned for submission is the same as that in John 19:11, viz., that ultimately the authority proceeds from God Himself. Here, however, the thought is quite different. They are to submit, but not because of the original source from which the authority flows, but because of the practical consequences of not submitting. It must be done "for the Lord's" (i.e., Jesus Christ's) "sake," i.e., in order not to bring discredit upon His teaching, and persecution

upon His Church. This difference of treatment, in the midst of so much resemblance, shows that at the date of St. Peter's letter there was much more immediate cause for laying stress on political subordination. St. Paul, writing to the Roman Church, urges submission to Claudius, because the Roman Jews (among whom the Christians were reckoned) were often in trouble and expelled from the city of Rome (Acts 18:2); St. Peter, writing in all probability from the Roman Church, urges submission to Nero and the provincial governors because "ignorant and foolish men" were beginning to misrepresent the Christian Church as a kind of Internationalist or Socialist conspiracy. The king, as supreme.--First division of second prudential rule: subordination political. Of course it means the emperor. The name "king," though detested in Latin, was used without scruple by the provincial Greeks to express the sovereignty of the Caesars. When he is described here as "supreme," it is not intended (as our English version would convey) to contrast his supreme power with the inferior power of the "governors;" the word is only the same which is rendered "higher" in Romans 13:1. Huther rightly says, "The emperor was in the Roman Empire not merely the highest, but actually the only ruler; all other magistrates were but the instruments by which he exercised his sway." Of course all Asia Minor, to which St. Peter was writing, was in the Roman Empire; the language would have been different had the letter been addressed to, or perhaps had it even been written from, the geographical Babylon.

Now let's stop here for just a minute. Ellicott has introduced his opinions, his ideas concerning what God intends for people to understand about "kings" and their relation to it. This is it. This is the despicable doctrine of the divine right of kings - which the country of England has been so famous for. Listen again:

that ultimately the authority proceeds from God Himself.

He is saying that the Authority of God is shown to the world - through men's little "governments." Obeying men - even Claudius, even Nero, is obeying God. This is his reasoning. His ideas. His thoughts - but they are not based on the Will of God which was shown in the first 39 books of our Bibles. Turn to Exodus chapter 1. What Ellicott is trying to make people believe is not based on the foundation of what God established long before I Peter chapter 2 was written. We must see the foundations of the last 27 Books in the first 39. If we don't - if we see what looks like contradiction - then we need to understand why - and we need to see the Bible as a Book without contradiction. We need to see harmony in our Bibles from cover to cover and when we don't - when we see people teaching disharmony - it must be exposed. Exodus chapter 1, verse 1, the Will of God concerning how to interact with kings in the Old Covenant:

- [1] Now these are the names of the children of Israel, which came into Egypt; every man and his household came with Jacob.
- [2] Reuben, Simeon, Levi, and Judah,
- [3] Issachar, Zebulun, and Benjamin,
- [4] Dan, and Naphtali, Gad, and Asher.
- [5] And all the souls that came out of the loins of Jacob were seventy souls: for Joseph was in Egypt already.
- [6] And Joseph died, and all his brethren, and all that generation.
- [7] And the children of Israel were fruitful, and increased abundantly, and multiplied, and waxed exceeding mighty; and the land was filled with them.
- [8] Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph.
- [9] And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel are more and mightier than we:
- [10] Come on, let us deal wisely with them; lest they multiply, and it come to pass, that, when there falleth out any war, they join also unto our enemies, and fight against us, and so get them up out of the land.
- [11] Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses.
- [12] But the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew. And they were grieved because of the children of Israel.
- [13] And the Egyptians made the children of Israel to serve with rigour:
- [14] And they made their lives bitter with hard bondage, in mortar, and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field: all their service, wherein they made them serve, was with rigour.
- [15] And the king of Egypt [the king of Egypt] spake to the Hebrew midwives, of which the name of the one was Shiphrah, and the name of the other Puah:

Now here it comes. One of the earlier examples of misunderstanding “every ordinance of man - for the Lord's sake - whether to the king - as supreme. And remember, Ellicott said to obey Claudius and Nero. This is also a king. The text here - as clearly as anything is in our Bibles - says - the king of Egypt. This is a king. This was the king of Egypt. And we are going to see some of the faithful children of Israel - and how they responded to the king and his “every ordinance of man.”

- [16] And he said, [the king said] When ye do the office of a midwife to the Hebrew women, and see them upon the stools; if it be a son, then ye shall kill him: but if it be a daughter, then she shall live.

[17] But the midwives feared God, and did not as the king of Egypt commanded them, but saved the men children alive.

I'm telling you this this morning, I first heard or read this story probably around the age of 6 or 7. Remember, even at that early age, I was the little kid sitting on the front row at "church" - glued to every word that the preacher was saying. All I wanted to be in life - was a preacher. I didn't want to be a doctor. I didn't want to be a fireman - I didn't want to be anything other than a preacher. I thought being a preacher was the greatest thing anyone could do - even at that very young age. So when I first heard or read this passage - I remember - and the thing that stuck out most to me - the principle that hit me like a ton of bricks and burned into my being - even as a child - and friends - I don't have an explanation for it. Most of the other kids my age were asleep in their mother's lap at "church" - but when the preaching was going on - I was wide awake - glued to every word of that Bible that was heard. And all I remember from Exodus 1:17 was

and [they] did not as the king of Egypt commanded them,

The midwives feared God and did not as the king of Egypt commanded them. Man, that's Exodus chapter 1. That's the second Book of our Bibles. This is what we learn long before we get to I Peter chapter 2. This is the second Book. I Peter is almost at the end. Don't tell me the principle they feared God and did not as the king of Egypt commanded them - was somehow dismantled, replaced, with all of a sudden, obey every whim of Nero - and not only that - but do it for the Lord's sake. When

But the midwives feared God, and did not as the king of Egypt commanded them,

is burned into your heart and your understanding and that becomes a guiding principle as you progress through the rest of the Bible - when you get to I Peter chapter 2 - and you read that - and you understand that what you are reading there must agree with what God has already established - all of a sudden it isn't all that difficult.

But when your approach to the Scriptures is that what you read in Genesis and Exodus is just bedtime stories for the children that don't have any application for today - then you can read I Peter chapter 2 - jerk it out - lay it on the table - and tell people that God commanded His Own people to obey the Caesars who history records - listen to this:

<https://blogs.uoregon.edu/rel317w15drreis/sons-of-god/#:~:text=The%20inscription%20to%20Julius%20Caesar,would%20also%20then%20be%20divine.>

The phrase “son of god” is applied in the Roman Empire to Augustus. The main theme that the article addresses is how would a Roman citizen, living in the Roman Empire, interpret Augustus being called “son of god”? Julius Caesar, Augustus’ adopted father, was viewed as divine and holy during his lifetime. The inscription to Julius Caesar in Macedonia states “To the Emperor Caesar, God, Son of God, Augustus. He had been declared a god of the roman state, “Divus Julius[2]”. If Julius Caesar was declared to be divine god by the roman state the logic would follow that his son would also then be divine. However it would seem that Augustus and his “divine state” began when he was a young boy, before his adoption by Caesar. It was believed by the Romans that Augustus was the son of Apollo himself. Therefore Augustus was a son of god by Caesar’s adoption of him and divine begetting through being the son of Apollo. Augustus only received the title of god ship through his adoption by Caesar. Augustus being the adopted son of Caesar posed a problem in ancient antiquity. In the Greco-Roman world, adopted sons were viewed as being lesser to natural born sons. This caused great tension across the Roman Empire between adopted and natural born sons.

Yet compare that with other words from the Book of Exodus. Turn to Exodus chapter 20. Ellicott says that God Himself commanded Christians to obey the Caesars - Claudius and Nero - and the rest of them goes without saying. History - if you can believe any of it - says the caesars called themselves gods. And here, the “Christian” - not “Christian” friends - it's churchian - Ellicott is saying that the writer of I Peter chapter 2 is demanding obedience to the caesars - Exodus 20, verse 1:

[1] And God spake all these words, saying,

[2] I am the LORD thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage.

[3] Thou shalt have no other gods before Me.

[4] Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth:

[5] Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the LORD thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me;

[6] And shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love Me, and keep My commandments.

Friends, this is the second of 66 Books that we say make up our Bibles. This is the foundation. We are expected to believe that this is what the God of the Bible at one time demanded - but then - He sent His Son to change this? God sent Jesus to earth - to tell people that Exodus 20 is no longer valid? This is why the world is in the shape it's in. The purposeful twisting of I Peter 2 into something it *cannot* say - I Peter chapter 2 *can not* be an instruction for men and women boys and girls to serve the caesars. If it is - if that's what it really means - then friends - count me out. I do not serve a schizophrenic God. I do not serve a God that instructed some men at some point in history to conclude, Fear God and keep His commandments is the whole duty of men - then years later - change His mind and say that was only for a certain time.

Now, I know what some people might want to say. "But what about the sacrifices? What about the 'baptisms?' Those are no longer commanded."

But that's not accurate. The sacrifices. The immersions. They are still commanded. But what we saw of those sacrifices and those washings in the first 39 Books - the Bible tells us they were but types of shadows of the sacrifices and the washings that were made perfect in the New World. God didn't say stop the sacrifices, God didn't say stop the washings. He just said there was a better way to sacrifice and a better way to wash. And the Book is quite clear on these issues.

The central theme of the Bible - one of the first examples - Exodus 1 - fear God, keep His Commandments - has never changed. And will never change. What we call the First Commandment - Thou shalt have no other gods before me - has never changed - will never change.

Go back and finish the last several verses of Exodus chapter 1. Verse 18:

[18] And the king of Egypt called for the midwives, and said unto them, Why have ye done this thing, and have saved the men children alive?

[19] And the midwives said unto Pharaoh, Because the Hebrew women are not as the Egyptian women; for they are lively, and are delivered ere the midwives come in unto them.

There's a principle there. When a usurper demands why we obeyed God and not them - there's more than one answer that can be given - and it is pleasing to God. Let me just leave it at that, that's for another time. Verse 20:

[20] Therefore God dealt well with the midwives: and the people multiplied, and waxed very mighty.

[21] And it came to pass, because the midwives feared God, that he made them houses.

That historical record that God has caused to be memorialized forever - should be burned into the heart, soul and mind of every man woman boy and girl that claims to be a follower of Jesus Christ. If that principle was burned into everyone's hearts and minds - as they continue through the Word of God - by the time they reach the last 27 Books - it should easily be seen how to harmonize the Word from cover to cover.

I'm telling you that even when I was briefly playing "church" and "churchman" - never - not one time ever - did I teach another man that Jesus told His people to "Render unto Caesar" as if Jesus was telling them to obey the caesars. Not one time, ever did I teach another man woman boy or girl that I Peter chapter 2 meant "obey all the laws of the land." I had heard that said a thousand times before - but I never taught it the way it was taught in the "church." It's not Bible. It is not the Way of God. And the record must be corrected.

Listen as I continue with Ellicott's notes on I Peter chapter 2, quote:

Pulpit Commentary

Verse 13. - Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man. The aorist passive (ὑποτάγητε) is used, as often, in a middle sense.

Now listen to this. Here comes the double-mindedness of the "churchman."

The word for "ordinance" is κτίσις, which in classical Greek means "foundation," as of a city; but in the New Testament is used elsewhere only of the works of God, in the sense of "creation," or "a creature" (see Mark 16:15; Colossians 1:23, etc.).

Exactly. Ordinance is used in the New Testament as ONLY OF THE WORKS OF GOD. It is not the works of men. It is not invented by men. Ordinances are exclusively the creation of God. God is the Only One Who created Ordinances. Man is not allowed. Man does not have the ability to define what is right and what is wrong. God, and God alone has kept that to Himself. He's the Only One capable of being the original designer of right and wrong, good and evil, lawful and unlawful. After so accurately providing the definition of Ordinance, listen to what he says next. Ellicott continues:

Hence some, as De Wette, translate the words, "to every human creature," supporting their view by 1 Peter 5:5. But on the whole this seems unlikely; ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις is a strange and awkward periphrasis for ἄνθρωπος. It is better to understand it as meaning a human creation or foundation.

Now he is saying the exact opposite of what he said was supposed to be meant by Ordinance. He just said Ordinance is used in other New Testament passages exclusively as the works of God. Now, he's saying it means a human creation, or a human foundation. How in the world people did not see through this is just amazing. He goes on. Right, left, right, left.

Certainly "there is no power but of God" (Romans 13:1);

Yes. That is what Romans 13:1 says. As plainly and as clearly as can be. There is no power but of God. God has kept it all to Himself. That's right. Now back to the left.

but the form which that power assumes is a human institution. St. Peter bids his readers to submit themselves to the de facto form of government. For the Lord's sake. Not from human motives, as fear of punishment; but for the Lord's sake, because "the powers that be are ordained of God," and in obeying them we obey the ordinance of God.

This is the despicable doctrine of the divine right of kings. When you obey the caesars, when you obey earthly "kings" you are obeying God. Well, why then wasn't that the way it was in Exodus chapter 1 with the midwives? Why wasn't it that the way it was with Daniel in Babylon? Why wasn't that the way it was with Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego? Why wasn't it that way with the prophets? Why wasn't it that way with Mordecai? With Moses? With Samuel? Somehow we have a new God in the New Covenant world? Ellicott continues. Back to the right, before turning back to the left.

Christians were commonly accused of insubordination, of doing "contrary to the decrees of Caesar" (Acts 17:7);

Yes. They were. Because true Christians have their faith - their belief - based on the foundational principles from the first 39 Books of the Bible. That's where we find the Will of God. That's where we find the Mind of God. Now, Ellicott back to the left.

they must show by their conduct that these accusations are false, that the progress of

the gospel be not hindered. Whether it be to the king, as supreme. By "the king" is meant the Roman emperor, who was frequently so described in the Greek writers. Nero was emperor when St. Peter wrote. Christians were to obey even him, wicked tyrant as he was; for his power was given him from above, as the Lord himself had said of Pilate (John 19:11).

Of course, when your state Bible is one that has tyrant and tyranny removed, I get it.

Okay. Here again. Yes. But understanding the Bible as a whole - not just from twisting one verse in an attempt to unravel the whole rest of the Bible - we know - in the Old Covenant world - yes - God raised up kings and brought them down. That's what happened from the time the Israelites said, "Give us a king like all the other nations."

But even still, even under that system and that punishment for their rebellion, God still expected people to obey Him and not the kings when the kings did wrong - which was most of the time. Exodus 1 is a very good example.

Now. Let's change gears for just a minute. We have just read Charles Ellicott's commentary on I Peter 2:13 where he explicitly says that Christians were to obey the caesars. The caesars were the "powers that be" from Romans 13 and Christians are to submit to everything the caesars decree because to obey the caesars was to obey God.

If we can believe the history books, Nero - who Ellicott specifically named in his commentary - was the Emperor in Rome - when the Book of I Peter was written. Alright. Now, we have already seen in Exodus chapter 1 where the midwives refused to obey the king - and God blessed them for it and even set them up as one of the greatest historical records we have in our Bibles.

But the skeptic might say, "How ridiculous. The king commanded them to kill babies - but they refused. No one would think that murdering babies was to be obeyed. If a king commands someone to murder someone, you should not obey." But that's not what we are told by the twisted teaching of

Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake.

Funny how in the "church" world - that word "every" can take on all sorts of meanings. Kind of like the word "all" in Matthew 24 concerning "all these things be fulfilled."

But no one would ever think that a “king” - certainly not in modern times - would demand that babies be murdered. Interesting. From NPR, what they call February 1, 2016.

<https://www.npr.org/2016/02/01/465124337/how-chinas-one-child-policy-led-to-forced-abortions-30-million-bachelors>

Headline

How China's One-Child Policy Led To Forced Abortions, 30 Million Bachelors

Last October, China ended its 35-year-old policy of restricting most urban families to one child. Commonly referred to as the "one-child" policy, the restrictions were actually a collection of rules that governed how many children married couples could have.

"The basic idea was to encourage everybody, by coercion if necessary, to keep to ... one child," journalist Mei Fong tells Fresh Air's Terry Gross.

Fong explores the wide-ranging impact of what she calls the world's "most radical experiment" in her new book, One Child. She says that among the policy's unintended consequences is an acute gender imbalance.

*"When you create a system where you would shrink the size of a family and people would have to choose, then people would ... choose sons," Fong says. "Now China has 30 million more men than women, 30 million bachelors who cannot find brides. ... They call them *guang guan*, 'broken branches,' that's the name in Chinese. They are the biological dead ends of their family."*

Fong says the policy also led to forced abortions and the confiscation of children by the authorities. Looking ahead, China is also facing a shortage of workers who can support its aging population.

Of course. Things like that never happen in modern times. So, my reading of Exodus chapter 1 this morning and equating that principle to our lives today - well that was just silly, right?

But Ellicott has I Peter 2 in the time of Nero. And he's saying that God Himself demanded Christians to obey Nero. Alright. Open your Bibles to Revelation chapter 13, please. Most of you listening today will understand this. I want to appeal to preterists

today who think that Ellicott's commentary on I Peter 2 is correct. Let's read a little, beginning in verse 1.

[1] And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy.

Think - the caesars calling themselves gods and the son of god.

[2] And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion: and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority.

[3] And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world wondered after the beast.

[4] And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast: and they worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like unto the beast? who is able to make war with him?

[5] And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months.

[6] And he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven.

[7] And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations.

[8] And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.

[9] If any man have an ear, let him hear.

[10] He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity: he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword. Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.

[11] And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon.

[12] And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed.

[13] And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men,

[14] And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on

the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live.

[15] And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed.

[16] And he causeth all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand, or in their foreheads:

[17] And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.

[18] Here is wisdom. Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast: for it is the number of a man; and his number is Six hundred threescore and six.

Now we aren't seeing a king of men here demanding the murder of babies. We see a king of the earth demanding that everyone in his realm receive a mark in their right hand or in their forehead. This is a command, a law, an "ordinance" in the most vulgar sense of the word - by an earthly king - Nero - that he was requiring of those under his rule. That he was requiring of those under his rule. What's the big deal? This isn't killing babies. This should be seen as obeying the caesars. Doing what the "government" tells you today - obey every ordinance that man comes up with - and do it because God demands it.

This is from Chuck Swindoll, one of the most influential "churchmen" in our generation. He wrote this about the Book of I Peter, quote:

Who wrote the book?

The first word of this epistle, Peter, identifies the author, who called himself "an apostle of Jesus Christ" (1 Peter 1:1). He wrote this letter to a group of Christians scattered throughout the northern areas of Asia Minor, where he may have previously preached the gospel.

Peter wrote to a group of people that probably included both Jews and Gentiles. The apostle addressed the letter's recipients as "aliens" (1:1), a word indicating that Peter was speaking not just to Jews or just to Gentiles but to Christians who were living their lives in such a way that they would have stood out as aliens among the surrounding culture.

Where are we?

In this letter, Peter spoke much about persecution, which anticipated the persecution he and other Christians would endure in the final years of Nero's reign. At the time he wrote, Peter had not yet been arrested, an event that would lead to his martyrdom around AD 66–68.

Stop here for just a minute. This is what is so confusing about what these guys are selling. Why would someone like Peter ever have gotten arrested? If Peter's message was, "Obey the caesars - no matter what they do - no matter what ordinance they create" obey the caesars." Why would they have ever gotten arrested? That makes no sense at all. We seem the same exact thing today. The "churchmen" have been saying forever, "Obey men's 'governments.'" They aren't arrested. They aren't persecuted. They are some of the most protected class of people in all of society. Their "churches" have tax-exempt status. They aren't persecuted. They are protected. If Peter and Paul and those guys were telling all their followers that God said to obey the caesars - the caesars would have done nothing but encourage that message. That's ridiculous to try to peddle this nonsense. Back to Swindoll:

First Peter 5:13 indicates that Peter sent greetings from the local church—calling it "Babylon"—but it's most likely that the apostle was writing in a common metaphor there. He used the name of the ancient Mesopotamian city as a stand-in for Rome, the modern city that, like Babylon, gave itself over to idol worship and false gods. While the fact is not recorded in the Bible, Peter has long been thought to have spent his final years serving the church in Rome. Based on the numerous references to suffering and persecution in this letter, Peter likely wrote in AD 64, just as the persecution of Christians under Nero was ramping up.

Why is First Peter so important?

First Peter focuses on the importance of believers bearing up under unjust suffering yet continuing to live well (1 Peter 2:20). In this way, 1 Peter might be called the Job of the New Testament, providing encouragement for the true believer to continue on in the way that Jesus has laid out for all His followers. The endurance Peter called these believers to is similar to Job's, a man who suffered despite his righteousness. Peter maintained that this was the kind of true perseverance that God expects from His people.

What's the big idea?

Living in close proximity to Jesus Christ for more than three years had provided the apostle Peter the best possible example of what it looked like to live in holiness amid a

hostile world. More than any other man who walked the earth, Jesus modeled that lifestyle. Peter therefore pointed his readers in the best possible direction, to Jesus Himself. The apostle called Christians to “sanctify Christ as Lord” in their hearts, that believers might live and act as Jesus desires during their short time here on earth (1 Peter 3:14–18). This would include submission to authority—even unjust authority—[of course, when your Bible has had tyrant and tyranny removed from it] in the government, in the home, and in the workplace. Jesus becomes the focal point for ordering one’s life in the midst of trials and tribulations. By rooting their perseverance in the person and work of Christ, believers can always cling to hope in the midst of suffering.

The historians tell us that Nero died in 68 A.D. Though the Bible does not specifically state that Nero was the beast, the dragon of Revelation 13, it's easy to see that this is who this is talking about. All these guys that say that I Peter 2 is talking about obeying the caesars - even the ESV “Bible” uses the word emperor in I Peter 2:13 - what do they do with Revelation chapter 13? Turn to Revelation chapter 20. Begin with verse 1:

[1] And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand.

[2] And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years,

[3] And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season.

[4] And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the Word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.

Because these “churchmen” do not understand that all the prophecies were fulfilled in the first century - they cannot understand I Peter chapter 2. During the same time that Peter was supposedly telling the Christians to obey the caesars - the caesars were demanding that the Christians receive the caesars mark in the hands or in their foreheads. And the record is clear. The Christians DID NOT take the mark, neither did they worship the caesars, neither did they worship the caesar's image. Neither did they serve that “king.”

The events recorded in the Book of Revelation were going on at the same time - or

shortly thereafter - that the Book of I Peter was written.

These guys are saying that the Christians were persecuted and killed from 64 to 68AD. But the supposed message of the Christians was to obey the caesars. It absolutely makes no sense at all. Men's little g "governments" do not persecute their faithful. They do not persecute those that are obedient to them.

I've said this for 40 years now. The "church" and the "churchmen" live in a fantasy world. They have their own language. Some of them have even created a language that no one can even understand. They live in a weird world that is outside of reality. It's mostly contained inside their four walls - but it's a world that is not based in reality.

Their false, destructive teachings on I Peter chapter 2 is what the ungodly in the world has used to gain the unbridled power they have over mankind today.

We must stand firm on the Bible truth that I Peter chapter 2 is commanding exclusive obedience to God and to His Ordinances - strike that - We must stand firm on the Bible truth that I Peter chapter 2 is commanding exclusive obedience to God and to Ordinances. It was extra to say "His Ordinances." There are no Ordinances that are not His Ordinance. An Ordinance is God's and God's alone. Man is not allowed to make up their own definitions of right and wrong, good and evil, lawful and unlawful.