

## Message# 256 9-10-2023 - If We had Just Known what this Meaneth

Preached first on 9/10/2023 on [www.molibertyradio.us](http://www.molibertyradio.us)

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

As most of you know, I sent out an extra email this week concerning what I found on my Snickers bar wrapper. I know, I know. I shouldn't be eating those things anyway - and as I told you in my email - I actually rarely eat them. I know - and I hope you do, too - that white sugar is not good for us. And I think it probably goes without a whole lot of investigation that that is what pretty much all the manufacturers of products such as those use to sweeten their candy. Of course if you bite into the candy bar you don't see the poison right away - so that's a bit "out of sight out of mind." But we aren't that stupid. We still know it isn't good for us - but we kind of think a little here and there won't be too bad. And maybe so.

My grandmother, who lived to be in her 90s, used to eat those Hydrox brand cookies just about everyday of her life. I remember as a kid her giving me those when I was at her house - and though I don't recall being all that fond of them - I still ate them. I was planning on saying that she ate those things her whole life - and it doesn't seem as though they hurt her much - then - I came across this. I wonder how many of you remember those Hydrox cookies? When you first hear the word, the first thing that comes to my mind is Clorox bleach. But I found this, it's really interesting and maybe my grandmother was smarter than I thought - AND - this could possibly explain some of my own genes - g-e-n-e-s. Listen to this:

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hydrox#:~:text=Hydrox%20is%20a%20cream%2Dfilled,Biscuits%20for%20over%2090%20years.>

*Hydrox is a cream-filled chocolate sandwich cookie owned and manufactured by Leaf Brands. It debuted in the United States in 1908, and was manufactured by Sunshine Biscuits for over 90 years.[1] Hydrox was largely discontinued in 1999, three years after Sunshine was acquired by Keebler, which was later acquired by Kellogg's. In September 2015, the product was reintroduced by Leaf Brands.*

*Oreo was created in 1912 as an imitation of Hydrox. Oreo eventually eclipsed Hydrox in popularity, which resulted in the Hydrox cookies being perceived as an Oreo off-brand. [2] Compared to Oreos, Hydrox cookies have a less sweet filling and a crunchier cookie*

*shell that is less soggy in milk.[3]*

### *History*

*In 1908, the cookie's creation was inspired by "purity and goodness", with a name derived from the hydrogen and oxygen elements within the water molecule.[2][4]*

*"Centennial" package of Hydrox cookies with the Sunshine label Sunshine Biscuits was purchased by Keebler in 1996, and in 1999, Keebler replaced Hydrox with a similar but reformulated product called "Droxies".[2] Keebler was acquired by Kellogg's in 2001, and Kellogg's removed Droxies from the market in 2003.[1] Kellogg's then marketed a similar chocolate sandwich cookie under the Famous Amos brand, along with sandwich cookies of other flavors, but also discontinued the line.[3]*

Now, I want you to listen to this very closely. There are two things in here of importance to me.

*On the cookie's 100th anniversary, Kellogg's resumed distribution of Hydrox under the Sunshine label in late August 2008*

Stop here. Kellogg's. In 2018, Kellogg's had a total equity of \$3.159 billion. They had total revenues of \$13.547 billion. Kellogg's is huge. We all know that. But listen to this - let me start that paragraph over again.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kellogg's>

*On the cookie's 100th anniversary, Kellogg's resumed distribution of Hydrox under the Sunshine label in late August 2008 in direct response to*

Now listen.

*in direct response to 1,300 phone calls from fans as well as an online petition with 1,000 signatures,*

1,300 phone calls and an online petition with 1,000 signatures and that made a 3 billion dollar company pay attention? Now listen to this. Remember my grandmother ate these cookies her entire life. Whether or not this is why she ate them, God only knows, but you know me, this definitely caught my eye. Quote:

*a Hydrox fan website with the essay "Nonconformists don't eat Oreos", and dozens of forum posts, asking that production resume. The cookies were available nationally for a limited time, and less than one year later Kellogg's removed Hydrox from their web site.*  
[4]

So, it moved Kellogg's for a year, but still, the point is, only 1,300 phone calls and 1,000 signatures moved a giant company like Kellogg's. The final two paragraphs about hydrox cookies is interesting.

*In 2014, Leaf Brands registered the "Hydrox" trademark, which had been abandoned by former owner Kellogg's.[5] Leaf began production of its version of Hydrox on September 4, 2015, at the company's facility in Vernon, California.[6] In 2017, the recipe was changed to remove artificial flavors that had been used for 50 years[7] and the company obtained non-GMO certification.[8]*

*Leaf Brands filed a complaint with the US Federal Trade Commission in 2018 against Mondelez International, maker of Oreo cookies, for hiding Hydrox cookies from customers on store shelves.[9][10][11]*

While Mars and Snickers has lost me. I'm done with Snickers bars - I will never eat another one - even if it's only one or two a year - I was hoping that many people would take my email and then make their own response to Snickers or pass that email on to as many people as they know. I don't know how many of you did. I know that Dave did. He sent me an email the other day to let me know that he contacted Mars. Dave had asked for a list of Mars products that contain Bioengineered ingredients. He got a very similar response to mine.

*Hi Dave,*

*Thank you for contacting Mars Wrigley. We appreciate you for reaching out to us.*

*However, we don't have a list of products that contain bioengineered ingredients. For products sold in the United States, we are in full compliance with the requirements of the USDA National Bioengineered Food Disclosure standard. All our products made with BE ingredients have a statement: CONTAINS BIOENGINEERED FOOD right on the label.*

*At Mars Wrigley, we are committed to manufacturing high quality products that are safe and enjoyable for consumers. We are constantly evaluating and updating our*

*ingredients based on changing consumer preferences, as well as the emergence of new technologies and scientific information.*

Well, that one's hard to believe. It sure seems to me like the people opposing GMO stuff are more vocal than the ones who don't care. What is so confusing to me is that they keep saying they are in "full compliance with the USDA - for products sold in the U.S." As if that's a good thing. I found this earlier this summer. I have a feeling I may have already shared it with you, so if so, just bear with me.

<https://www.intheknow.com/post/american-ketchup-ingredient-canadian-tiktok/>

*WOMAN IS SHOCKED WHEN SHE COMPARES INGREDIENTS IN AMERICAN KETCHUP VS. CANADIAN KETCHUP*

*Article by Cassie Morris*

*Fri, June 16, 2023 at 12:19:52 PM EDT*

*A Canadian woman living in America was stunned by what she found when she examined two Heinz ketchup bottles — one manufactured in the U.S. and one in Canada — and her findings are going viral.*

*TikToker and former personal shopper Ray (@heyyitsrayyyy) gained over 1.3 million views, 135,000 likes, 8,000 saves and 5,600 comments when she uploaded the video to her account.*

*This isn't the first time that mysterious food ingredients have gone viral on the app. Recently, a concerned TikToker gained over 5.5 million views when he spotted a fishy ingredient warning on a bag of Great Value mini marshmallows in Walmart.*

*But Ray's video is unique in that it compares the same exact brand — and seemingly the same exact product — with very different findings about the ingredients.*

*In the video — captioned, "6 months living in the states and the food is honestly making me sick — Ray compares two bottles of ketchup, one she bought in the U.S. and one she bought in Canada on a recent trip back home. Each bottle lists the same ingredients as those on the Heinz U.S. and Heinz Canada websites:*

*Heinz Tomato Ketchup (America): Tomato concentrate from red ripe tomatoes, distilled vinegar, high fructose corn syrup, corn syrup, salt, spice, onion powder, natural*

*flavoring.*

*Heinz Tomato Ketchup (Canada): Tomato paste (from fresh, ripe tomatoes), sugar, vinegar, salt spices.*

*While both countries produce organic, no/lower sodium, and no/lower sugar varieties, only Heinz U.S. produces a variety called Simply Tomato Ketchup — whose ingredient list still looks quite different from the standard Canadian variety of Heinz Tomato Ketchup:*

*Simply Tomato Ketchup: Tomato concentrate from red ripe tomatoes, distilled vinegar, cane sugar, salt, onion powder, spice, natural flavoring [or] tomato concentrate made from red ripe tomatoes, distilled vinegar, sugar, salt, onion powder, spice, natural flavoring.*

*Ray's TikTok isn't the only one to compare ingredients found in American foods versus other countries. Last year, @foodinsider broke down the differences between McDonald's fries made in the U.K. and those made in the U.S.*

*World Famous Fries (America): potatoes, vegetable oil (canola oil, corn oil, soybean oil, hydrogenated soybean oil, natural beef flavor [wheat and milk derivatives]\*), dextrose, sodium acid pyrophosphate (maintain color), salt. \*natural beef flavor contains hydrolyzed wheat and hydrolyzed milk as starting ingredients.*

*McDonald's Fries (U.K.): potatoes, non-hydrogenated vegetable oils (rapeseed), dextrose (predominantly added at beginning of the potato season).*

For the record. I'm reading this about McDonald's just because it's in the article. Teresa and I have not been to a McDonald's in more than 30 years. And to my knowledge, none of my children have ever eaten at McDonald's. Oh, and speaking of Teresa, for the record again, we just celebrated our 34th anniversary. We went to a restaurant and celebrated together - and hopefully we didn't eat lab grown meat. Can you imagine we need to start going to restaurants now and asking, "Did your beef come from a cow or from a laboratory?" Good grief. Anyway, 34 years, five children, 3 grandchildren with 3 more on the way.

Back to the article.

*“They don’t care if we’re healthy”*

*Over 5,600 TikTokers took to Ray’s comment section to express their shock at her findings.*

*“Is there a way to order groceries from another country? Cause this is insane,” wrote @hollyeekitty.*

*“They don’t care if we’re healthy. They care about making money,” commented @lisamariemahan.*

*“You can buy ‘cleaner’ ketchup in America, but it costs more \$,” wrote @iamsam0616.*

*To that point, the Heinz store on Amazon sells a 20 oz. bottle of Heinz Simply Tomato Ketchup for \$3.98, while a 20 oz. bottle of Heinz Tomato Ketchup sells for \$3.48.*

*With more TikTokers using the app to compare international ingredients, it’s likely there are still many more shocking discoveries to come.*

I don't know what is going on. Why, after all these years, does Mars think it's a good idea to make a milk chocolate and peanut candy bar with Bioengineered ingredients. What are they doing? Here's an article from all the way back in 2013.

<https://www.sheknows.com/food-and-recipes/articles/1002379/gmo-inside-calling-for-hershey-and-mars-to-label-gmos-in-chocolate/>

*GMO Inside calling for Hershey and Mars to label GMOs in chocolate  
by MICHELE BORBOA MS*

*It’s only customary to have some form of chocolate to be at the top of your Valentine’s Day must-get list. But are GMOs also on your list? They could be if you’re picking up candy from Hershey and Mars.*

*Stop with GMOs already*

*GMO Inside, a campaign dedicated to advancing the right of consumers to know whether or not foods are genetically engineered, is calling on Hershey and Mars to stop putting GMOs in Valentines candy and other products or to start labeling the products*

*as containing GMOs. According to GMO Inside campaign director Elizabeth O'Connell, Hershey and Mars combined comprise nearly 70 percent of the U.S. chocolate market. The two companies together spent more than a million dollars to oppose GMO labeling in California in the November 2012 election. Hershey is reported to have spent \$518,900 to defeat Prop 37 and Mars spent \$498,350.*

*What's the big GMO deal?*

*Genetically modified organisms have never been proven safe for consumption, and a growing body of studies is raising concerns around the health effects of eating them. GMOs are also increasing the use of toxic herbicides and causing harm to farmers in the US and abroad.*

*O'Connell says that in Europe, where genetically modified ingredients are already required to be labeled, Hershey and Mars have adapted their recipes to formulate Kisses and M&Ms without GMOs. According to Confectionery News, Hershey products made for distribution in Europe will be formulated without GMO ingredients, in order to meet the requirements of major retailers which ban the sale of products with genetically modified ingredients and to satisfy increasing consumer concern about the safety of GMOs.*

*"Unless you can buy Hershey or Mars products in Europe, there is a high chance you could be giving your Valentine a treat with GMOs that endanger their health and the environment," adds O'Connell, "To be safe, you should choose organic certified or Non-GMO Project Verified chocolate to show the loved ones in your life you really care."*

So again. Why are they using those ingredients in the U.S., but not in other places around the world? It almost seems - but of course - I'd be the last one to talk about any kind of conspiracy - but it almost seems like they are purposely trying to harm people that live on this soil. Pretty strange.

So, whether or not you ever eat a Snickers bar - and hopefully - after this week that nail went into the coffin - my hope is still that people would contact Mars and let them know they don't appreciate the ingredients in their products.

Someone wrote to me and asked me to clarify the statement in my original email concerning adultery. I said that adultery certainly pertains to sexual sins. But that is not the only definition. Changing something, altering God's Creation is also adultery. If you

go to the Webster's 1828 Dictionary and look up the word adultery. Here is what you find:

<https://webstersdictionary1828.com/Dictionary/adultery>

*ADUL'TERY, noun [Latin adulterium. See Adulterate.]*

*1. Violation of the marriage bed; a crime, or a civil injury, which introduces, or may introduce, into a family, a spurious offspring.*

*By the laws of Connecticut, the sexual intercourse of any man, with a married woman, is the crime of adultery in both: such intercourse of a married man, with an unmarried woman, is fornication in both, and adultery of the man, within the meaning of the law respecting divorce; but not a felonious adultery in either, or the crime of adultery at common law, or by statute. This latter offense is, in England, proceeded with only in the ecclesiastical courts.*

*In common usage, adultery means the unfaithfulness of any married person to the marriage bed. In England, Parliament grant absolute divorces for infidelity to the marriage bed in either party; and the spiritual courts divorce a mensa et thoro.*

*2. In a scriptural sense, all manner of lewdness or unchastity, as in the seventh commandment.*

*3. In scripture, idolatry, or apostasy from the true God. Jeremiah 3:8.*

Turn to Jeremiah chapter 3 this morning. I am reading from the Greek Septuagint. The KJV isn't all that different in this passage. Verse 1.

<https://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/greek-texts/septuagint/chapter.asp?book=44&page=3>

1 If a man put away his wife, and she depart from him, and become another man's, shall she return to him any more at all? shall not that woman be utterly defiled? ye thou hast gone a-whoring with many shepherds, and hast returned to me, saith the Lord. 2 Lift up thine eyes [to look] straight forward, and see where thou hast not been utterly defiled. Thou hast sat for them by the wayside as a deserted crow, and hast defiled the land with thy fornications and thy wickedness. 3 And thou didst retain many shepherds for a stumbling-block to



thyself: thou hadst a whore's face, thou didst become shameless toward all. 4 Hast thou not called me as it were a home, and the father and guide of thy virgin-time? 5 Will [God's anger] continue for ever, or be preserved to the end? Behold, thou hast spoken and done these bad things, and hadst power [to do them]. 6 And the Lord said to me in the days of Josias the king, Hast thou seen what things the house of Israel has done to me? they have gone on every high mountain, and under every shady tree, and have committed fornication there. 7 And I said after she had committed all these acts of fornication, Turn again to me. Yet she returned not. And faithless Juda saw her faithlessness. 8 And I saw that (for all the sins of which she was convicted, wherein the house of Israel committed adultery, and I put her away, and gave into her hands a bill of divorcement,) yet faithless Juda feared not, but went and herself also committed fornication. 9 And her fornication was nothing accounted of; and she committed adultery with wood and stone. 10 And for all these things faithless Juda turned not to me with all her heart, but falsely. 11 And the Lord said to me, Israel has justified himself more than faithless Juda. 12 Go and read these words toward the north, and thou shalt say, Return to me, O house of Israel, saith the Lord; and I will not set my face against you: for I am merciful, saith the Lord, and I will not be angry with you for ever. 13 Nevertheless, know thine iniquity, that thou hast sinned against the Lord thy God, and hast scattered thy ways to strangers under every shady tree, but thou didst not hearken to my voice, saith the Lord. 14 Turn, ye children that have revolted, saith the Lord; for I will rule over you: and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you in to Sion: 15 and I will give you shepherds after my heart, and they shall certainly tend you with knowledge. 16 And it shall come to pass that when ye are multiplied and increased upon the land, saith the Lord, in those days they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of the Holy One of Israel: it shall not come to mind; it shall not be named; neither shall it be visited; nor shall [this] be done any more. 17 In those days and at that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord; and all the nations shall be gathered to it: and they shall not walk any more after the imaginations of their evil heart. 18 In those days the house of Juda, shall come together to the house of Israel, and they shall come, together, from the land of the north, and from all the countries, to the land, which I caused their fathers to inherit. 19 And I said, So be it, Lord, for [thou saidst] I will set thee among children, and will give thee a choice land, the inheritance of the Almighty God of the Gentiles: and I said, Ye shall call me Father; and ye shall not turn away from me. 20 But as a wife acts treacherously against her husband, so has the house of Israel dealt treacherously against me, saith the Lord. 21 A voice from the lips was heard, [even] of weeping

and supplication of the children of Israel: for they have dealt unrighteously in their ways, they have forgotten God their Holy One. 22 Turn, ye children that are given to turning, and I will heal your bruises. Behold, we will be thy servants; for thou art the Lord our God. 23 Truly the hills and the strength of the mountains were a lying refuge: but by the Lord our God is the salvation of Israel. 24 But shame has consumed the labours of our fathers from our youth; their sheep and their calves, and their sons and their daughters. 25 We have lain down in our shame, and our disgrace has covered us: because we and our fathers have sinned before our God, from our youth until this day; and we have not hearkened to the voice of the Lord our God.

So here is a good example that in the Bible, adultery is not exclusively sexual sins. Definition 4 from Webster's 1828.

*4. In old laws, the fine and penalty imposed for the offense of adultery*

*5. In ecclesiastical affairs, the intrusion of a person into a bishopric, during the life of the bishop.*

Now listen to the last definition.

*6. Among ancient naturalists, the grafting of trees was called adultery being considered as an unnatural union.*

If you click on where Mr. Webster said, "See adulterate." This is what you'll find.

<https://webstersdictionary1828.com/Dictionary/Adulterate>

*ADUL'TERATE, verb transitive [Latin adultero, from adulter, mixed, or an adulterer; ad and alter, other.]*

*To corrupt, debase, or make impure by an admixture of baser materials; as, to adulterate liquors, or the coin of a country.*

*ADUL'TERATE, verb intransitive To commit adultery. obsolete*

*ADUL'TERATE, adjective Tainted with adultery; debased by foreign mixture.*

So, I feel it's perfectly justified to include my statement in regards to the Snickers bar and tons of other things that have Bioengineered Ingredients - it's perfectly justified in calling it adultery. Listen to the definition of Bioengineered Ingredients. This is from the USDA website:

<https://www.ams.usda.gov/rules-regulations/be/faq/general#:~:text=The%20Standard%20defines%20bioengineered%20foods,breeding%20or%20found%20in%20nature.>

*The Standard defines bioengineered foods as those that contain detectable genetic material that has been modified through in vitro recombinant deoxyribonucleic acid (rDNA) techniques and for which the modification could not otherwise be obtained through conventional breeding or found in nature.*

Yeah, that's what we want in our food. That's what we should be eating. All I can say, is thank God for forgiveness. Thank God for the Law concerning ignorance. Who knows how much of this garbage we have already put into God's temples - our bodies.

Teresa has received some criticism through the years for being a label reader. That's pretty ridiculous and petty that someone could find fault with that. I wouldn't say she's eased up on label reading at all. She has learned through the years what to buy and what to stay away from. I'm sure her pantry is about the same as most other women. They have bought the same things through the years and they know what's good and what's not - at least according to the labels. So, the other day, she went back and started looking at some of the labels. She started throwing things away. Because some of the things she had been buying, she found now, the labels said Bioengineered Ingredients. They had not always said that - now they are. That's aggravating. If I had thought of it, I should have recommended that she return the items to Aldi's where she shops and complained and got our money back.

Alright, enough of all of that. Let's get back to the Bible study where we have been for the last several weeks.

Why are we on this subject? We are here because I'm doing all I can to turn this world upside down. We live in a world where 99.9999% of the people believe that the despicable doctrine of the divine right of kings still exists. From Britannica.com.

*divine right of kings*

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

Yes. But all it did was transfer the principle of the divine of kings - to the supposed "republican democratic" form of government that the people created - instead of the monarchies. All they did was transfer the divine right of kings from the kings - to the other forms of government they created for themselves - and they said - God has awarded earthly power to whoever we say he awarded it to.

When I talk about the despicable doctrine of the divine right of kings - I'm telling you that it applies to any man or woman that believes they have the power from God - to tell another man, woman, boy or girl how they are supposed to live - based on their definitions of right and wrong, good and evil, lawful and unlawful, legal and illegal.

When Jesus Christ ended all of this foolishness - where God allowed men to reject His Kingship and take to themselves kings like all the other nations - when God ended that foolishness with the sending of His Son the Messiah, the Saviour, the King, God no longer awards temporal power to anyone that is not living exclusively by His Laws, Commandments, Statutes, Judgments and Perfect Will.

Friends, it is this false transferrance of the divine right of kings to a group of people - as opposed to one king or one queen - that is destroying the world.

The only time one man can interfere with another man is when one of them is violating the few Laws of God. That's it. You can't deny a man his lifestyle because someone

passes a “law, statute or ordinance” that says a man can't paint his house purple. You can't deny a man his lifestyle because he has his grass cut to five inches instead of four.

The only time you can interfere with another man's lifestyle is when one of them is breaking the few Laws of God - as in - Thou shalt not murder, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not covet, thou shalt not commit adultery. You can't cause harm to someone else's body. You can't cause harm to someone else's property.

So how does this work? It works like this. You have men in your communities that know the Laws of God. They know the Will of God. It's not just enough to know the Laws - they have to understand what the Will of God is. Turn to Matthew chapter 6. A head knowledge of the Laws of God is not all that's needed. There's more than just knowing what the Laws of God are. Matthew chapter 6, verse 8.

[8] Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him.

[9] After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name.

[10] Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven.

It is the Will of God that a Godly judge in the community must understand. I've said this before, if the Government of God was what men have chosen for themselves, for instance, would there be Speed Limit signs on the roads? Personally, I think they are a very good idea. I think a better name for them would be Suggested Speeds - but I think it's a good idea to let someone know that someone has taken the time to research that under normal driving conditions - a safe speed is - fill in the blank. It may be perfectly safe to drive your car 70, 80, 90 miles per hour in broad daylight. But what if it was raining? What if it was snowing? What if there was ice on the road?

In the Government of God, men are responsible for their actions. It doesn't matter if there's a sign on the side of the road that says 70 - if there's smoke or fog covering the road - you'd be an idiot to drive through that at 70 miles per hour. And if you did that and ran into someone and killed them or destroyed their car - the numbers on the sign on the side of the road are totally useless to a Godly judge that will be making a ruling - not based exclusively on the written Law of God - but on what the Will of God is. When we understand what the Will of God is - then applying the Laws of God is way easier than most people think.

The reason man has 50 different definitions of murder - is because man is not judging concerning the Will of God. So, they come up with more laws and more statutes and more ordinances trying to cover every single breath of life that someone takes.

Knowing what the Will of God is - makes judgment far more simple and easy. My eye caught a video on Youtube where the state of Ohio was trying a young lady for murdering her own mother. And the judge opened the trial by reading the charges...."So and so did violate Ohio statute, 89-09998-432..." It would be so refreshing to hear, well, God forbid concerning murder, but it would be far better to hear, "So and so did violate the Laws of God stating, "Thou shalt not kill." A Godly judge would then apply the Will of God to each case where "Thou shalt not kill" was violated.

Knowing what the Perfect Will of God is - is how our communities are supposed to be Governed since Jesus Christ came in the first century. You can't come up with a specific "law or statute" to try and cover every single act that men are capable of. That is a recipe for disaster and that's why we're in the shape we're in.

I was so sad - years ago - I was in a discussion with a man that I felt like was a "different preacher." He wasn't 501(c)(3) - he at least knew that much. He would, or at least I think he would have never opposed the Government of God and people trying to live in it today. But we were talking about judges. And he made the comment to me that he could never be a judge and he was glad he wasn't "qualified." That just blew me away. He had been a preacher for about 50 years when we were having this conversation and he was admitting to me that he didn't know enough about the Laws of God and the Will of God that he couldn't be a judge. How sad. Turn to I Corinthians chapter 6. Let's begin in verse 1:

[1] Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?

Listen to how Mr. Tyndale translated verse 1:

1 How dare one of you havinge busines with another goo to lawe vnder the wicked and not rather vnder the saintes?

No surprises there with the word dare. We use it the same way today as I believe it was intended back then. "How dare you? How could you possibly think this is the right thing to do?" Mr. Thayer says "not to dread or shun through fear". It is a fearful thing, or

should be a fearful thing to violate the Will of God found here in I Corinthians 6 - but today - people who call themselves Christians do it all the time. And it is disgraceful. It is shameful and brings reproach on the name of Christ.

[2] Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters?

[3] Know ye not that we shall judge angels? how much more things that pertain to this life?

[4] If then ye have judgments of things pertaining to this life, set them to judge who are least esteemed in the community.

Tyndale's translation is this:

4 If ye have iudgementes of worldely matters take them which are despised in ye congregacio and make them iudges.

5 This I saye to youre shame. Is ther vtterly no wyse man amoge you? What not one at all yt can iudge bitwene brother and brother

Here's really good evidence that we have to be careful in the way we understand Scripture - as in particular words. Like in verse 4 - take them to the despised. We would read that today and completely misunderstand the word despised. Today, that word means hated. Remember when we were talking about Jesus saying that His disciples should hate their parents? The words don't mean the same. But the principle is that the very least of the people in our congregations should understand enough of the Law of God and the Will of God - that even the least in the community should be able to make wise judgments.

This I saye to youre shame. Is ther vtterly no wyse man amoge you? What not one at all yt can iudge bitwene brother and brother

This is why I said it was so sad, so concerning, that the "preacher" told me he was unqualified to be a judge. If the "preacher" doesn't even know enough of the Laws of God and the Will of God - we are in really bad shape. It's no wonder. Preachers should be driving this passage home every single time an issue comes up. Instead, it's "call the cops" - "take them the court." Amazing how these churchmen have tossed out the "Old Testament Laws of God" - and then do the same thing with what's in the New.

Friends, I Corinthians 6 is the Law of God. Just as much as Exodus chapter 20 - I

Corinthians 6 is a Law of God. This is how we are supposed to be living our lives. Finish again with verse 5, reading from the KJV.

[5] I speak to your shame. Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren?

[6] But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers.

[7] Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong? why do ye not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded?

Funny how Paul condemns the “law of the unbelievers” here in I Corinthians 6, but supposedly in Romans 13, he commands obedience to the laws of the unbelievers. Amazing how that works. It's no wonder the “church” is powerless and it's no wonder it has lost all credibility. Double-minded men are unstable in all their ways.

Alright, back to Britannica.com and the definition of the divine right of kings.

*The bishop Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627–1704), one of the principal French theorists of divine right, asserted that the king’s person and authority were sacred; that his power was modeled on that of a father’s and was absolute, deriving from God; and that he was governed by reason (i.e., custom and precedent).*

There you have it. The king's person and authority are sacred, it comes from God, and they govern by reason, by custom and precedent.

That is exactly the way things are done in the countries - like the U.S. - where there supposedly is no king. Government is by reason, custom and precedent. But that's not the way God said it is supposed to be done. Government is supposed to be done by the Laws, Statutes, Ordinances, Commandments and Perfect Will of God - and God alone.

All the churchmen will stand up and say, “Yes. When Jesus comes that's the way it will be.” And that is a complete denial that Jesus already came. That is a Jesus that is not the Jesus of the Bible. That is not the Messiah of God. That is not the Saviour of Israel and the world. That is a false Jesus - one that will never come - and not only that - once again - think of the double-mindedness of that statement. These same men that tell us that the Laws of God have been away with - will somehow have those Laws reinstated when their Jesus comes to this earth? Or, will this futuristic Jesus rule according to the CONstitution? Or will he rule according to reason, custom and precedent? When this



supposed Jesus comes to this earth to set up his kingdom, his government, what law will be the law? I know they don't have an answer, because their religion hasn't connected all the dots.

When they start reading a Bible and if they happen to find themselves in Genesis 49 and first read about the "last days" - if they don't connect the "last days" with the coming of Christ - they will be completely unable to put it all together. So when this Jesus of theirs comes to the earth and sets up a one-world government - what will be the law? Can't be God's Law because that mean old awful system was done away with. Can't be Hitler's law. Can't be the Muslims. Can't be the Chinese or the Russians. Has to be the U.S. Constitution. That will be the law that their Jesus uses when he institutes his one-world government. Well, wait a minute, not so fast. What if the World Economic Forum has their way before this Jesus comes back? What if the U.S. Constitution has been done away with? Back to the definition:

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

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

Yes. It is double-mindedness and double-mindedness means that the man is unstable in all his ways. The doctrine of the divine right of kings - which - as we have just seen - does not just apply to kings - is unstable. From Quizlet.com helping college students prepare for political class tests:

<https://quizlet.com/712414088/government-midterm-flash-cards/>

*Question: Which of the following accurately describes the divine right of kings and the social contract theories?*

*Answer: The divine right of kings theory holds that the power of government derives*

*from a divinity; the social contract theory holds that the power of government is acquired from the people.*

And, this is exactly what most people living in - not just the U.S. - but in pretty much every part of the world believes. This is why the world is upside down. This is why the world is in chaos today. This is the root of the world's problems and until Christians - people that claim to be believers in the Jesus Christ of the Bible - until they understand this - and then repent that they have believed in and taught this lie - and they turn to Jesus Christ and His Father's Government over the world - things will not get better - but will continue to get worse and worse. The foundation is off. The root of the tree is off and the fruit just continues to grow.

All the supposed "Christian religions" teach the Kingdom of God. But pretty much every single one of them do not have the timeline correct. They have failed to understand what happened when Shiloh came. They failed to understand that Jesus Christ fulfilled all the prophecies. Quite possibly the most important one being one of the very first ones - the prophecy of Jacob to his sons - concerning the last days and the coming of Shiloh.

Turn again to Genesis chapter 49. This time reading from the KJV. Verse 1:

[1] And Jacob called unto his sons, and said, Gather yourselves together, that I may tell you that which shall befall you in the last days.

[2] Gather yourselves together, and hear, ye sons of Jacob; and hearken unto Israel your father.

Now verse 8 and 9 regarding Juda.

[8] Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee.

[9] Judah is a lion's whelp: from the prey, my son, thou art gone up: he stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion; who shall rouse him up?

[10] The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.

Shiloh is supposed to be the Lawgiver. Shiloh is supposed to be the King. We've looked the sceptre. We've looked at the Law. Let's look at the the coming of Shiloh now and the gathering of the people.

Open your Bibles to Matthew chapter 3. Begin in verse 1. John the Washer will be prophesying concerning the coming of Shiloh.

[1] In those days came John the [Washer], preaching in the wilderness of Judaea,

One of the clearest examples of bapto found anywhere in our Bibles is the story of Elisha and Naaman. When Elisha told Naaman to “bapto” himself seven times in the river Jordan. II Kings 5:14 in the Greek Septuagint says that Naaman went and baptizo himself in the river Jordan seven times - just like the prophet - the one who God used to explain His Law to the people - told Naaman to do. In our English Bibles, the word used is Wash. John was a Washer according to the Law God gave Moses. Baptist, baptism, baptize are made up words that should not be in our Bibles. Verse 2.

[2] And saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.

What is John saying? He is saying that Shiloh is just about here. In the first century. In the last days - Shiloh is almost here. The sceptre, the Lawgiver, the gatherer, Shiloh is just about here. To say that Shiloh is coming in the future - is to deny that Jesus Christ came in the flesh. Friends, this is really a big deal. If we miss this - we miss the whole meaning of Bible. We miss the whole meaning of what man's existence is supposed to be. The fulfillment of Genesis 49 was taking place in the first century. The Government, the Kingdom of God was on the brink of being established.

I'm just amazed at how people have read this for hundreds of years and it just goes right over their heads. The Kingdom is at hand. But then again, it's the exact same thing with Revelation chapter 1. “The time is at hand.” “Well, it doesn't really mean that.”

[3] For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

[4] And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his meat was locusts and wild honey.

[5] Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judaea, and all the region round about Jordan,

[6] And were [washed of him according to the Law God gave Moses] in Jordan, confessing their sins.

Friends, there is simply no other way to understand this. John was not bringing

something new onto the scene. They were confessing their sins according to the only way they knew how - according to the Law God gave Moses. And that Law required blood and water. Sometimes - it was just blood. Sometimes it was just water. And as I have said many times now - sometimes - depending on the situation - water was even more important than the blood. Apparently, because we see the instance of leprosy all over this time period - the water was the predominant factor with these people in Jerusalem and Judea - for the remission of their sins.

[7] But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his [washing according to the Law God gave Moses]

What else could he have been doing? He was leading the people into obeying the Law God gave Moses. Whenever you see people in the Bible immersing themselves in physical H2O water - you are seeing people obeying the Law God gave Moses. Everywhere you see it. Whether in Matthew 3 or in the Book of Acts - you are seeing people fulfilling the Law God gave Moses. That is old covenant. It was a picture, a type and shadow of the water that flowed from Jesus' side - and it is a picture of the Living Water that is Jesus Christ. And not only is it NOT required in the New Covenant - but washing your flesh in physical water for any other purpose than washing dirt off of you - is the same exact thing as if you were having a ceremony and sacrificing animals. It is NOT for the New Covenant world in which we live. I need to hurry. The rest of verse 7 - looking for the gathering of the people in the last days - in identifying the time of the coming of Shiloh.

, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?

[8] Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance:

[9] And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.

[10] And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire.

[11] I indeed [wash] you with water unto repentance:

Of course. The Old Covenant way of repentance was all they had at that time.

but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: He shall [wash] you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire:

Now watch.

[12] Whose fan is in his Hand, and He will throughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner; but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.

This is one of the prophecies concerning Shiloh - all the way back in Genesis 49. This is what Jacob prophesied. John said this concerning Jesus Christ - in the first century.

and He will throughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner;

This is just one instance. There are other gathering fulfillments concerning Jesus. This one is all I have time for this morning. Let's finish the chapter now.

[13] Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be [washed] of him.

Why? Because Jesus needed to repent of His sins and have His sins forgiven? Better be careful. People that tell you that you need to be "baptized" because Jesus was. They either haven't connected the dots - or they are just plain deceivers. Think about it. This is very important. You better have this nailed down.

[14] But John forbad Him, saying, I have need to be [washed] of Thee, and comest Thou to me?

[15] And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered Him.

There again. Jesus was washed - not for the remission of sins - but because the Law God gave Moses required washing - a ceremonial washing - of every thirty year old that was entering into the service of the temple. Jesus' washing was done to fulfill the Law God gave Moses. And when you see others in the first century being washed in physical water - it is for the purpose of fulfilling the Law God gave Moses.

[16] And Jesus, when he was washed, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto Him, and He saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon Him:

[17] And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased.

The Lion of the tribe of Juda had come. The One Who would be given the sceptre of

Juda, the Lawgiver and the gatherer of the people had come. He came in the first century. He came in the Last Days of the Old Covenant. He's not coming again. He did all that He was supposed to do when He came in the first century. Now - all that's left - we are supposed to live like we believe this.

The last days were fulfilled. The sceptre was given to King Jesus, the Lion of the tribe of Juda. The Lawgiver was established. We need to start living according to this Kingship and according to this Lawgiver and Law. The timing of the establishment of the Kingdom of God is the first century. The timing of the Last Days of Genesis 49 is the Last Days of the Old Covenant world.