

FALSE WITNESS

**How the Christian Church
Built a Foundation of Lies**

KEITH MICHAEL

FALSE WITNESS

HOW THE CHRISTIAN
CHURCH BUILT A
FOUNDATION OF LIES

KEITH MICHAEL

KEITHMICHAEL.ORG

FALSE WITNESS—Copyright © 2021 Keith Michael. All rights reserved.

Published by Keith Michael Publishing | KeithMichael.org

ISBN Paperback: 979-8-4555-1084-7

Unless otherwise noted, most Scripture quotations are from the “NIV” Holy Bible New International Version®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984, 2011 International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved. Other Scripture quotations marked as: “CEV” are from the Contemporary English Version Copyright © 1995 by American Bible Society. Used by permission. / “NLT” are taken from the Holy Bible, New Living Translation, copyright © 1996. Used by permission of Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., Wheaton, Illinois 60189. All rights reserved. / “AMP” are taken from the Amplified® Bible, Copyright © 1954, 1958, 1962, 1964, 1965, 1987 by The Lockman Foundation Used by permission. www.lockman.org / “NKJV” are taken from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved. / “KJV” and “YLT” are taken from the King James Version and Young’s Literal Translation, both of which are Public Domain. / “TNIV” are taken from Today’s New International Version. Copyright © 2001, 2005 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of International Bible Society. All rights reserved worldwide. “TNIV” and “Today’s New International Version” are trademarks registered in the United States Patent and Trademark Office by International Bible Society. Use of either trademark requires the permission of International Bible Society.

Permission is GRANTED to anyone to copy and redistribute this book or electronic file at no cost as a whole and in its entirety PROVIDED the copy is redistributed as a stand-alone single file (not “wrapped” by another file or content), without any cost or fee(s) whatsoever, and retains the author’s copyright notices, and the book or file remains unedited, unannotated, and/or unmodified in every and any way. You can get and link to the latest electronic version of this book in various file formats at the author’s website at KeithMichael.org.

Version 1.0—RELEASE COPY. This work may be periodically updated by the author/publisher with various corrections, additions and/or deletions to the work without a change of ISBN and without notice, guarantee or warranty of any kind.

*This book is dedicated to all of us
who have ever been trapped by the lies of the Christian Church
and simply needed a path to find their way out
and into the true Light and Love of GOD.*

FALSE WITNESS

CONTENTS

Preface	13
<i>Exposing the Lies of Tradition.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>Revealing Truths</i>	<i>18</i>
1—Who Changed the Bible and Why?.....	21
<i>The Business of Christianity.....</i>	<i>26</i>
2—Heretics	32
<i>A Holy Tradition of Error is Reborn</i>	<i>40</i>
3—Where Did the Bible Come From?	47
<i>The First Bible.....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>Why Only Four Gospels?</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>Other Early Christian Writings</i>	<i>66</i>
4—Christianity’s Non-Jewish Gospel.....	68
5—Paul or Jesus?	77
<i>Jesus versus Paul</i>	<i>82</i>
6—More Roman than Jewish.....	86

7—Peter and the Wolf	91
<i>Paul's Other Jesus: History versus the Bible</i>	<i>96</i>
8—Pagan Rome's Takeover of the Jewish Church	101
9—'Judaizers' in the Church!.....	106
<i>Paul Insults the Super Apostles</i>	<i>112</i>
<i>Paul's gospel is Dead</i>	<i>115</i>
10—Paul's Thorn.....	117
<i>A Tale of Two Benjamites.....</i>	<i>127</i>
11—Falsifying the Law	131
<i>The Lying Pen of the Scribes</i>	<i>135</i>
<i>Sacrifices</i>	<i>139</i>
<i>Who was Really Righteous: Cain or Abel?.....</i>	<i>141</i>
12—Abolishing Falsehood.....	144
<i>Fulfilling the Law</i>	<i>150</i>
13—Jesus or Mithras?.....	154
<i>Paul's Jesus.....</i>	<i>156</i>
14—The Witness of Two or Three	165
<i>The Books of Peter.....</i>	<i>166</i>
15—A 'Renewed' Covenant	172
16—Paul's Lawless Gospel	179
17—Removing Paul's Witness.....	184
18—Rebuilding the Witness of Jesus.....	188
<i>Messiah.....</i>	<i>189</i>
<i>No Sin is Greater than Another?</i>	<i>189</i>
<i>'Filthy Rags' Righteousness</i>	<i>190</i>
<i>God Cannot Look Upon Sin?</i>	<i>192</i>

19—The Real Gospel of Jesus.....	194
<i>Inherited Sin</i>	<i>195</i>
<i>Substitutionary Atonement</i>	<i>197</i>
20—Misquoting Isaiah.....	207
<i>Lucifer: A New Name for the Devil</i>	<i>211</i>
<i>A Virgin Birth?.....</i>	<i>214</i>
<i>Unreliable Manuscripts</i>	<i>218</i>
21—Isaiah 53: The Suffering Servant.....	221
<i>Isaiah 53</i>	<i>225</i>
22—The True Name of GOD	229
<i>Revealing the Name of GOD</i>	<i>232</i>
<i>Judaism’s Obfuscating of the Name of GOD.....</i>	<i>235</i>
<i>Christianity’s Hiding of the Name of GOD</i>	<i>236</i>
<i>Restoring the Name of GOD</i>	<i>238</i>
23—Apologetics: Defending the Indefensible.....	241
24—The New Light of a Second Reformation.....	249
<i>A Second Reformation</i>	<i>251</i>
<i>The Law of GOD.....</i>	<i>252</i>
<i>The Nature of GOD</i>	<i>258</i>
<i>Prayer.....</i>	<i>265</i>
<i>The Nature of Jesus</i>	<i>266</i>
<i>The Nature of Man</i>	<i>267</i>
<i>The Church</i>	<i>268</i>
<i>The Bible</i>	<i>269</i>
<i>The Nature of Good and Evil</i>	<i>270</i>
<i>Heaven and Hell</i>	<i>275</i>

<i>Holy Days</i>	275
<i>Vegetarian</i>	277
<i>The Name of GOD</i>	279
25— Conclusion	281
How to Help Spread the Word.....	284
About Keith Michael.....	285

PREFACE

*“The TRUTH does not mind being questioned.
Only the LIE demands that you cannot challenge it.”*

— Unknown

Have you ever felt that there is something just not quite right with what you have been told to believe about GOD? That there’s a disconnect somewhere between what you are reading in the Bible and what your church is teaching, and you just cannot quite put your finger on what that is?

Within our deepest heart of hearts, there is within every Christian the suspicion that Christianity may not be 100% correct in everything the Church teaches. But we convince ourselves that whatever those things might be they are so minor they’re not worth bothering with or getting upset over.

The problem is, we're not trained theologians; we're just everyday people trying to be what GOD wants us to be. We don't have the background, the experience, the knowledge, or the deep education to even know if what the Church has been teaching us is 100% correct, or an unrepentant bald-faced lie. We simply put our faith and trust in the fallible people we have grown to love, like our fellow Christian friends, pastors and other Church leaders. It's their job not to lead us astray. But we still wouldn't know if what these beloved friends are teaching us is truth or mere man-made tradition.

In that respect, I need to tell you that in doing so, in simply believing what the Church has told us to believe, we've not really put our faith in GOD so much as we have put our faith in MAN.

Sure, we can attempt to say that GOD is leading our friends and pastors, but again, that is an assumption; we don't really know if GOD is leading them or not. We have nothing to compare what is being preached to what the truth is or might be.

This book was specifically written to give you a comparison of facts that you may be missing; to unearth the esoteric religious knowledge of scholars and make what might otherwise be complex easily understandable. I will show you, in easy-to-understand terms, what is truth and why; and what is fiction and why.

And to borrow a quote from a famed movie: You won't know how deep the rabbit hole goes until you take the red pill—that is, read the book cover to cover.

You may read something that makes you upset or even angry. I'm going to be challenging long-held Christian traditions, it's going to happen with a lot of us. Some of this is going to be painful to read. We just won't want to believe that we have been this deceived!

But go ahead, set the book down for a while. Pray. Seek GOD's leading. This book is not an effort to destroy your faith in GOD; just the opposite actually. And when you're ready to keep going, please keep reading. This book has a marvelous ending and New Light that will encourage you to seek GOD anew.

Please don't just skip to the end thinking you can read the last chapter to get the whole story, because you can't. You need the knowledge and foundation of understanding of who did what, where, when, and why.

Exposing the Lies of Tradition

When you see the term "Church" capitalized within this book, I am not just talking about the Roman Catholic Church, but the Christian Church in general, both Catholic and Protestant.

What we as Christian believers have done is not so much put our faith in GOD as we have really put our faith in the Church, that is: the PEOPLE running the Church—past and present.

The Church is not GOD, although the people running the Church quite often act like or even claim to be speaking for GOD.

I assure you—they are not speaking for GOD.

GOD needs no one speaking for them.

Honestly, I would not trust any of the pastors I've known throughout my life to speak for GOD. They were good and nice people, but I still wouldn't trust them to build MY relationship with GOD for me.

Although I will be exposing the lies of the Church layer by layer, please keep in mind that this is not some atheist's exposé

written with the goal of shoveling undeserved dirt onto the Christian Church.

I am not an Atheist.

I am very much a believer in GOD.

But I can no longer hold any amount of faith in the Church's version of "God".

Millennia ago, the men who built the foundations that would become the mainstream modern Christian Church essentially "dropped the ball", if you will, when it came to a truthful understanding of who and what GOD is.

Rather than keeping with the truths they were handed, either via direct inspiration, actual conversations with God, or upholding the truths that others had delivered to them, they abandoned the understandings they were given and instead inserted their own understandings, right or wrong, unintentionally or deliberately, into the writ.

Through little more than simple man-made tradition, what all these purveyors of "God's Word" have essentially and effectively left us with is a mishmash of histories, beliefs, laws, dogmas, doctrines, views and traditions that have absolutely nothing to do with an eternal and unchanging GOD; and everything to do with what was religiously popular 3,500, 2,000, 1,500, 500, and even just 100 years ago. And this pop-religion continues even now into the present day as so-called "mainstream Christianity".

Furthermore, I want to emphasize that this book is not about attempting to destroy people's faith in GOD. That is not at all my intention. Just the opposite is true, in fact. I want to bolster and rekindle your faith in GOD.

What this book will do, however, is destroy your faith in falsehoods by blatantly exposing them through history, examination, facts, archeology, and GOD-given reason. It will turn upside-down what you thought was unassailable Christian truth as espoused by the ostensibly all-knowing

infallible people of the Church, and wholly expose the lies, half-truths, and unfounded beliefs for what they are—man-made tradition masquerading as the “Word of God”.

My long-term goal is not to destroy but to REFORM the Christian Church back into something much closer to what Jesus and the Apostles most likely taught.

My immediate goal is to start conversations; begin unearthing deep lies of tradition; and exposing ungodly Christian beliefs and doctrines by bringing them into the light of well-known historical facts and rock-solid scholarship.

My ultimate goal, one that will most likely happen after I have long since passed on, is to bring about a Second Reformation of the Christian Church!

Reformation is never a popular ideal—especially when you are the target of it.

Oh, as Christians, we say we love Reformation!

No, you don’t.

You love dumping on the Catholic Church for reasons that you don’t really understand, but since they are not on your Protestant team, they, the Catholics, are automatically “WRONG!” about all things Christian. Meanwhile you, the simple trusting uneducated Christian merely sitting in church reading your Bible, are automatically “RIGHT!” about all things Christian.

Without pulling any punches for anyone, this book will unabashedly show you why BOTH Catholics and Protestants, and even the ancient Priesthood, are all dead wrong about a good number of things that many Christians today consider “core” or “foundational” or “immovable” doctrines.

GOD is not going to strike you dead for knowing the truth. The Church might, like they tried with Luther and the other Reformers, but that’s another story.

But beyond illustrating and exposing the Church's deepest errors, this book will also point out what is RIGHT about Christianity and what doesn't need to change.

However, reformation doesn't happen overnight.

If history is any indication, reformation literally takes centuries. At least the last one with Luther and the other Reformers did. However, Luther didn't live within our Information Age, and he didn't have the internet, so things may move much more quickly this time around.

I am pretty certain that I will not be the one who sets up a new Second Reformed Christian Church that leads millions into a new understanding and new light of GOD. I believe I will be long dead by then. But much of what forms the basis of this book, will hopefully become the understandings of a much more powerful Christian Church in the future centuries to come.

Revealing Truths

Finally, let me be upfront with everyone about my purpose and what I am doing because there will be many people who will want to mischaracterize me, my motives and the facts laid out within this book to protect their traditions. First,

I am NOT attacking the Bible.

The Bible is what it is. What I am attacking are errant traditions that are completely man-made ABOUT the Bible; both what the Bible is and what it is not. The Bible is not GOD in book form. However, the Bible can and does help us see GOD more clearly through the events and witnesses of the various peoples who wrote it.

I am NOT attacking GOD.

I am very much on the same path as the other Reformers. Calling into question man's errant traditions about the Bible

and about GOD does NOT equate to “an attack” on GOD. Just the opposite, in fact. Like Luther, I am on the exact same path of attempting to correct centuries of errant man-made “holy tradition” that are keeping us from seeing GOD much more clearly and in a light that is much more holy than what your personally chosen church has ever exposed you to.

Consider this book my “95 Theses”, if you will.

Finally, I am NOT attacking or “persecuting” the Church.

No one is being “persecuted” when they are merely being “corrected” or contradicted by the facts.

And that is ALL I am doing.

Exposing facts your church is hiding from you.

Yes, I do come across as “chastising” to be sure, and quite often within this book it may look like I am “attacking” the Church. But keep in mind, in every instance, what I am actually attacking, and for good reason, is MAN-MADE so-called “HOLY TRADITION” that the Church is peddling.

Ironically, this is the same brand of “holy tradition” that Protestants accused the Roman Catholic Church of building! Now the Protestant Christian Church has gone and done the exact same thing, built a mountain of Protestant “holy tradition” that has zero basis in fact, but has become accepted truth by the masses because that is what good people the world over have become indoctrinated to believe.

If your journey and desire is to see GOD in the clearest light possible, then please read on. The following pages will, layer by layer, strip away literally millennia and then centuries of bogus man-made traditions masquerading as the “Word of God”, all in an effort to get to the true Heart and Character of GOD.

My hope and desire is to, at the very least, expose you to the truth of GOD through facts and GOD-given reason and logic. And if enough people of like minds congregate as a result of seeing GOD much more clearly, then I will have achieved

KEITH MICHAEL

my goals of being at least one little cog in the history of the
Second Reformation of the Christian Church.

1

Who Changed the Bible and Why?

“The fact that certain doctrines have been held as truth for many years by our people is not proof that our ideas are infallible.”

— E.G. White

The last Reformation spearheaded by Luther made a grand push away from what Rome’s Catholicism (meaning Universalism) had built. But Luther and the other Reformers made an egregious mistake—they ASSUMED that God had somehow protected the Roman Catholic Bible from error. In fact, they built an entire doctrine around their assumption, calling it *Sola Scriptura*, or “Scripture Alone”, as the basis of building their newly reformed faith in God.

In accepting the Catholic Church’s Bible as their foundation of belief, the newly reformed Protestant Christian Church did not so much push away from the Catholic Church’s errors as they sealed their own fate to forever repeat them.

Protestants became little more than a shadow copy of the very mother church they held in deep contempt. Reforming Protestants would become in essence little more than Roman Catholic “Lite”.

While Reforming Protestant some 500 years ago considered the Catholic Church errant in its views, beliefs, and “holy tradition”, these reformers failed to consider that the very Bible the Catholic Church had assembled was in fact a product of those very same errant views, errant beliefs, and errant holy traditions.

Many of us don’t even know that the Reformers changed the Bible just 500 years ago.

It’s true.

They literally dropped entire books from the Roman Catholic Bible. These books, known collectively as the “Apocrypha” or “hidden” books, were considered by the Reformers to be *less than* inspired and had no place in the corpus of Christian thought nor in their Bible canon (ie. standard). This is why, even today, the so-called Catholic Bible is slightly larger than the Protestant Bible.

Just so we know, these Apocryphal books are not “Catholic” books, they are “Jewish” books, and they are part a body of Jewish writings dating before the time of Jesus, or what Christian scholars refer to as the “inter-testamental” period, or that period of time between when the last of the latter prophets had written and when the Roman Catholic “New Testament” books began to appear in the latter half of the first century.

To many Protestants, these ostensibly “Catholic” books are an abomination. Evil. Some of us have even been bullied and told that if we dare read these “hidden” books of the Bible we’ll *lose our salvation!*

Seriously, I was told this growing up.

Well, I am here to tell you that the days of idiotic scare tactics are over. The Information Age has brought a great deal

of New Light into Christianity and this book is a product of this enlightenment.

What most of us do not see or fail to realize (many Christian scholars are guilty of not seeing this on purpose) is that while erecting their new doctrine of *Sola Scriptura*, “Scripture Alone”, Luther and the other Reformers were at the same time literally junking books from the Roman Catholic Bible, dropping whole books from “God’s Word”, calling them “uninspired”, unholy, even apostate!

Do you see the massive contradiction here? You cannot first call something inerrant and infallibly inspired of God and then proceed to drop errant and/or uninspired books from it!

This makes you a hypocrite.

Yes, we can attempt to say that AFTER these Apocryphal books were dropped from the Bible, that suddenly the whole Bible was now totally cleaned of error and wholly inspired. Yes! God used the Reformers to finally “fix it” once and for all!

However, that would be yet another assumption in error. The moment a book gets dropped from the Bible, in whatever era, someone or some ones, somewhere, is guilty of not listening to GOD. This includes any changes or corrections, that might have happened along the way and in any era, including our own modern era.

What most of us don’t know is that well before the Reformation, the Catholic Church itself was adding and then dropping books from the Bible canon. Different factions of the Catholic Church regarded some books as inspired while other factions regarded them as uninspired. The factions disputed with each other, each creating their own “canons” of what they saw and felt the leading of God to be.

So much for inerrant inspiration of previous generations.

Who was right?

Which Church faction was or was not listening to GOD?

Do you see the predicament this places us within?

Much later, after excising the Apocrypha from the Bible, the Reformers themselves, vehemently disagreed on other books that should have been dropped as well, but ultimately were not.

Even today the Protestant Church tries to demand that “the Bible is not a product of the Catholic Church!” and that the Bible is not a product of “contests and controversies” between warring factions of early Christians!

But this is a lie.

Historically, we can see via the facts already in play, that contests and controversies WERE indeed the case: The Bible IS a product of the Roman Catholic Church, and it WAS decidedly assembled through deep controversies between a number of disputing (I dare say warring) Christian factions within the early Catholic Church itself beginning in the 2nd century, and then culminating with the Protestant Church’s dropping of books in the 17th. And this is not even the latest controversy of change the Bible has undergone in the modern era BY “Bible-believing” Christians!

Significant changes, corrections, within the Bible are STILL happening today! And as this book progresses, I will show you what these errors are and, perhaps more importantly, why they happened.

The main point here is that you cannot in fact nor in good conscience demand something to be “inerrant” (meaning, “without errors”) when you are CORRECTING ERRORS within it!

This makes you a liar; or at best a hypocrite.

Of course, the biggest latest change to the Bible was with the Protestant Reformers. But even once the Apocrypha had been dropped, there was still deep disagreement and controversy as to other books the Reformers argued over, other books they demanded still needed to be dropped from their new version of the Bible.

Who was right?

Which of these Reformers were not listening to GOD?

Were any of them really listening to GOD?

Or were they just following their own preconceptions and perceptions (traditions) they'd inherited from the mother Church?

Again, do you see the predicament we place ourselves within?

We as everyday (again, mostly uneducated) Christians are now stuck choosing sides based on who we know and like and who we don't know or don't like.

It becomes little more than a popularity contest.

Our decision has nothing to do with any real knowledge of the history of the Bible, but only about who we have heard of and like or don't like. This is not a very good methodology to use to settle an issue this important!

Also, when I say everyday Christians are "uneducated", I am not attempting to be insulting. Most of us aren't Bible scholars. We've not been to seminary. We just learn what we know by sitting in church and reading the occasional Christian book by whomever is most popular that year.

And just because you've read the Bible cover to cover one or more times doesn't make you a Bible scholar, nor does it automatically imbue you with the knowledge of Greek or Hebrew.

What it does do is make you susceptible to falsehood if you don't know the underlying languages, cultures, or history behind the Bible's various books.

Knowing ABOUT a book is just as important, if not more so, as knowing what is WITHIN the book.

So, let's get back to this picking and choosing which books belong in the Bible based on who we know and like and see where this leads us.

Most of us have heard of Martin Luther as the *de facto* leader of the Reformation. As Protestants, we simply assume that Luther was listening to God. This being the case, let's say you side with Luther about which books should be included or dropped from the Bible. Is that a fair assumption? If it is, then your infallible, inerrant and wholly inspired "Word of God" still contains errors!

What most of us as everyday Christians do now know is that Luther wanted to junk not only the Apocrypha, but the last five books of the current Protestant Bible as well! Your siding with Luther means that the books of Hebrews, James, 1-3 John, Jude, and Revelation would be gone because Lutherans just 500 years ago believed them to be uninspired for various reasons and not worthy of being included in the Bible! In fact, that is the very reason why these books appear at the BACK of your Bible.

GOD did not put them there.

Luther did.

Because, like the Apocrypha, he didn't like them.

Surprised?

Are you wondering why your personally (randomly?) selected favorite flavor of Protestant Christian church didn't tell you these things?

I'll tell you why ...

The Business of Christianity

Churches are not in the habit of creating actual controversies. You can have a church controversy over what to serve at the church potluck or what color to paint the building; but you are not allowed to have a real doctrinal one, at least not a foundational one. The reason should be obvious—it's bad for business. And at the end of the day that is exactly what a

church is—a business. It is a business that caters to people of varying degrees and understandings of faith.

Each of these businesses support their carefully chosen market segments and then attempt to grow those segments (customers) through advertising, word-of-mouth (they call it “witnessing”) and “missions”, which is just another word for “opening a new store”. Various churches will also sponsor community events, like “evangelistic series”, where they attempt to scare the hell out of people with their take on apocalyptic events, “End Times Prophecy”, and the like, which are very subjective tales usually lifted from very loose or decidedly Christian interpretations of Daniel and Revelation.

Churches also like to be “on fire” for God with “radical love” and other such hip phrases, which usually means that they have a large and thriving youth population that brings in more customers from the local high schools and colleges.

More customers mean more money.

I think you get the picture.

Strip away all the religious pomp, hype, trimmings, and warm-fuzzy mood music, and at the root of the “body of Christ” is—a business. A business selling what its customers want to buy.

The product is supposed to be learning the knowledge of GOD and helping the needy; and your tithes and offerings of cash are what complete the sale. The better the product, the bigger and more ostentatious the church building, the more professional the band and music, the more charismatic the speaker, the more money the church can collect as revenue to expand the business’ operation.

Many churches today have full-time production staff for media, music, counseling, even entire schools and universities. Churches, no matter their size, have payrolls, budgets, rent, mortgages, utility bills and office expenses, and if they are big enough, they have media airtime and advertising to pay for.

The last thing they need is a real doctrinal controversy that might turn otherwise paying customers away!

So, when you are sitting in church, or a Sunday School, or Sabbath School class, the last thing you are going to hear is something controversial, let alone “heretical”, that might cause you to have real doctrinal questions, or God forbid, leave and take your money elsewhere.

Ergo, what gets preached from the pulpits and in Sunday Schools is a kind of lowest common denominator message. It will be something that titillates the ears and desires of the most people; something that will be least offensive, and the most warm-and-fuzzy motivational kind of uplifting message that leaves people wanting to come back for more.

The LAST thing your church leadership wants you or anyone else talking about are controversial topics that might cast doubt down upon the leadership or make people think that the leadership either doesn’t know what they are preaching, or are deliberately hiding, or that they are peddling a LIE in the name of God.

The Church is a business, and the product is a Gospel you as a paying customer are most likely already familiar with. So as a pastor, you don’t want to be delivering a product with preaching that calls into question long-held fundamental or core beliefs—even if those strongly-held beliefs are complete man-made tradition and duplicitous hogwash—beginning with the unfounded doctrine of “Scripture Alone” that I have already mentioned.

So here is the foundational truth you need to keep in the back of your mind:

Pastors lie.

All of them.

To some degree.

About the Gospel. About the Bible. About Jesus. About God.

The chances are your pastor is already aware of ALL the things I expose within the pages of this book; they learned them while they were in seminary. But the odd disconnect is, seminaries are not churches. And for your freshly minted pastor with his or her shiny new M. Div. degree to get hired by a denomination and church, they must sign a contract, an agreement, that says they will essentially toe the party line of whatever denomination's "statements of faith" say. In effect, what they are forced to do is conceal the lies in exchange for a job in the ministry and their resulting paycheck.

Of course, no pastor enters the ministry because the pay is exemplary. Pastors are notoriously underpaid. I'm merely making the point that they are under the thumb, if you will, of the larger denomination they work for. A church board can fire a pastor in a heartbeat for preaching denominational "heresy".

Pastors have been fired for wanting to change the day of a local church's worship back to the seventh day of the week; because, well, that is the day Jesus and the Apostles kept.

This is but one example.

You get the picture.

People want to go to church on Sunday because that is what they are used to doing. It's tradition. And if some pastor shows up wanting to change the church's worship day to the same one that Jesus actually observed, well that's heresy in their minds, and it's time to get rid of the pastor. The pastor is not wrong, but the tradition always steamrolls over the truth if that is what the congregation wants. After all it's the congregation's money that keeps the church's lights on and the bills paid.

All of this is a rather long way of saying that Reformation is NOT going to happen in the Church.

It's just not.

Where it is going to happen is at the grass-roots level with individual Christian people looking to build a deeper, more truthful connection with GOD.

Luther wanted to reform the Catholic Church; he didn't want to start a new one. But the arrogance of the Catholic Church's leadership just would not abide this upstart monk's reformational ideas. The Catholic Church considered Luther a heretic, a non-conformist, a hell-bound apostate for abandoning the tenets and teachings of the mother Church.

Incidentally, being a "heretic" isn't what you think. The root of this term comes from the Greek which simply means "to choose", or one who chooses; and it has nothing to do with being a God-hating apostate. Paul originally uses the Greek term "*hairetikos*" to describe people who didn't "choose" his brand of gospel. Then the Catholic Church used the term in its own derogatory fashion to label dissenters, not just reforming Protestants, but anyone, going back as far as the first and second centuries, as "heretics".

Marcion in the 2nd century was labeled a "heretic". So-called "Judaizing" Christians in the 3rd and 4th centuries were also called "heretics". So, Luther wasn't the only one. ALL the Reformers were considered "heretics" preaching *apostate lies of Satan from the pit of hell!* (Note the drama to add emphasis to an otherwise innocuous term.)

And as a modern Reformer this is exactly what your Church will call me, or you, or anyone for that matter, who begins to interfere with their business model and their cash-flow.

Your personally chosen Protestant church is now in the exact same position the Catholic Church was 500 years ago when the Reformers began preaching their reformed message. And like the entrenched Catholic Church, the Protestant Church's leadership is just as arrogant, just as unmoving, and just as locked into their business model as the Catholic Church

FALSE WITNESS

was 500 years ago when Reformers were leaving it in droves and taking their money with them.

2

Heretics

*“I have carefully considered what it means
to be a heretic and I cannot make it mean more than this:
a heretic is a man with whom you disagree.”
— Sebastian Castellio, French Reformer*

Perhaps the first thing that comes to mind when someone begins challenging long-held religious beliefs with a message that is different than the status-quo is that this someone is being (gasp!) “heretical” or is a “heretic”. The fact is, people really don’t understand what a heretic actually is. The Church makes it appear that heresy and heretics are hell-bound, God-hating apostates infused with the lies of Satan! The drama and scare tactic usually work to keep the more simple-minded (religiously uneducated) people away from whomever the Church leadership doesn’t want causing problems with their carefully groomed (indoctrinated) customer base.

The last thing the Church needs is for its people to start a controversy that might make dozens of people upset or wondering about the leadership's competency.

Well, let me begin by telling you up-front that your church's leadership, if they have been to any kind of real seminary, is *already* aware of just about everything that you will read in this book. If they aren't, then you shouldn't be learning anything about God from them in the first place. And if they are, then they have been deliberately lying to you. Deliberately withholding information.

Remember I said earlier, pastors lie. This is what I mean. Pastors are typically under contract by the denomination to lie to you. Honestly, it's not their fault, per se. By contract, they must keep certain facts hidden from you and they must paint a deliberately one-sided perspective of these facts that simply upholds the Church's (denomination's) man-made traditions. They really don't have the option of challenging the denomination's dogma in order to get to the historical truth.

Most pastors, if cornered privately by you, will admit to knowing most if not all the facts I lay out within this book. They will probably attempt to excuse the facts with all kinds of different rationalizations and "spin", to be sure, but they *do* know about them. Maybe they actually believe the denominational spin, maybe they don't. I'm just letting you know there's a legal agreement in play here as well.

One thing I do not want you to be afraid of is recognizing religious bullying, because with some Churches and some pastors it is going to happen. YOU will suddenly be called names, and you will become the "heretic" for daring to challenge the Church and almighty God! Depending on how conservative (or traditional) your church is, you might even be told that you will lose your Salvation in Christ by even reading this book!

See the drama?

Don't buy into the bullying.

No Christian scholar who has been to seminary and is worth his or her salt would ever put up with any kind of religious bullying. In fact, they would likely laugh at you for even suggesting someone could lose their salvation by questioning Church doctrine. That IS part of what they do in seminary, well, the better ones anyway.

Keep in mind that you are entitled to ask questions of your pastors and church leadership. And they have an obligation not to lie to you. You are not challenging GOD; but your church pastor or leadership is engaging in egregious SIN by lying to you and not coming clean with the facts.

You are not challenging GOD by asking questions.

No, who and what you are really challenging is the Church.

Not GOD.

Not Jesus.

Not the Bible.

The Church.

Or more to the point, the Church's man-made tradition.

Over the centuries, the Church has gotten very good at selling the misnomer assumption that it alone speaks for God.

It doesn't.

GOD speaks for GOD.

What the Church does is get in the way of that conversation and muddies it all up with its man-made traditions, its Pagan Bible, and its Pagan dogma.

Yes, you read that right, I said "Pagan Bible".

"Keith! You cannot call the Bible 'Pagan'!"

Yes, I can, because that is exactly what it is. The terms "Pagan" and "Bible" are inescapably related, inextricably linked, and as you keep reading this book you will understand how and why.

Keep in mind that "Pagan" and "Gentile" are just two ways of saying the same thing; they imply and define the exact same

thing: a person of a culture that is not Jewish. In the New Testament, the Greek term *hellēn* is typically rendered as “Gentile”, but what it really means is someone who is Greek, or in the larger sense of the term, anyone who isn’t Jewish; this includes Romans as well. You may have heard the term “Hellenized Jew”, this is someone who is Jewish but was raised in the Greek culture. They might be “Jewish”, but they are also “Pagan”, meaning Greek, not really “Jewish” in culture.

Another Greek term that gets rendered as “Gentile” is *ethnikos*, meaning someone of an ethnic background who is also not Jewish.

Thayer’s Greek Lexicon renders the term *ethnikos* with the following explanation,

“ἔθνικός, -ή, -όν, (ἔθνος);

1. *adapted to the genius or customs of a people, peculiar to a people, national ...*
2. *suited to the manners or language of foreigners, strange, foreign; so in the grammarians [cf. our ‘gentile’].*
3. *in the N. T. savoring of the nature of pagans, alien to the worship of the true God, heathenish; substantively, ὁ ἔθνικός, the pagan, the Gentile ...”*¹

Within the Old Testament Hebrew, the term that often gets rendered as “Gentile” is *gôy*, meaning “heathen” or people who are not of the nation of Israel, or non-Hebrew.

¹ “Thayer’s Greek–English Lexicon is a revised and translated edition of C.G. Wilke’s *Clavis Novi Testamenti* - first published in 1841. After numerous revisions by both Wilke and his successor, C.L. Wilibald Grimm, Thayer took over the project. Thayer devoted nearly thirty years to the translation that first appeared in 1885, and updated edition in 1889.” —Wikipedia, Joseph Henry Thayer

I just wanted you to know that I was not just making something up. “Pagan” and “Gentile” mean the exact same thing within a Biblical context—anyone who is not Hebrew or Jewish.

So, when I assert that the Church is “Pagan” or that the Bible is “Pagan”, I do so for clarity and not just because I want to call the Church nasty names. The Church is not what the Church thinks it has made itself into.

Huh?

Let me say it another way.

The Church is NOT Jewish—not by a long shot and for very explainable reasons that we will cover as we dig deeper into the history and formation of the Christian Church as it was coming to power in Rome.

You may think you’re sort of Jewish because as a Christian you have been told that you worship the “Jewish” Messiah; but you’re not culturally Jewish.

Not even close.

In fact, the Church is so UN-Jewish today that I dare say that if Jesus showed up in your church one Sunday morning and began preaching, you and your congregation would literally be aghast and would want to throw him out of the building!

You would.

Because the same things Jesus would be preaching are many of the same things you will read about in this book.

About now you may be confused.

How am I going to quote GOD without using the Bible? Am I some kind of prophet?

No. In fact, I will be quoting the Bible; a lot of it. And I will be doing the exact same thing your Church does—I will be picking and choosing scriptures that more closely match the Character of GOD than the way your Church hypocritically picks and chooses. The only difference will be that I am not

trying to tell you that the entire Bible is without error. I will be picking and choosing my way AROUND the errors.

“Wait, Keith, if there are errors in the Bible, how do you know what they are?”

I will show you and tell you WHY I am picking and choosing the scriptures that I cite and why your Church does or doesn't. I will be using logic and reason to illustrate something your Church ignores, or tries to ignore, which is Biblical CONTRADICTION.

You see, here's the problem your Church has that I do not. Your church is being a hypocrite because of the errant man-made belief of “Sola Scriptura”. Because of this doctrine the Church is stuck. It has built a construct that demands that the Bible is 100% inspired of God in its every word and that includes translations. The Church demands that there are no contradictions within the Bible, not real ones anyway.

Because of their belief in *Sola Scriptura*, the Church has built this other LIE that says something to the effect of “every book from Genesis to Revelation is in perfect harmony with God!”

In other words, the Bible can have no contradictions whatsoever. To have a contradiction between books would mean that someone is not telling the truth.

Because of this belief in a perfect Bible, the Church does not have the luxury of picking and choosing which scriptures it likes and which ones it can (or would like to) IGNORE.

I am not saddled with their man-made problem and you shouldn't be either.

The entire doctrine of “Scripture Alone” is bogus man-made manufactured holy tradition and nothing more.

It's completely illogical and hypocritical because the Church STILL dances its way around scriptures that destroy its own doctrines. (We see major examples of this later in the book.)

As we just learned, Luther and the Reformers chucked a bunch of books out of the Bible, and Luther wanted to chuck even the last five out as well. (Again, remember, that is why those books appear at the end of the Bible, because Luther stuck them there as being less than inspired.)

Even before the Reformation, the Catholic Church itself was adding and dropping books.² Was God making mistakes with the Bible? Or was it just men squabbling, adding and dropping what was popular at the time?

It was indeed the latter.

Again, the Church is adamant that the Bible was NOT assembled as a contest (ie. disputing, questioning, arguing, infighting) of different peoples at different times. But history shows us that was exactly what was happening! Protestants dropping books from the Bible was indeed a MASSIVE DISPUTE between Christians—Catholics and Protestants!

Attempting to say the Bible was assembled without contest or dispute is about as convincing as listening to a bank robber testify that he wasn't even in the bank at the time of the robbery

² The *Didache* was an early Christian book that was considered by some within the early Roman Catholic Church to be canon, that is, part of the Bible. It was eventually dropped from the Bible in the 4th century. The book of *Hebrews* was also controversial within the early church because of its unknown authorship. It too was considered canon by some, but, then dropped as spurious, then added back in by later church leadership.

The Church spins this adding and dropping of books by declaring that only “some” Catholic Church leaders considered these books canon or not canon. But ultimately, it was the official decree of the various ecumenical Church Councils who officially declared what went into the Bible and what was left out.

when we have him on video waving his gun at the teller and stuffing money in his bag.

In fact, it was precisely because of the Protestant church's dropping books from the Catholic Bible, that during the ecumenical Council of Trent, c. 1545-63, the Catholic Church reaffirmed its full canon of Scripture, including the Apocrypha. This is by anyone's definition or account, "a dispute". A challenge. A contest of wills by differing factions of Christians!

These facts are bona fide, irrefutable Christian history.

This history is well documented regarding the formation of the Bible. All we are doing is peeling away the spin, pulling back the curtain of half-truth, and focusing in on the errant tradition and perspective, and laying the bare facts open for everyone to see.

We have just exposed a LIE.

"Why are we even doing this? Why not just leave it alone, Keith? The Church isn't hurting anyone by hiding these little white lies, right?"

I wish that is all they were, "little white lies."

But they're not little.

We need to see the bare truth.

Your church is not going to give you a straight story, not without a boatload of hyperbole and spin added so you that you don't come to the logical, truthful conclusion, which is: that you cannot declare something "inerrant" that clearly has had and continues to have errors and even outright lies embedded within it.

We've already touched on this, but the other outright LIE is the Protestant Church demanding that "the Bible is not a product of the Catholic Church!"

Seriously? Then who assembled it?

"God did! Er, using the Catholic Church." Pastors get a little quiet or sheepish uttering the last sentence.

Why?

Because they know it makes zero logical sense.

If God used the Catholic Church to infallibly create the Bible as a canon (standard) of Scripture, then the Reformers coming along later and junking books from the Bible either means that: 1) God made a mistake; 2) the Catholic Church made mistakes; 3) the Reformers made a mistake; or 4) the Church is lying and the man-made doctrine of "*Sola Scriptura*" is a mistake.

Take your pick.

By now you know the truth.

For the Protestant Reformers of 500 years ago to declare their newly re-assembled Bible to be inerrant and wholly inspired of God, and then to pass that tradition of error down to us, was indeed a mistake.

A massive mistake of Human error.

A mistake I don't think they fully realized the deeply dire ramifications of.

So, let's try to understand why the Protestant Reformers changed the Bible and created *Sola Scriptura* in the first place.

A Holy Tradition of Error is Reborn

The real reason for inventing the doctrine of "Scripture Alone" was because up until the time of the Reformation, the Catholic Church itself, as a body of leadership, was considered to be "inerrant", "infallible", and "wholly inspired" of God. Reforming church protestors ("Protestants") needed something to cling to, to put their faith in, something that *wasn't* the Catholic Church's wayward leadership.

So instead of putting their faith in the Church, they placed their faith in the Church's Bible.

Up until this point in time, the Catholic Church observed (and continues to observe) something called "Holy Tradition".

This was the Catholic Church's way of observing the edicts of past popes and church councils as the "Word of God", more or less.

In fact, to the Catholic Church even today, the Bible is not the basis of their beliefs. It is included and referenced at times, to be sure, but it does not form the final authority for all things and beliefs Roman Catholic. That is left up to the sitting pope at the time and the various church councils that have occurred over the centuries since the time of Rome.

Here's an example: Jesus says that we are to call no religious leader "rabbi", "teacher", or "father".³ Yet the priests of the Catholic Church are all referenced with the title "Father". Church holy tradition overrides even the words of Jesus within their own Bible. That is how powerful "holy tradition" is within not only the Catholic Church

But the Protestant Churches have just as powerful holy traditions as well. Protestants have no problem junking even some of the Ten Commandments! God says, "make no images of God", yet Protestant Christians make all kinds of images. Yes, the excuse is that they don't worship the actual image or statue (idol), but that is a strawman fallacy argument. No one actually worships a picture or an object. The image is simply representative of the larger spiritual god. Christians also blow off the Commandment to keep a 7th day worship day. We manufacture illogical excuses like "Jesus is my sabbath day!" Huh? That makes no sense. Jesus kept a 7th day sabbath. Remember when I told you that you would throw Jesus out of your church if he showed up to preach? This would be one of the many things the very Jewish rabi would be teaching us that would get your religious knickers in a twist!

³ Matthew 23:8-10

Getting back to the Reformers inventing *Sola Scriptura*: To distance themselves as much as possible from the authority of the Roman Catholic Church, reforming Protestants literally pulled from thin air the idea of Bible inerrancy, infallibility, and whole inspiration. They literally INVENTED out of thin air the doctrine or dogma of “*Sola Scriptura*”.

The doctrine essentially is this: If you could find your basis of belief within the Bible, then this is what we as Protestants will now believe as God’s honest truth; and the leaders of the Catholic Church can go pound sand.

It’s no secret that the Catholic Church has a bunch of beliefs that are not, well, exactly Biblical, or even rational. It’s stuff they just created themselves out of thin air, or what they assume to be “inspired” and it becomes infallible holy tradition.

For example: the 17th century Church under Pope Urban VIII believed that the Earth was the center of the universe and that the sun revolved around it. This belief was thought to be inspired holy tradition, it was immovable canon. That is it was, until Galileo came along championing Copernican astronomy and heliocentrism. Galileo essentially declared the Church in error and proved with science that the Earth revolves around the sun; not the other way around. When the Church balked at his findings, Galileo was accused of effectively insulting the Church by questioning the church’s leadership and their holy tradition. So incensed were the leadership that the matter was investigated by the Roman Inquisition and in 1615 it was concluded that heliocentrism was foolish, absurd, and heretical since it contradicted Holy Scripture. (It didn’t contradict the Bible, but that is what or how the sitting Pope and Inquisition interpreted the scriptures as saying.) The Church found Galileo guilty of heresy and exiled him, placing him under house arrest for the rest of his life.

It would not be until 500 years later, in 1992, that Pope John Paul II would acknowledge, finally, that the previous Church leadership had erred in condemning Galileo.

This is a rather long way of saying that the Church has built a lot of dogma, beliefs, and traditions that are either not Biblical or come from bad Biblical “interpretations” (or deliberate misinterpretations) of scripture that just do not exist.

So, getting back to this issue of *Sola Scriptura*, where did this doctrine actually come from?

In 1521, a young Holy Roman emperor, Charles V, summoned Martin Luther to appear at the now-famous Diet of Worms⁴, in Germany, in order to give Luther the opportunity to officially recant his reformed ideas. The renegade monk was shown his books in full view of the assembly and was asked to recant and disavow their teachings. The next day, Luther replied with his now-famous words:

“Unless I am convinced by the testimony of the Scriptures or by clear reason (for I do not trust either in the pope or in councils alone, since it is well known that they have often erred and contradicted themselves), I am bound by the Scriptures I have quoted and my conscience is captive to the Word of God. I cannot and I will not recant anything, since it is neither safe nor right to go against conscience. I cannot do otherwise, here I stand, may God help me, Amen.”

Luther indeed lit the fires that would eventually become this foundational belief of the Protestant Christian Church.

⁴ A “diet” is not about food in this case. It is simply a term describing a formal deliberative assembly. Also, a “W” in German is pronounced with a “V” sound. So, this event might be better called or translated “the Assembly of Vorms”.

At the time, I'm sure it sounded like a perfect solution for what these reforming protestors were doing, and it was a slap to the face of the rather wicked Church they were coming out of.

I say "wicked" because the Church authorized the slaughter of literally tens of thousands, if not more, of these new "heretics". People who did nothing more than disagree with the Church's robbing people of their money in the name of God, among a plethora of other sins.

The Catholic Church, of course, denies this. Big surprise.

However, *Foxes Book of Martyrs*⁵ is a cataloguing and clear history of those early Reformers whom the Church murdered.

The irony is, in attempting to distance themselves from the mother Church, the Reformers merely setup their own brand of hypocrisy, their own brand of "holy tradition". While junking books from the Roman Catholic Bible, they declared the very same Bible, sans the Apocrypha, to be "without error" and "wholly inspired of God".

But it was a LIE.

It wasn't true.

It was just as big of lie as the ones told by the mother Church they had just come out of.

⁵ "The *Actes and Monuments*, popularly known as Foxe's Book of Martyrs, is a work of Protestant history and martyrology by Protestant English historian John Foxe, first published in 1563 by John Day. It includes a polemical account of the sufferings of Protestants under the Catholic Church, with particular emphasis on England and Scotland. The book was highly influential in those countries and helped shape lasting popular notions of Catholicism there. The book went through four editions in Foxe's lifetime and a number of later editions and abridgements, including some that specifically reduced the text to a Book of Martyrs." —Wikipedia

The very same Pagan (Gentile) culture and traditions that had built the Catholic Church had also built the Church's Bible, a Bible that supported those very same errant beliefs and man-made traditions.

"The Church was built around the Bible, Keith!"

NO. It wasn't. That is a misnomer. It is a LIE. The Church existed long before their Bible ever appeared, and we will get into that history shortly.

The Church built its Bible around its already existing views and traditions, not the other way around. And anyone who tells you differently is either lying or doesn't know their Church history very well.

"Well, Keith, that was a long time ago. The dropping of those books is ancient history."

Not exactly. The irony here is that even after the Reformers had ostensibly dropped these "Catholic" books from the Bible, Protestant Bible printers and sellers would continue to distribute Bibles with the Apocrypha still included; and these ostensibly errant Bibles were being purchased by Protestant believers!

Yes, you read that correctly.

Many if not most Bibles would continue to be printed with the Apocryphal books still included because that is what the Christian market in the 1500's, the 1600's, the 1700's and late into the 1800's demanded.

So, was this Bible with its declared "unholy", "uninspired" books really God's version? Or just man's version?

The only reason Bible printers continued to print Bibles with the Apocrypha still included was because that is what the Protestant market, their customers, demanded. Sure, the books were "deprecated", so to speak, but who would want a Bible that didn't include everything?!

So just when did the Protestant Bible “officially” become “holy”, “inerrant”, and “infallible” without being printed with these ostensibly “God-hated” Apocryphal books still attached?

When?

Many scholars will point to the pivotal year of 1885 when the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury finally and formally declared that the Apocrypha was no longer to be printed in any Protestant Bible.

1885 is hardly ancient history. It was the same year future WWII General George Patton was born and Gottlieb Daimler would patent his four-stroke internal combustion engine.

This is not ancient history. It’s modern history.

While there is no doubt that the idea of Bible infallibility and inerrant inspiration had become engrained in the fabric of Christian Protestants, it did not erase the hypocrisy. How could something that needed to be corrected, many and multiple times, suddenly be without error from its inception?

The truth is, the Bible never was “inerrant”.

The Bible never has been “wholly inspired”.

Nor has the Bible ever been “infallible”.

And the dogma and doctrine of *Sola Scriptura*, is in and of itself, not factual. It is in every definition a man-made myth, a lie. A lie perpetuated by nothing more than man-made tradition.

In the next chapter we’ll take a deeper dive into some other books of the Bible and unearth quite a few more inconvenient facts and history about the Bible that your church doesn’t want you knowing.

3

Where Did the Bible Come From?

“The glory which is built upon a lie soon becomes a most unpleasant incumbrance. ... How easy it is to make people believe a lie, and how hard it is to undo that work again!”

— Mark Twain

Sola Scriptura, “Scripture Alone”, was supposed to form the new inerrant basis of Reformed Christian thought. For centuries the Roman Catholic Church had based its dogma and doctrines on “holy tradition”, accepting the edicts and decisions of previous generations of leaders as infallible, immutable, and wholly inspired of God—even if they were a little wacky by more modern standards.

Despite what the Church would like to promote, the assembly of the Bible as a canon or standard of Scripture did NOT happen “naturally”, or through some God-given pronouncement, or even through amiable agreements of the earliest Christian founders. Nor were the books written by the

Apostles specifically for the creation of some Bible canon. Jesus and the Apostles had long since died by the time most of the books of the so-called “New Testament” had even been written.

HUH?! Wait! What?!

Oh, your church never told you this?

I know what you’re thinking, “How could the books of the Bible have been written if the Apostles who wrote them had already died?!”

And now you know the dirty little secret of the Roman Catholic New Testament, the very same Roman Catholic New Testament you are using as the basis for your inerrant, infallible and wholly inspired beliefs about God.

The fact is, MOST of the books of the Roman Catholic New Testament—are forgeries.

Stay with me here. You need to know this.

Christian scholars also know this.

Your Pastor also knows this. At least they should if they went to a decent seminary.

But Christian leaders don’t want *you* knowing this. They don’t even want to admit it to themselves!

So, they concoct and then use fancy terms like “pseudepigrapha”⁶ to describe these forged books of the Bible and obfuscate (hide) the fact that the books are forgeries. But at the end of the day, a so-called pseudepigraphal work is just

⁶ Pseudepigrapha [ˌsoʊdəˈpɪgrəfə] NOUN pseudepigrapha (plural noun) · pseudepigraphum (noun)—spurious or pseudonymous (forged in the name of) writings, especially Jewish writings ascribed to various biblical patriarchs and prophets but composed within approximately 200 years of the birth of Jesus Christ. ORIGIN: late 17th century; neuter plural of Greek pseudepigraphos ‘with false title’ (see pseudo-, epigraph).

that—a forgery. A book written by an anonymous author in the name of someone famous.

Once again, if you corner your pastor privately and ask them, if they are a real Bible scholar and not a shill just going through the motions to collect a paycheck from your denomination, they will hopefully come clean and tell you the truth about who really wrote these books.

However, they will likely also spin the lie in an attempt to water-down or distract from the fact that most of the books of the New Testament are indeed forgeries. Your Pastor may even bully you into accepting their explanation or “apologetic” reasoning by threatening to kick you out of the church if you persist in asking these questions openly. You are about to see just how “loving” your friendly pastor and church body gets when they are confronted with the truth.

Thankfully, the truth about the books of the Bible being forged is becoming more and more well known among the laity within the Information Age.

So, to counter the facts that the books of the New Testament are a lie, churches have begun coming up with some rather interesting if not astonishing “spin” to make it look like a forgery in the ancient world was no big deal; or that everybody was doing it; or that’s just how things were done in the ancient world; or that even if the books were forged, God allowed it and (somehow) protected what was in them so you can rest assured that what we have today is what Jesus and the Apostles actually said and taught.

Take note that an unknown author was considered a spurious work in the ancient world, a forgery. If you don’t know who wrote it, what authority did the book really have? The book of Hebrews is such a book with an utterly unknown author. But the Church spins this unknown authorship so as to make it look like Hebrews is essential to knowing and understanding God.

Famed modern Christian Pastor, Chuck Swindoll, paints his explanation of Hebrews this way. He does tell the truth, but then he inserts a distraction, a half-truth, a lie, in order to turn your attention away from the fact that the book is a spurious forgery:

“The author of the letter to the Hebrews remains shrouded in mystery. Even early in the church’s history, a Christian as learned as Origen had to admit his ignorance of the true author of Hebrews. Several theories regarding the author’s identity have been proposed over the years, but all of them contain significant problems.

“Most of the churches in the eastern part of the Roman Empire believed Paul to have authored the book, leading to its early acceptance into the Canon by the churches in those areas. Even though Clement of Rome drew much from Hebrews in his late-first-century letter to the Corinthian church, many in the Western church pointed away from Paul as the source of the book. Authors such as Luke, Barnabas, Apollos, and even Clement have been considered as possibilities.”

Now here comes the spin:

“The unknown authorship of this book should not shake our confidence in its authority. [He’s telling you what to think.] Hebrews makes important theological contributions to the biblical Canon, [What he means is that without Hebrews, a lot of our beliefs disappear!] it has been drawn upon as sacred Scripture since the late first century, and Christians [Some, but not all of them!] have for two millennia consistently upheld the divine inspiration and, therefore, the canonicity of the book of Hebrews.”⁷

⁷ From: <https://www.insight.org/resources/bible/the-general-epistles/hebrews>, [my commentary supplied]

Again, the fact is, the book of Hebrews was added and dropped from various Christian Bible canons up until the 4th century by “Christians” arguing over its authority and authenticity.

Yes, there was more than one Bible “canon” in circulation during the first few centuries of the Christian Church.

In fact, there was MORE THAN ONE CHRISTIAN CHURCH during the first few centuries of the Common Era! I’m not going to go into all of them, but you can discover who and what these people were and believed by reading Dr. Bart D. Ehrman’s *Lost Christianities*. This book is an excellent overview of the differing Christian “denominations”, for lack of a better term, that were in existence before Rome and Constantine more or less destroyed them all and took over Christianity.

A common mechanism for Christian apologists to use is the excuse that “Christians” were doing this, or “Christians” have believed that, during whatever era, and the earlier the better. Like Swindoll’s errant point, or half-truth lie rather, yes, SOME Pagan Christians were believing whatever—that doesn’t mean these particular “Christians” were right.

To bring Swindoll’s words into the light of the full truth we need to observe that,

“Some Pagan Roman Catholic Christians have upheld the divine inspiration of the canonicity of Hebrews while others did not.”

Keep in mind that the victors (re)write the history to suit themselves. Also keep in mind that Luther wanted to junk the book of Hebrews for the very same reasons these other early Catholic Church factions wanted to junk it—it’s unknown authorship made the book utterly suspect an unreliable.

In any event, I'll leave it for you to decide whether or not the Church leadership, people like Swindoll, are blowing smoke up your nose with their half-truth explanations.

What I will tell you is historical fact: forgery was rampant in the ancient world, and it was looked upon with just as much disdain then as it is today.⁸ A writ by an unknown author was looked upon as a spurious, illegitimate work of fiction.

Here are the most glaring examples of forged books that we have in the modern Bible:

- The Apostle Matthew is not the author of the Gospel that bears his name.
- Neither is Mark the author of the Gospel that bears his name.
- The Apostle John is not the author of the Gospel of John.
- Peter is not the author of the books of 1 and 2 Peter.
- The author of the book of Hebrews is utterly unknown.

Outside of the Pauline epistles, these books are perhaps some of the most foundational to the mainstream of modern Christian faith.

And all the above-mentioned books are LIES.

Forgeries.

Each and every one.

⁸ See: EHRMAN, Bart D.; *Forged: Writing in the Name of God — Why the Bible's Authors Are Not Who We Think They Are*; Dr. Ehrman is the author of more than twenty books, including the New York Times bestselling *Misquoting Jesus* and *God's Problem*. Dr. Ehrman is the James A. Gray Distinguished Professor of Religious Studies at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and is a leading authority on the Bible and the life of Jesus.

Why? Why are they lies if the Church knows they are forgeries?

When you are sitting in church, does your pastor say something like, "Please open your Bibles to the Gospel of Matthew ..."? If they do, then he or she is promoting a lie. Using the name of the Apostle Matthew is supposed to lend credibility to the book. But Matthew never wrote it. Someone else wrote it and attached Matthew's name to it; but the Apostle Matthew did not write it.

But your church teaches you that he did write it.

That's called a lie.

Especially when they know the truth.

It's the same with the Gospel according to Mark. The Apostle Mark never wrote it.

So why do we say that they did?

This is where we need to stop; step back from what we think we know about the Bible; and slip into the past during earliest development of the canon and see where its individual "books" actually came from; and just who was it that was assembling the Bible to begin with.

The First Bible

The history of the Bible in a nutshell is that after the deaths of Jesus and the Apostles, a myriad of books and letters were circulating all over Rome and Asia Minor. There weren't just four gospels, there were dozens, quite possibly hundreds of different versions, all borrowing from each other different parts of the Jesus story. These books were for sale to any early Jesus follower or congregation with enough money who might want to buy them.

Since the printing press wouldn't be invented for another 1,300 years, these copies were all handwritten by nameless

people and offered for sale. It didn't mean they were authentic. They all borrowed heavily from each other's works.

And again, they were all forgeries.

All of them were created by nameless, faceless people with a motive for profit, using either the best parts of the stories they knew and liked, and OMITTING whatever parts of the story they themselves found offensive based on their own pet views and beliefs.⁹

Remember, there were many factions (denominations) of Christians vying for dominance during the early centuries of Christianity. They did not always agree, just like Baptists and Adventists and Mormons and Pentecostals will not agree on many foundational issues. The Roman Catholic version of Christianity during the early centuries of the Common Era was but ONE faction, and it was not the largest, despite what the Catholics would like you to believe.

Based on its content, many if not most scholars agree that the Gospel of Mark appears to be the closest to the root of the gospel books, itself a copy of a copy of a copy, etc., of another so-called "Q" source document that has been lost to time (or was deliberately destroyed or hidden away on purpose to keep its true contents from becoming known).

Here's the point: Contrary to the Church's revisionist history, GOD was NOT leading these people to create an authoritative Biblical document that billions would read hundreds of generations later just to get to know Jesus.

No. That is not what was happening.

Business is what was happening.

Buyers and sellers of religious tomes and materials was what was happening. And everyone had their own take on

⁹ EHRMAN, Bart D., *Misquoting Jesus: The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why*, Harper-Collins Publishers

what was true and what was just manufactured garbage—tales, falsehoods, even outright lies. (Again, as an example, take note that many Christians disavowed the book of Hebrews as spurious because it had an unknown author. The other reason many Christians may have eschewed the book is because they *did* know who wrote it and they didn't like its author—more on this later ...)

Matthew and Mark had long since died by the time their books (that is, the gospel books bearing their names) were in heavy circulation in the second century.

I shouldn't need to tell you this, but I will remind all of us that Mathew and Mark were VERY Jewish men, with a very Jewish culture, and it was this very same hated Jewish culture was being picked up by the Pagan (Gentile) Romans and not just in the areas surrounding Judea. The Jesus message was spreading all throughout Rome and even into the city of Rome itself and all these hand-written gospel books were part of that reason.

Why were the Jews so hated?

It was primarily because of their numerous and bloody uprisings since the nation had been conquered by the Roman General Pompey in 63 BCE. The last straw for Rome was when Judean zealots (including members of Jesus' own family) rioted in 66 CE, forming a Judean provisional government in Jerusalem. Rome had had enough. The Roman army, led by the future Emperor Titus, laid siege and (re)conquered the city of Jerusalem in 70 CE, burned the Temple to the ground, and then banned any Jew from entering Jerusalem. Three years later Masada would fall as well, leaving Titus with a rather empty victory.

Circa 100 CE, Jewish leaders gathered at a place called Jamnia. One of their reasons was to solidify what would become the canon of Jewish Scripture, what Jews call "Tanakh". The Tanakh contained Torah (the first five books of

the Bible), the Prophets (major and minor prophets), and the Writings (collections of histories, the Psalms, Job, Ecclesiastes, the Songs of Solomon, Solomon's Proverbs, etc.). Christians refer to this Jewish canon as the "Old Testament". We'll get into the reasons why later, if you don't already know.

Eventually, by 140 CE all manner of various Gospel books and letters were well in wide circulation even in the capitol city of Rome itself. But not everyone, especially in the city of Rome where the Jews were probably most hated, was happy about seeing a "Jewish" Jesus.

A wealthy businessman by the name of Marcion took it upon himself to create what Christian history remembers as the very first Christian "canon" of Scripture, or what we might call the very first "New Testament" Bible. However, Marcion had no love for the accursed Jews and no love for the Jewish Apostles. As such, his Bible contained very anti-Semitic books (we'll talk more about this anti-Semitism later in the next chapter) and included only the Gospel of Luke, heavily redacted to remove any mention of Jesus' Jewishness, and ten of the Pauline epistles.

And that was it.

Marcion's church exploded with popularity in Rome.

Not just because of his new Bible, but I'm sure it helped. The real reason Marcion was so successful in anti-Semitic Rome was because of his new take on a new Gospel featuring a new kind of Jesus via his new Bible canon. A non-Jewish Jesus looked a lot like the Persian god Mithras to the Pagans (Gentiles) of Rome, a god already well known in Rome at the time.

Take note that Marcion WAS a Christian. As much as the Catholic Church might despise the thought, so-called Marcionites WERE Christians. And the Marcion Bible did not include the book of Hebrews for what will become obvious reasons if they are not obvious already. Hebrews was well

known by the mid 2nd century; but while some Christians considered the book “canon”, others did not. Again, we see the very beginnings of the “contests” that would take place in the formation of the Bible, the very *Pagan* Roman Catholic Bible.

“C’mon, Keith! Marcion was a heretic. A blip on the Christian radar of history.”

Not. Even.

You church isn’t telling you the whole story.

Again, telling a half-truth is a LIE.

History records Marcion as collecting a massive following of Christian believers into his anti-Jewish church; a church within which he claimed that the Hellenized Roman citizen Paul was the only legitimate “apostle”.

Marcion gave substantial sums to the ostensibly “official” Catholic Church in Rome. History is not exactly clear why he did this, probably to win their favor, but we’ll likely never know the real reasons.

History then records the Catholic Church in Rome cutting ties with Marcion, calling him a “heretic”. As we all know, the victors (re)write the history, so the uber-popular Marcion Canon and even Marcion himself went down in the annals of official Catholic Church (and subsequent Christian) history as an excommunicated heretic. The Church in Rome even gave back all the money Marcion had given them. (Sure they did. Just like your church will give you back all of your tithes and offerings if they ever kicked you out.)

However, Marcion’s church did not just dry up and go away after being “excommunicated” from the ostensibly “official” Catholic Church in Rome. In fact, Marcion’s church got bigger. The followers of Marcion, called “Marcionites”, were and remained alive and well, building a following that rivaled (some historians say surpassed) the size and popularity of the early so-called Catholic Church for the next two hundred years, well into the 3rd and 4th, if not 5th centuries.

So, being called nasty names by the earliest Catholics didn't seem to affect Marcion all that badly. In fact, if the history is accurate, the Church in Rome struggled to keep up with Marcion's crowds and income for centuries.

So successful was Marion, that it appears Marcion's new Bible gave the Church in Rome its own ideas about what should be in a canon of Scripture. While deriding Marcion as a heretic for editing the Gospel of Luke, the early Catholic Church did more or less the exact same thing; they picked and chose from among the perhaps hundreds if not thousands of circulating versions of the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Luke's Acts, Paul's epistles and other books.

But now we need to put on the brakes.

Stop for a moment.

Take a step back.

Let's do a reality check, and ask ourselves something critical to our understanding: What kind of men were running the ostensibly "official" Catholic Church in Rome during the second century city of Rome?

Were they Jews?

Nope.

Who were these people culturally?

Pagan Romans. Gentiles.

None of them were Jews. In fact, they hated Jews.

They did.

We'll get into more about this anti-Semitism later and we will look at the very stark evidence of it.

So—were these anti-Jewish leaders in Rome really listening to a Jewish Jesus or Jewish Apostles and their "Jewish" GOD?

Don't delude yourself here.

Answer the question truthfully.

Do we really think these Pagan (Gentile) Romans were being led of GOD; or were they listening to what was popular

with their Pagan (Gentile) Roman congregations (ie. customers)?

You already know the answer.

Just be honest with yourself and the facts.

Here's a modern example: If you're a Baptist, are you going to want to listen to a Mormon or an Adventist for the truth about the Messiah?

No. You're not.

But for decades and decades throughout the 20th century Mormons and Adventists, both indeed "Christian" denominations, were labeled as "cults" by many other denominations and Christian leaders within modern Christianity.¹⁰ Some Christian denominations *still* teach this.

So, let's ask the question again: As a Roman pagan (non-Jew), you are not going to be found dead anywhere near some (gasp!) "Jewish" church!

No.

Like you, these early Catholics were Pagan, meaning they were not Jewish. These Church leaders were listening to whatever was most popular with the Pagan people, especially those with the deepest pockets of their eras.

Just like churches do today.

They were serving their customers.

Both Marcion and the Catholics were competing for the same Pagan Roman customers.

Customers who were NOT Jewish and wanted nothing to do with a truly Jewish Messiah or a truly Jewish Gospel or a truly Jewish GOD.

Marcion appears to have been one of the Catholic Church's deep-pocketed customers. But then a schism occurs, and he

¹⁰ MARTIN, Walter, *Kingdom of the Cults*

strikes out on his own. My take is that this deep disagreement was over this very issue of Jesus' Jewishness.

Marcion had his own ideas about what was most popular with the Roman people and the Catholics had another. Marcion appears to have hit the nail on the head with his un-Jewish message because it was very popular with Rome, even overshadowing the Catholic Church's own version of the Gospel and stealing their customers.

The Catholic Church would like to say that Marcion "strayed from the truth," but that's just hogwash when you look at what the Catholic Church in Rome itself was doing to the history of Jesus and the Apostles by attempting to remove Jesus's Judaic heritage. (Again, we'll get more into the whole "Judaizing" thing later.)

Why Only Four Gospels?

There were literally scores if not hundreds of documents floating all over the ancient world of Rome, all purporting to be "authentic" and written by their respective famed authors. When building their own canon of Scripture, the early Catholic Church leadership chose what they wanted, most probably edited with what they wanted in or out¹¹, and then all kinds of copies of their "official" canon made for sale to their congregations all over the Roman world.

They would have also destroyed anything that didn't agree with their Pagan views.

While there were 12 Apostles and potentially room for 12 Gospels, one written by each, for some reason the early

¹¹ EHRMAN, Bart D., *Misquoting Jesus: The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why*, Harpers-Collins Publishers

Catholic Church leaders decided to limit the Gospel books to just 4. And do you want to know their reasoning for doing so? Allow me to quote Irenaeus of Lyons as to why.

First, Irenaeus was a late 2nd century early Church leader, a disciple of Polycarp, and was Bishop of Lugdunum in Gaul within the Roman Empire (now Lyons, France). He was an early Christian apologist whose writings were formative in the early development of (Pagan) Christian theology. Irenaeus said of the 4 Gospels,

*"It is not possible that the Gospels can be either more or fewer in number than they are, since there are four directions of the world in which we are, and four principle winds ... The four living creatures [of Rev. 4:9] symbolize the four Gospels ... and there were four principle covenants made with humanity, through Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Christ."*¹²

"(It is) Not. Possible."

Really? Seriously?!

This is what passes for early Christian apologetics (proof) in the ancient Roman Catholic world? This statement, were it to be uttered in any church or seminary today, would get you laughed out of the building by any serious pastor or scholar. But yet, people "buy it" because they are told to respect the early "church fathers" as some kind of inspired demigods, no matter what dimwitted things they've said.

If Billy Graham or Oswald Chambers said nutty stuff like this, would you buy it? I don't know, maybe you would, but therein lies part of the problem with Christianity. Because you are TOLD to revere someone by your Church, because they

¹² METZGER, Bruce, *The Canon of the New Testament*, Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 154-155

were some famed, esteemed Christian of yore, even if they say something utterly nutty or incomprehensible, we just buy it, because, well, it's Billy Graham, or Oswald Chambers, or Ellen White, or Brigham Young. It doesn't matter who it is. We just automatically respect whomever because we're told to do so.

I used to read Oswald Chambers, thinking the guy was like the epitome of deep Christian thought. However, the more I read Chambers later in life, the more I began to see that the god Chambers was following was utterly incomprehensible. Chambers was writing a diatribe of hypocritical, contradictory nonsense that made no sense whatsoever in the simple logic of the light of day.

But people follow his writings as if they reveal some mystical deep understandings of God ever unearthed to Humanity. But much of Chambers' thoughts in his writings are just psychobabble, incomprehensible nonsense.

Here is the simple truth—GOD is not complicated.

If you are reading something that is complicated, like the book of Hebrews for instance, it is not of GOD.

Getting back to the Catholic Church's competing version of the Bible with Marcion's: the fact of the matter is, Marcion was a huge competitor to the Catholic Church and neither of them were winning Roman converts by promoting Jesus' Jewishness. Now the budding Catholic Church had its own shiny-new canon of Scripture to compete with Marcion's. But it appears the Catholic Church did something that Marcion refused to; it spread a bit wider net, so to speak. While condemning the Jews for being, well, "Jewish", it also acknowledged at least some of Jesus' and the Apostles' Jewishness.

The Catholic Church would even go so far as to glue the Jewish Bible to its own, but delineating them as still different, calling one the Old Covenant (Testament) and their shiny new Bible the New Covenant.

The effect of this was to give the Catholic's new Bible much more history and, if you will, gravitas.

Within both Marcion's church and the Catholic church, Paul was and would remain the central figure of authority. After all, Paul was the original author of the "New Covenant"; a concept that was not found in any of the other gospels or non-Pauline writings; that is, writings that did not come out of Paul's group. (We'll discuss more about Paul's group later.)

By including the Jewish canon, the Catholic Church was simply attempting to build a superior product model, just like any other business might do by adding features. They were attempting to give themselves a history; to spin their own Bible as being superior to any others that might be floating around in circulation. And yes, there were numerous Bible canons floating around Rome by the end of the 2nd century. Of course, none of them were "official" according to the Pagans leading the Catholic Church in Rome, but I think you get the picture.

There were also numerous "Christian" churches or congregations, not unlike our denominations of today, all over the Roman world. All of whom the Catholics called "heretics" or "heretical" because they didn't follow the Catholic's patented brand of Christianity. Again, the victors (re)write the history. When Constantine became what is essentially "Catholic" and made this brand of Christianity, this denomination, the "official" religion of Rome, that pretty much spelled the doom of any other Christian denomination existing in Rome. They would have been destroyed along with their books and writings so that only the "official" Constantine-approved version of Christianity would survive.

Incidentally, this revision of history is what made the Dead Sea Scrolls so potentially dangerous to the Catholic Church! And why there is even today an effort (conspiracy?) to keep some of these scrolls out of the public eye. The assumption is that some of these yet-to-be-seen MSS reveal an extant factual

history or histories of Jesus and the Apostles that the Catholic Church doesn't want people to see. We don't really need to digress into conspiracy theories to prove the history, however. It's just a side note of interest.

Regarding the Bible and which version of the various Bible canons that were in deep circulation during the early centuries of Christianity, I want to be very clear: It was NOT the inspiration of GOD that was creating the earliest Bible that came out of the Catholic Church, it was more of a business (and later political) decision by a group of Pagan (non-Jewish) men wanting to serve the widest possible audience.

Some of you think I'm being stupid.

"Keith! God was in-control of the Bible! Even if Irenaeus was a simpleton, or the Church Fathers were Gentiles, God used them!"

Did God lie to us as well?

"Huh?"

Did GOD allow books to be put into the Bible that bore the names of Apostles who never ever wrote them?

Listen, I get it. You're stretching.

You REALLY want to believe as much as possible what your beloved Church has told you; so much so that you are willing to pretend that the Church really didn't lie to you by telling you that Matthew, Mark, John, and Peter really did write the books that bear their names.

But here's the point: GOD didn't do this.

MAN did.

Stop trying to drag GOD into the problem.

If men sin, did GOD cause them to sin, or does GOD keep us from sinning?

No.

We're very much capable of sinning and lying to people all on our own—and GOD doesn't stop us from doing so.

This is NOT GOD's problem.

It's MAN'S.

"BUT—it's the BIBLE we're talking about here!"

So? Listen, you need to get over the man-made tradition. The Church lies about all kinds of things. You think a little thing like inserting a bogus book, or deliberate mistranslation or adding some man-made tradition about the Bible is going to stop people from lying?

I'm here to tell you, it doesn't; and it hasn't. Especially where there is money involved. LOTS of money. And lots of power over people's lives. The Catholic Church has become the single biggest landowner in the world. It is a business operation worth trillions of dollars and one that takes in billions tax-free each year.

Because of the Church's indoctrination, people tend to equate the Bible with being something GOD intended. That's a huge misnomer and one that took me quite a few years to unlearn as well.

I keep saying this, but I'm going to repeat it again:

The Bible is not GOD in book form.

Yes, the Church keeps calling its Bible the "Word of God", but the Bible is not GOD's book—it's 100% MAN's book, that is, the Bible is a product of the very fallible people running the Church.

The whole point of this book, FALSE WITNESS, is an attempt to get you to see GOD without the Church's man-made traditions, man-made errors, and without these lying MEN, getting in the way.

But I am not attempting to get rid of the Bible!

No.

In fact, I want as many books as possible from the ancient world to be found and included in the corpus of Christian knowledge that we have regarding GOD. Sure, most of it is likely balderdash and mythological hogwash, but that is for us to see and decide, just like our quote from Irenaeus. Were there

really only four gospels? Or was that just the number a handful of perhaps not so smart people decided to include? What did they leave out? What did the Church destroy because they didn't want others reading?

Other Early Christian Writings

I want to introduce you to a website that has helped me see a lot of what didn't get included in the Bible but were documents that were in fairly wide circulation from the beginning of the mid to late first century and beyond:

<http://earlychristianwritings.com>

Note that some of these early Christian writings have very wide ranges for their dates of authorship. This is because traditional Christian apologists cannot tolerate the notion that a book has a later date than the author's lifespan, so they "dispute" the date of authorship. Not because of archeology or paleography, but because of their own Christian tradition.

All this means is that the later date, is likely the more accurate.

Too many Christian apologists attempting to insert their pet personal views into the paleography has only muddied the waters instead to making them clearer. I smell the hand of the Catholic Church at work with these wide range of dates here; they never used to be listed as being so early. It wouldn't be the first time the Church muddied the waters to hide their lies.

Some of you might be wonder why I haven't dived into the books of Peter yet, illustrating how and why these books were forged.

We'll be getting there later in the book.

But before we do, I want to build a little bit more of a foundation of understanding. Why did Marcion only choose the books of Paul and Luke? Why did he consider Paul the only “legitimate” apostle?

To find out, we need to peel back a few more layers of LIES, SPIN, and outright DECEIT that will help us see what the Bible is, what it isn’t, and what the Church has attempted to turn it into.

4

Christianity's Non-Jewish Gospel

*"The truth will always offend the people
that don't want to believe it."*

— Sonya Teclai

Unpacking a lifetime of Christian falsehoods was not an easy task to undertake for me, and it may not be a fun time for you either. I've been where you are, but I didn't have a roadmap like this book to help me either. My wife and I undertook this journey together and we had to unravel the tangled skein, yarn-by-yarn, then piece the truth back together piece-by-piece until we could see a much clearer picture of GOD.

The Bible is really NOT the problem here.

The Church is.

More to the point, the Church's holy tradition is.

The Bible is what it is, a collection of early Christian writings and even earlier Jewish writings. But then the

Protestant Church took hold of the compendium, declared it and the disparate books it contains utterly infallible, completely inerrant, and wholly inspired in their every word, jot and tiddle.

And therein lies the root of the problem, or as I have alluded to, the big man-made LIE.

“Keith, the church exists only because of the Bible!”

NO. Exactly the opposite is true.

FIRST there was the Church. The Church THEN created their Bible based on what a handful of Pagan Romans believed some 2,000 years ago. Then Protestants came along 1,000 years later and declared that the hodge-podge collection of books that not even the original creators of the Bible would call “inerrant”—was now suddenly “inerrant” and “wholly inspired” of God!

Listen to me carefully: BEFORE you “believe in” a Bible that is somehow the inerrant Word of God, you first must “believe in” the Church that created it and then told you WHAT to believe about it!

In other words, you’re not really believing in the Bible; you’re really believing in the Church who handed you their Bible and then TOLD you to believe in it—or else!

I’m not kidding about the “or else” bullying either.

If you tell your pastor and your church that you don’t believe the Bible is 100% inerrantly inspired of God, at some point you will be asked to leave the church and not come back. And they will figuratively kick the dust off their feet and write you off as a hell-bound heretic as you leave.

You think I’m kidding; but you know I’m right.

The Bible is only “God’s Word” in your mind because the Church told you (threatens you) to believe it is God’s Word. So, you must understand this isn’t really about the Bible—it’s about what the Church told you to believe ABOUT their Bible.

The bottom line here is your BELIEF IN the Church, not their Bible.

The Bible didn't show up on its own. It wasn't faxed or emailed to us from Heaven. There wasn't some watershed moment in history where GOD appears and descends from Heaven with "His Word" for us to pour over.

It would have been nice if that was what had happened, but GOD didn't do that.

The creation of the Bible was something that happened over the course of some 1,500 years; 3,500 years if you include the Jewish Tanakh (Old Testament). It contains the writings of men. Some of it is accurate; much of it, well, it's anyone's guess if it's accurate or not. Most of it is not accurate of history nor of GOD. We'll begin to see why as the layers of lies continued to be peeled back.

Again, the victors (re)write the history and the Bible is nothing but the epitome of man's re-written history.

Yes, we can say and preach and stomp our feet red-faced and shouting, demanding that GOD somehow inspired the tome. But that is merely us parroting the man-made dogma of the Church—it is not of GOD.

"But Keith! God says that all scripture is God-breathed ... See, the Bible proves itself!"

Stop.

Here is where we peel away yet another layer of lies and get to the root of where these lies come from. I know you don't like hearing me call the Bible a lie—I'm not calling "God's Word" a lie. The Bible is not "God's Word". Yes, there are the words of GOD within it, to be sure. But not ALL of it is "God's Word".

This is NOT an "all or nothing" paradigm.

Too many churches preach the misnomer assumption that "Either the Bible stands together or it falls together!" This decree sells well within a sermon being preached to the

uneducated, but it is nothing more than a lie itself. The Reformers junked books from the Bible. Did it fall then?

No.

It's a stupid saying.

So, let's unpack some assumptions and outright lies that the Church tells us to believe about their Bible:

- Church Lie #1: Assuming the whole Bible is "God's Word" just because some or a part of it is.
- Church Lie #2: Assuming God created the Bible.
- Church Lie #3: Assuming something said in one book pertains to the whole Bible; or even to Christians.
- Church Lie #4: Assuming that whoever wrote whatever book is being truthful.

We've already discussed the first two lies a bit already, so I want to look at this #3 Lie: Assuming that something said in one book pertains to the whole Bible.

First, we need to understand what the Bible is: it's a compendium, a collection, of different books, letters, and histories, written by different authors from widely differing periods of time, widely differing cultures, and with very different goals, topics and reasons for writing what they did.

The Prophet Jeremiah wasn't writing what he wrote for a Christian audience. Jeremiah didn't know about Jesus or the Apostles; he didn't care about Jesus or the Apostles; what he did care and write about was Israel and how they had disfavored GOD with their collective sins.

Jeremiah's audience was a newly conquered Israel who'd just been taken over by Babylon—Jeremiah's audience was NOT the Christian Church.

Now what Jeremiah wrote CAN be beneficial to a Christian audience, or any audience for that matter, but we err deeply when we think or try to assume that God was using Jeremiah

to speak to modern Christians 2,600 years later. The same goes for any of the other latter Prophets or even Torah (the first five books of the Bible).

Because of this assuming that what someone says in one book pertains to us in the modern era or even to the whole Bible, Christians have forever been attempting to “see” their brand of Pagan beliefs somehow reflected in Hebraic Jewish thought and the beliefs of people who live hundreds or even thousands of years prior.

“It’s the Bible!” we reason, “Somewhere, God must have prophesied the birth of Jesus within the prophets!” And so Christian scholars will move through all manner of hypocritical linguistic translation gymnastics attempting to bend and twist the simple Hebrew language to make it say what they want to see.

We’ll get into the texts of Jeremiah and Isaiah later, but suffice to say, it is a misnomer, a lie, to take what someone said in one book of the Bible and attempt to make it pertain to the whole Bible, a compendium book that did not even exist as a canon until the around 100 CE for the Tanakh ¹³ (Old Testament) and the latter part of the 4th century for the Christian New Testament.

So, with that in mind, let’s get back to this whole “God-breathed” business. Within Paul’s second letter to Timothy, Paul states:

“All Scripture is God-breathed and is useful for teaching, rebuking, correcting and training in righteousness ...” ¹⁴

¹³ Modern scholars believe that the process of canonization of the Tanakh (Old Testament) became finalized somewhere between 200 BCE and 200 CE.

¹⁴ 2 Timothy 3:16

I cannot tell you how many times I have heard Christian pastors and then laypeople parrot this passage as their proof text of the whole Bible being “God-breathed”.

“See! The Bible proves itself!”

No, it doesn’t.

Here’s the problem: Context.

Paul wrote this letter to Timothy nearly a century before Marcion would even assemble his first Christian canon of “Scripture”. In other words, the Bible as a compendium didn’t even exist when Paul was talking about “Scripture” being “God-breathed”.

If anything, Paul was ONLY talking about the Jewish “Scriptures”. And in his day, they were a loose collection of books that comprised Torah, the Prophets and the Writings, books that would eventually become the Jewish Tanakh, or what Christians disparagingly and errantly refer to all the time as the “Old Contract”, “Old Covenant”, or “Old Testament”.

Note that the whole idea of an Old versus New Testament was first coined by another early Roman Catholic rock star by the name of Melito of Sardis, in the 2nd century CE.

God wasn’t the one who divided the Bible between Old and New—the Catholic Church owns that LIE as well.

So, it was not God who divided the Bible between Old and New Contracts (Testaments). Men did that. Specifically, Pagan Roman Catholic men; and then their error was picked up by reforming Protestants some 1,400 years later.

And now you’re beginning to see why the Protestant Church has become little more than Roman Catholic Lite.

We’re using their Pagan Bible and believing in their version of Jesus because of what these Pagan Romans put into their Bible.

When Paul says “Scripture”, the Bible as we know it today did not exist yet as a canonized compendium. In fact, some of

the Gospels and other books had not even been written yet when Paul penned these words to Timothy! As such, all Paul was referring to as “God-breathed” were the loose collection of books the Jews knew as Torah, the Prophets and the Writings.

The so-called New Testament canon didn’t even exist yet.

Attempting to prove a 16th century belief about a 4th century book using a 1st century quote—isn’t going to fly.

Also, let’s get real. Paul may have been boastful and even arrogant and cocky, but he wasn’t referring to his own letters as “Scripture”. That is something, again, the Church has added as its own man-made tradition and then created a half-truth, a lie, to make it look like Paul was referring to “the whole Bible”.

Finally, I touched on something earlier when discussing Marcion that you likely have never heard of before—the schism within the early Church regarding Paul’s apostleship. It’s no secret that Marcion hated the Jews; as such his favorite “apostle” was the one who wasn’t really Jewish, at least not in culture. Paul was a Hellenized (culturally Greek and Roman) Jew. To Marcion, Paul was the only legitimate apostle because he wasn’t really Jewish so much as he was a Roman Pagan, or *Gentile* if you want to whitewash the terms.

Again, a “Jewish” Jesus was a hard-sell in the city of Rome and other non-Jewish places throughout the Roman Empire. The Jews were not well liked because of their incessant and bloody uprisings. Paul’s Gospel was much more palatable, much more acceptable to the pagan citizens of Rome than what the Jewish Apostles in Jerusalem were probably preaching.

Now here is where we peel back the curtain to reveal something the Church does not want you to know or even thinking about: The Jewish Apostles and Pagan (Hellenized) Paul were NOT preaching the same “Gospels”.

They weren’t even close.

Your Church will deny this and jump up and down stomping their feet in red-faced rage to convince you

otherwise; trust me, I've brought it up before to pastors and they will get HOT under the collar the moment you bring it up.

It's what happens—people get angry—when you begin to expose their lies.

But let's keep in mind that, historically, Paul wasn't even an "official" Apostle. We'll get into this in the next chapters, but just so you know, Paul never even met Jesus. Never traveled with him. Never had a letter of authority from the Jerusalem Synagogue (Church) to be preaching as an "Apostle".

Your Church doesn't tell you these things while you're sitting in church and for good reason: They don't want their lie exposed.

When Marcion was assembling his canon with Paul's epistles and Luke's redacted Gospel, there was a reason. The real Apostles were Jewish men with Jewish culture and Jewish customs—a culture and customs the people in this period of Rome hated. Anti-Semitism was rampant in the latter part of the Roman era. Marcion chose Paul's (version of) Jesus and Paul's (version of the) Gospel for a reason. Because it resonated with the Pagan (Gentile) people of Rome. The Jewish Jesus and the Jewish Gospel did not resonate well, if at all. Not that the Jewish Gospel was bad, it wasn't. But because of Jewish culture, it's likely that the Gospel preached by the Twelve also included a bunch of Jewish culture Rome wanted nothing to do with, like worshipping on the 7th day of the week instead of the 1st, things like that. But outside of these cultural issues, what the Jewish Apostles were preaching was in fact the REAL Jesus and his REAL Gospel message.

Paul proclaimed himself the Apostles to the Pagans (Gentiles) for a reason. His Gospel was being rejected by the Jewish people—for a reason: it was Pagan, not Hebraic (not actually Jewish). We'll continue to dig deeper into this in the next chapter.

But this does bring us around to Church Lie #4, and that is assuming that whatever book the Roman Catholic Church inserted into their Bible was being truthful.

The early Pagan Roman Church took its cue from Marcion and built a canon, a Bible, not on that of the despised Jewish Jesus and his Jewish Apostles, but on a gospel built almost entirely on the Pagan (Gentile) Gospel according only to Paul.

5

Paul or Jesus?

*“It rests with every professor of the religion
of Jesus to settle with himself, to which of the two religions,
that of Jesus or that of Paul, he will adhere.”*
— Jeremy Bentham, Harvard Divinity School

Christian seminary students who will become tomorrow’s pastors are often introduced to knowledge of the history of the Church that you sitting with its pews will never be told.

And for good reason.

It’s bad for business.

You will be spoon-fed a whitewashed, watered-down, spun, and altogether heavily massaged history of the Christian Church just the way the Roman Catholic Church designed—via the way they assembled not only their early Holy Tradition, but their Bible canon as well. Keep in mind that the Bible you now hold is a product of the early Catholic Church’s Pagan tradition.

Whenever there is a so-called “controversy”, or someone says that some topic is “controversial”, it almost always means that someone is lying, attempting to hide the lie through “spin”, or a version of, an “interpretation” of, or one-sided “perspective” of the history or the facts that doesn’t exist in reality. Remember how Chuck Swindoll massaged the history with a half-truth by saying that “Christians” were using the book of Hebrews since the latter part of the first century? But he never tells you who these particular or peculiar “Christians” were. Only some Christians were. What if the wrong “Christians” were using the book? What if only the Pagan Christians were the one’s saying something was inspired?

In any event, this is an example of “spin”.

The news media gets accused of this all the time. They spin the story by either manufacturing “facts” that don’t exist or by omitting facts that do.

Sometimes the liars will even go so far as to say idiotic things like “your facts” versus “my facts”, which usually do not agree.

Just so we know, facts are facts.

They are axiomatic.

Either they happened or they didn’t.

When someone starts a discussion or argument with “your facts”, what they really mean to say is that they want to IGNORE “your facts” because the facts “you” are presenting are destroying their argument and perspective.

A “perspective” or “viewpoint” is built on facts. If you don’t have ALL the facts, your viewpoint or perspective of things can be 180-degrees of what really and logically happened. However, when new facts are introduced into your understanding, those facts can and should change, at least somewhat, your perspective or viewpoint.

If you allow them to.

However, within the realm of religion (and politics as well), a strange and curious thing happens, a kind of cognitive dissonance¹⁵ takes place that creates a confirmation bias¹⁶ in what we read, see, or hear. And because we so want our previous perspectives and viewpoints to be true, well, we drop into self-delusion mode.

We deliberately ignore the facts we don't like.

We delude and LIE to ourselves.

You may be doing this right now reading this book. You've never heard or been exposed to these FACTS before and you just cannot believe what you're reading about are in fact true,

¹⁵ Cognitive Dissonance (noun)—the state of having inconsistent thoughts, beliefs, or attitudes, especially as relating to behavioral decisions and attitude change.

¹⁶ Confirmation Bias (noun)—the tendency to process information by looking for, or interpreting, information that is consistent with one's existing beliefs. This biased approach to decision making is largely unintentional and often results in ignoring inconsistent information. Existing beliefs can include one's expectations in a given situation and predictions about a particular outcome. People are especially likely to process information to support their own beliefs when the issue is highly important or self-relevant.

Confirmation bias is one example of how humans sometimes process information in an illogical, biased manner. Many factors of which people are unaware can influence information processing. Philosophers note that humans have difficulty processing information in a rational, unbiased manner once they have developed an opinion about the issue. Humans are better able to rationally process information, giving equal weight to multiple viewpoints, if they are emotionally distant from the issue (although a low level of confirmation bias can still occur when an individual has no vested interests). —Britanica.com

meaning they are factual history. There isn't a Bible scholar who will disagree with my facts. They will, however, most likely engage in some form of "spin" or massaging of the facts to downplay their significance or to outright dismiss them. Just like Swindoll was doing in his explanation of the book of Hebrews.

This is called a LIE.

An attempt at deliberately misguiding a perception of the facts so as to only allow one outcome or perspective.

When you attempt to build a perspective that is built on half-truths (or only part of the facts, usually only the facts that agree with your view) you are in fact building a perspective that is a half-truth, a LIE.

A half-truth is the deliberate withholding or hiding of some of the facts to change someone's view or perception; it too is just another form of an outright LIE.

Many news organizations do this all the time. They put their own either "liberal" or "conservative" spin on the facts.

Good and wholesome perspectives must be built on ALL the facts available to us. We cannot jettison facts we don't like. At the end of the day, the jigsaw puzzle must be complete with all the facts available; we cannot leave pieces out that might change our perspective of what the whole picture looks like.

And that is all this book is designed to do—provide you with more facts than what your Church has given you—or more to the point, hidden from you. Again, hiding facts from you is tantamount to creating a deliberate LIE.

The Pharisees evidently had this problem as well because history records Jesus talking about perspectives.

Jesus said it this way,

"The eye is the lamp of the body; so then, if your eye is clear [healthy, sincere, good], your whole body will be full of light. But if

*your eye is bad [evil], your whole body will be full of darkness. So if the light that is in you is darkness, how great is the darkness!"*¹⁷

In this parable, Jesus is illustrating how the eye is representative of our perspectives, how we “see” things. Including how we *want* to see things. If we *choose* to see things with all the facts, sincerely, with good intentions, then our whole being will be filled with light, a metaphor for truth.

But then Jesus issues this warning: If your chosen perspective is evil; in other words, if you don’t want to know the truth, if you don’t like or don’t want to “see” all the facts or try to deliberately misunderstand the facts as they are; then what you think is good will actually be evil. If then what you think is good is actually evil, then Jesus says the darkness within you will be great! Insurmountable. There will be no hope for you to ever see the truth.

Because I am calling the Church a liar, the Church will just automatically say that Jesus was talking to people like me, people who call into question the Church’s man-made holy tradition. I say Jesus was indeed talking about people who deliberately attempt to deceive not only others, but themselves as well. If you are a Christian leader, pastor, bishop or even the Pope, and you’re reading this, it’s time to take a good hard look at what you have been teaching and come clean with the historical facts instead of trying to spin them with whatever holy tradition you were handed by previous generations.

No, I am not expecting the Catholic Church or even a major Protestant denomination to just come clean and start preaching the SAME Gospel that Jesus and the Apostles would have historically preached rather than the Gospel of Paul. I’m only making the point that we should be careful not to delude

¹⁷ Matthew 6:22-23 NASB, amplification supplied

ourselves with an errant perspective just because it might upset our pristine apple cart of beloved man-made tradition.

Jesus versus Paul

This subheading might better read, “The Apostles versus Paul”. Many Christians are never told and never realize that Jesus never met Paul; and Paul never met Jesus. Yes, Paul says he met Jesus, in some angelic form on the road to Damascus, but we really only have Paul’s word on that. Paul says others saw him and that he has witnesses, but still, we only read about this encounter from Paul and Paul’s friend, Luke. And Luke wasn’t there. What Luke wrote was *hearsay* even if it did come directly from Paul. Luke wasn’t a true “witness” of the event.

Luke also wasn’t an Apostle. And like Paul, Luke never met Jesus. Luke was part of Paul’s group, if you will, and like Paul, Luke was a Roman Pagan (Gentile). Luke wasn’t even Jewish.

So, at the end of the day, Paul is his only witness, at least as far as the Bible is concerned. Paul’s account is not corroborated on the witness of two or three as is required by Hebraic custom.

“But Keith! It doesn’t matter. Paul is in the Bible and that means he’s telling the truth!”

No. It doesn’t.

The Bible isn’t even telling the truth!

We just went through pages and pages discussing how the Bible’s books are not truthful just because they are in the Bible. The Gospels themselves are straight-up forgeries. Again, we must unlearn a lot of entrenched “holy tradition” here. It was a bunch of Pagan Romans who put Paul into their Bible; it was not GOD.

FURTHERMORE, how a “Gospel” book written by a Pagan author, namely Luke, found its way into what should have been a wholly Jewish canon, is beyond questionable.

“Keith! You just cannot question the Bible like this!”

Yes, we can.

In fact, WE MUST!

It should have been something that was done centuries ago.

All we are doing here is exactly what the Reformers of 500 years ago did, questioning the Roman Catholic Church’s assembly of their canon of Scripture to see if what they assembled was really “of GOD” or just of their own pet pagan views and beliefs shaped by a hatred of the Jewish peoples.

Luther and the other Reformers made a bold move against the mother Church, but they didn’t go far enough. They were in many ways still stuck, mired in the Catholic Church’s traditions and dogma and unable to recognize truth from error.

Like the Catholic Church he was raised within, Luther was highly anti-Semitic, he hated the Jews even in his day, and it was that inherited anti-Semitism that blinded Luther to seeing the Jewish Jesus and Jewish Apostles much more clearly than he could have.

Luther indeed recognized error within the Bible canon; but for different reasons. Luther’s view of the Gospel sided with Paul’s Gospel instead of recognizing that Paul was a charlatan apostle. Again, let’s remember that Luther and many of the other Reformers never wanted to split the Catholic Church. No! They just wanted to reform it. But when the Church refused their reformed ideals, and instead embarked on a murderous path to rid the world of the Reformers, well, it obviously split the Church.

Although Luther was a well-educated priest (or monk rather) and theologian, he still didn’t have the vast amount of historical and paleographical knowledge that we in the

modern era have unearthed today and have been collecting for the past 500 years since the Reformation. Christian scholars today now know more about the Bible and where it came from than the Reformers did 500 years ago.

In that time and as a result of our newfound knowledge, many of these scholars have begun to question not just the Catholic Church's dogmas and traditions, but the very foundations that build the Church in the first place—namely Saul called Paul of Tarsus, and the very different, even opposing, “gospel” message that Paul preached.

Again, let me reiterate: NOTHING you read in this book is “original research”, that is, nothing you read in this book is just my opinion. I have listed quite a few footnotes to substantiate the facts, history, and my points from the very well-educated and scholastic work others. Many scholars since the Reformation have called into question Paul and his alternative “gospel”.

This is not the first time to topic has been breached.

You can read Paul's letters, including books from others in Paul's group, including Luke's Gospel, Acts, and Silas' I Peter¹⁸, either one of two ways: either with an eye that “sees” these books as completely truthful and legitimate; or you can read them with a more critical (meaning exacting) eye that looks for Paul and his group attempting to massage their rocky relationship with the “Super Renowned Apostles” in Jerusalem (“Super Renowned Apostles” is Paul's description of them, not mine.)

So, unless we know of any other “Super”, “Renowned”, or “Preeminent” Apostles in Jerusalem, Paul is indeed talking

¹⁸ Silvanus (Silas) is most probably the author of 1 Peter, and perhaps 2 Peter as well. Most Bible scholars agree that the Apostle Peter is not the author of either of these letters.

FALSE WITNESS

about James, Peter, and the rest of the twelve who personally walked with Jesus when he disputes with them.

6

More Roman than Jewish

*“No man ever believes that the Bible means what it says:
He is always convinced that it says what he means.”*
— George Bernard Shaw

Before I had ever read anyone’s work on Paul’s alternative gospel, I was already having questions about him. As a Christian sitting in various churches for the better part of 40 years, Paul was my favorite apostle. What Paul said—that was it, end of discussion. Growing up, I even debated with the Adventist family down the street about eating vegetarian and attending worship on Saturday versus Sunday. Didn’t these people ever read Paul?! In fact, in many ways, Paul WAS the Bible; at least he was a big chunk of it. I seldom even looked at the Old Testament. Why bother? That was then, this is now.

Perhaps unknowingly, that is how many of us as Christians view this highly revered “apostle”. In fact, although we may be loathe to admit it, Paul is allowed to override everyone and

everything in the Bible, including Moses and the Prophets, including the other Apostles like Peter, including even Jesus, and even GOD. ALL take a backseat to what Paul says. In fact, Paul speaks for GOD. Paul is allowed to rewrite the Law with his own take and interpretation.

We just automatically buy-into whatever Paul says.

Just own it. We do.

Paul (re)interprets the Bible for us—meaning Paul re-writes the Bible for us.

You can debate this with me, but at the end of the day you know I'm right. Who do you go to first with a doctrinal question?

It's not James or Moses.

No.

It's Paul.

Just Paul.

And only Paul.

And then you will back it up with one of Paul's people, like Luke or Silas (the real author of the books of Peter).

If you read something in the Gospels like Jesus preaching "a baptism of Repentance for the forgiveness of sin," that immediately gets overwritten by Paul's human sacrifice of Jesus for the forgiveness of sin. Somehow the two get merged and now you need BOTH repentance *and* Jesus' blood sacrifice.

You know I'm right here. Because that is exactly what the Protestant Christian churches are preaching today.

I know because I grew up in it.

In fact, so pervasive is Paul within the faith, it should more accurately be called "Paulianity". Not Christianity.

Around 2005 or so, my wife and I sought a deeper understanding of GOD. Like a lot of Christian people do when they suddenly realize that the Christian version of Jesus isn't very Jewish, we began a kind of Jewish journey to find the heart and truth of GOD. We walked away from the traditional

Christian experience and embarked on a much more Jewish or Hebraic walk. Some people will call these folks “Messianic Christians” because they are discovering, learning, experiencing, and living the Jewish culture of the Jewish “Messiah”.

During this time, my wife and I learned and kept the Jewish feast days, eschewed Christmas and Easter as Pagan (they are, and were originally lifted from Pagan holy days), and began to adopt a much more Hebraic understanding of God.

In that time a new light was dawning within both of us. We began to see the Bible through much more discerning eyes than what our previous Christian churches had taught us to see, and, as a consequence of that very one-sided Christian-only perspective, never allowed us to see.

As someone newly immersed in true Judaic thought, I began looking askance at some of the things Paul was saying and teaching because they didn’t gel with what I was reading in Torah, the Prophets or the Writings.

Paul says that he was a Jew’s Jew, trained under the tutelage of the esteemed Gamaliel. Well, after reading some of Paul’s interpretations of Torah, either Paul was a terrible student, or he’d never really read Torah all that well, or he was twisting the words of Torah to a Pagan people who would never read them and just take his ostensibly Jewish word for it.

Many scholars, both Christian and Jewish alike, have also recognized Paul’s bending and twisting of Torah and have “spun” the contradiction as “Paul interpreted” such and such passage as whatever.

As I began to learn and study from a much more culturally Hebraic perspective, I began to have questions about Paul and if he really knew what he was preaching. It was then I discovered that I was not alone in questioning Paul. There is a massive corpus of very good scholarship discussing not just

Paul's fast and loose interpretations of Torah, but whether he was even a Jew or an "Apostle" to begin with!

Since this is not intended to be a scholastic work, I am simply going to reference some other books with footnotes of other authors that you can review and then decide for yourself if you think Paul (and by extension, Paul's group) should have been included in the Christian Bible.

In her book, *The God Jesus Knew and Christianity Forgot*, author Serena Evenson adeptly points out each and every one of Paul's misinterpretations beginning in Galatians 3.¹⁹ Paul starts off by saying that Abraham is his "witness" of what he (Paul) is preaching. But then Paul twists and lifts out of context Abraham's words, calling the Law of God a "curse", quoting Deuteronomy 27:26. But what is really happening is Paul is twisting the words of Torah like he's an anchor for Foxnews or CNN. (Pick your pet political bent.)

Here is the portion of what Paul doesn't quote, but this leads up to what Paul does quote out of context:

*Cursed is the man who dishonors his father or his mother. ...
Cursed is the man who moves his neighbor's boundary stone. ...
Cursed is the man who leads the blind astray on the road. Cursed is
the man who withholds justice from the alien, the fatherless or the
widow. ...*

I think both you and I can agree that doing these above things, yea, will land you in a curse. People will hate you for being a first-class thief and a tyrant.

Either Paul didn't know Torah as well as he says, or he's deliberately twisting the words of Torah in order to make an

¹⁹ EVENSON, Serena, *The God Jesus Knew and Christianity Forgot*, Chapter 24

errant point that is not supported in context by what he's quoting.

Christian scholars have recognized Paul's playing fast and loose with his quotes of Torah for centuries, but because he is the almighty Paul, he gets a pass. No one dares question Paul because, well, the Protestant holy tradition of *Sola Scriptura* means that God put Paul in the Bible, so we cannot just go and rip the charlatan out of it now. Otherwise, it will look like the early leadership of the Protestant Christian Church didn't know what they were doing and weren't being led by God! People will get upset and leave and that will cause controversy and cost us customers! And we'll be labeled "heretics"!

You get the picture.

Undoing the lie is going to be just too hard now.

So, the Church really has only one option—to double-down on the LIE.

Paul HAS to stay in the Bible lest the Protestant Church of yesteryear, beloved pastors like Chuck Swindoll, Oswald Chambers, even perceived prophetesses like Ellen White, look just as foolish and just as un-led of God as the Catholic Church we came out of.

So, the early Pagan Roman Catholic Church decided that Paul was their guy, but only because Paul was good for business. Sure, Marcion had his followers, but the Catholic Church spread an ever wider net attempting to collect not just the anti-Semitic Romans, but even some of the more Jewish Jesus believers as well.

But make no mistake: The gospels of Jesus and Paul were NOT compatible. The Church made it work, but only by including the Jewish corpus of scripture and by hiding the true nature of the Jewish Gospel as much as possible.

7

Peter and the Wolf

*"It's hard to hear GOD's voice
when you've already decided what you want GOD to say."
— Unknown*

This may be the first time that you have ever been exposed to the notion that Paul might not have been exactly who he says he was within the pages of the Bible. After all, you believed your Church when they told you that God (effectively) wrote the Bible. You believed your church when they told you God put Paul into the Bible. You believed your church's spin that "God has no reason to lie to you." The previous excuse is a completely vacuous argument; the Church is always trying to drag GOD into THEIR lies. It's the Church's go-to logical fallacy to get you to shut up. But what they are really doing is attempting to erect a firewall excuse to bully you into submission.

But as we continue to peel back the layers of man-made tradition, we discover that it isn't GOD who is lying to you — the Church is.

GOD has nothing to do with it.

The Church acts as if they are the only ones who can possibly be right; and any view or perspective outside of what the Church officially recognizes is automatically a lie of Satan from the pit of HELL! But all that is, again, is just another LIE of the Church, emphasized with a bit of drama.

The truth is, you don't need the Church to see GOD more clearly. In fact, the Pagan (Gentile) Church and its Pagan Bible is what are keeping you from seeing GOD more clearly by keeping you from seeing what the Jewish Jesus and his Jewish Apostles most likely taught.

What we as everyday Christians do not realize, because we are not Jewish and we cannot "see" any difference, is that there are actually two gospels at work within the pages of the Roman Catholic New Testament.

One is Paul's.

The other is Jesus' and his Apostles.

Because of Paul's popularity and prominence within the New Testament canon, it is Paul's Pagan (Gentile) gospel that gets preached more often than not within Christian churches.

But every now and then some pastor gets themselves into hot water with the congregation by accidentally preaching Jesus' and James' version of the Gospel.

I remember sitting in an Adventist church one time when the pastor was preaching a sermon series on the Law. In Adventism the Law of God is featured much more prominently than it is within other Protestant denominations. The Law is to be actually followed; which is why Adventists keep Shabbat (the Sabbath worship day) on the 7th day, Saturday, and not the 1st day, Sunday, like the rest of (Roman Catholic) Christianity does.

Briefly, ALL Christians (followers of Jesus) beginning in the first century kept the 7th day as their day of rest and worship, in observance of the Jewish Fourth Commandment. It is what Jesus and the Apostles did. It was cultural. They were, after all, Jews.

However, Jewish custom did not settle well with the Roman Pagans who observed a rest and worship day on the 1st day of the week, a day they called *Dies Solis*, or “Sun’s Day”, in honor of their pagan sun god.

It would be during the Council of Laodicea in circa 364 CE that the Catholic Church would attempt to change the Christian worship day to the day Pagan Rome found more appealing, which was “Sun’s Day”, or the first day of the week. It was the day most Romans were used to keeping anyway in veneration of their pagan gods, namely Solis, the sun god, and Mithras, the pagan god Paul would fashion his version of Jesus after. (We’ll get back to this Jesus, Paul and Mithras business later in the book.)

Getting back to our story about our pastor accidentally preaching Jesus’ gospel, this Adventist pastor was having a very difficult time preaching both Jesus’ message of upholding the Law and Paul’s version of ignoring it.

The flip-flopping caused no small amount of controversy, which at the end of the sermon series the pastor simply blew off all the questions he was getting; mostly because he couldn’t truthfully answer the deep contradictions. His sermons finally went back to more appealing things that the congregation was used to and wanted to hear him preach about.

I am not going to go detail by detail examining the differences between what Paul taught versus what Jesus and the Apostles taught about the Law and Salvation. First because, we are using the Roman Catholic Gospels, so anything we can glean from them is likely to have long since been massaged (edited) out of them. The early Catholic Church did not choose

its pet Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John because the books heavily contradicted Paul. There are still some contradictions, to be sure, but the Protestant Church has managed to more or less dismiss the contradictions as “mild” through various interpretive gyrations.

You can find all kinds of Christian books on “what Paul really meant” or “what Jesus was really saying” about the Law of God. The only reason these books exist is because of the obvious contradictions between the teachings of Jesus and Paul. All kinds of Christian lay people, leaders and scholars throughout the past five centuries have been deeply searching for new ways and means to somehow unify or reconcile the deep divide between what Jesus said versus what Paul was contradictorily teaching.

In a nutshell, Jesus upholds the Law and preaches a Gospel (Baptism) of Repentance for the forgiveness of sin.

Paul, on the other hand, utterly disavows the Law as a “curse”, dismisses it as having any relevance for salvation, and declares that only one’s faith in Jesus’ sacrificial death and resurrection is the means for forgiveness of sin.

The two gospels are not compatible.

Not even close.

They teach two completely different things for two completely different reasons and have two completely different views about GOD and how forgiveness is achieved.

You, sitting in church, have been taught the latter Pauline version and been told that this is the same Gospel that Jesus taught!

But that is a LIE borne of Church tradition.

And being a Protestant Pagan (Gentile) Christian, you have never really been exposed to a true period Hebraic perspective or culture like Jesus and the Apostles had.

You have been taught to think that Jesus is just like you are, culturally speaking, a Pagan Gentile.

But he's not.

You have been spoon-fed a "Christianized" or "Paganized" perspective of a Pagan "Jesus" and a Pagan "Gospel" that isn't Hebraic at all. It is a perspective that if Jesus or James, or Peter were sitting in your church today, would not recognize.

This is why I said earlier that if Jesus showed up in the flesh to preach in your church, you'd want to throw him out of the building, because he would be saying very Jewish things you would not agree with.

You would not agree with the real Messiah or the real Apostles because the Roman Catholic Pagan Bible has given you a Pagan (Gentile) version of Jesus, a version that is Paul's Hellenized (Pagan) version of Jesus, and you have no idea what the real historical Jewish Jesus is even like.

Earlier in a previous chapter heading, I quoted Jeremy Bentham, a professor of Harvard Divinity School, about which religion a student should decide to preach, that of Jesus or that of Paul? While I was writing this book, I asked a family member, who has been a pastor and has an M.Div. from Princeton Theological Seminary, what they thought about parts of this book. I thought I was going to get grief about my issues with Paul. However, this family member told me point blank: "Actually, I can't stand reading Paul."

I was like a deer in headlights.

Huh? I thought I was going to get all kinds of pushback. This family member is a very well-educated, Ivy-league seminary-trained (former) pastor with an M.Div. degree.

"Even in seminary I couldn't stand the guy," they continued. "There are two different gospels being preached in the Bible. One is Jesus and the Apostles, and the other is Paul."

Mind you, up until this time, neither of us had ever discussed this specific topic before. This family member attended the same seminary about the same time that Bart Ehrman was some 30 years ago.

I'm bringing this up because I want you to know that when you adopt a much more Hebraic perspective of Jesus and the Apostles, as many if not most seminary students are taught to do if they are attending a well-rounded seminary, you begin to see things that you were never able to see before. This family member of mine came to the same conclusions I had, only they had a 30-year head start!

Paul's Other Jesus: History versus the Bible

It is well established history that Paul never met Jesus in person and that he (Paul) had issues and/or disagreements with the Apostles, Jesus' hand-picked Disciples who knew and walked with him personally. So at least we have confirmation that there was Paul's Pagan (Gentile) group, and there were the Jewish Apostles.

However, the depth of Paul's disagreements with Jesus' Apostles gets heavily watered down and even reversed within the Roman Catholic Bible via the writings of Luke and the forged letters of Peter. If we look at the Roman Catholic Bible as the inerrant tome the Church purports it to be, then fine, yes, Paul and the Apostles were all just one big happy family.

But that is not historically the facts or the truth.

I want to examine this issue now between what is "historical" and what is "Biblical", because the two are often not in agreement. Most Christians consider the Bible to inerrant and as such indisputable history. It is for this reason that all kinds of nonsense gets preached, things like, "the Earth is only 10,000 years old," (it is billions of years old); "the Flood of Noah completely covered the Earth", (no, it didn't); and other such nonsense that science has disproved, like the Church demanding that the Earth was the center of the

universe and the sun revolved around it. The Church doesn't have a very good track record when it comes to science or factual history.

But you should by now be seeing that just because ONE GROUP of people, namely the early Pagan Roman Catholics, installed a bunch of edited books into their canon as their version of the facts, so to speak, does not the truth make.

There are other extant (still existing) documents from the period that contradict the Roman Catholic Bible's version of the facts. And just because it's in their Bible, doesn't lend this one group's source any more weight than any other period source, no matter how much you might want to disagree. Both Catholics and Protestants view these other contradictory period documents as "spurious"; but I think we're beginning to see that the Roman Catholic Bible, isn't any better than what they label as "spurious". In fact, I would offer that the Bible is worse than these other period sources in terms of its historical honesty.

Often these days you will see someone discussing the "historical" Jesus versus the "Christian" Jesus. This is basically a nice way of saying that the "Christian" Jesus is a lie. Getting back to Peter and Paul, the historical facts are, looking at other early Christian writings, that Peter and Paul were not friends at all, but were instead, bitter rivals.

Nowhere do we see this deep divide more clearly than within Paul's own letters. Church tradition has watered down the rivalry, even to the point of calling Peter a dunce (more or less) and setting up Paul as the clear winner of their disagreement.

But who was the real Apostle in authority here?

It was Peter.

Not Paul.

Dr. Bart Ehrman, one of the more renowned scholars of Christian history of our time, sums up the situation with a

perspective that is more in keeping with the historical record regarding what really happened between Peter and Paul:

*“The controversy between Peter and Paul presupposed in [the Homilies and Recognitions] is premised on a real, historical conflict between the two, evidenced in Paul’s own writings. In particular, in his letter to the Galatians, Paul speaks of a public encounter with Peter in the city of Antioch over the issue of whether Gentiles who have become Christian need to observe the Jewish Law (Gal. 2:1-14). Paul reports the encounter and states in the strongest terms that Gentiles are under no circumstances to be required to keep the Law. As scholars have long noted, however, Paul does not indicate the outcome of the public altercation—leading to the widely held suspicion that this was one debate that Paul lost, at least in the eyes of those who observed it.”*²⁰

In his argument with Peter, Paul makes it sound like he’s the real authority regarding the Law. However, we never get Peter’s side of the argument within the Roman Catholic Bible. But that doesn’t mean it was never recorded. It just means the Church doesn’t want you knowing what the outcome was.

As Dr. Ehrman has pointed out, we do know from the *Homilies and Recognitions* what happened and what Peter’s side of the argument was. Peter dresses-down the interloping Paul in no uncertain terms. Peter says:

“And if our Jesus appeared to you also and became known in a vision and met you as angry with an enemy [recall that Paul had his vision while still persecuting the Christians; Acts 9], yet he has spoken only through visions and dreams or through external

²⁰ EHRMAN, Bart D., *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew*, 2005, p. 184

*revelations. But can anyone be made competent to teach through a vision? And if your opinion is that that is possible, why then did our teacher spend a whole year with us who were awake? How can we believe you even if he has appeared to you? ... But if you were visited by him for the space of an hour and were instructed by him and thereby have become an apostle, then proclaim his words, expound what he has taught, be a friend to his apostles and do not contend with me, who am his confidant; for you have in hostility withstood me, who am a firm rock, the foundation stone of the Church.”*²¹

The Apostle Peter pulls no punches here in his dressing-down of Paul. Peter challenges Paul’s vision by saying a couple of things, namely: “Can anyone be made competent to teach through a vision?” and “How can we believe you?” And finally, to paraphrase Peter’s words, “If you [Paul] were really instructed by Jesus then you should be preaching the exact same thing as we who actually walked with him!”

Peter pretty much wins the smackdown here.

This also leads us to the obvious conclusion that Paul was NOT teaching the same gospel as the Apostles.

Finally, Peter pulls rank, “Be a friend to [Jesus’] apostles and do not contend with me, who am his confidant; for you have in hostility withstood me, who am a firm rock, the foundation stone of the Church!”

Ouch.

Here is where we see the conflict openly on full display. Paul is the clear interloper here and not the bona-fide accepted apostle he claims himself to be.

In other words, Paul is a LIAR.

This deep division between the Apostles and Paul’s group (namely, Luke, Silas, et. al., Paul had amassed a group of

²¹ Homilies 17.19

twelve of his own disciples according to Luke's Acts) was well known in the first and second century and even beyond. It has been only time and tradition and a deliberate withholding of the facts that have erased the deep conflict and controversy from modern Christian memory.

8

Pagan Rome's Takeover of the Jewish Church

*"Beware of false knowledge;
it is more dangerous than ignorance."*

— George Bernard Shaw

Have you ever wondered why the seat of the Christian Church is in Rome and not Jerusalem? I've wondered that myself many times. But it wasn't until I learned what happened between the Jewish founders and the later Pagan leaders of early Christianity that it began to make sense. The bottom line is that the faith and teachings of Jesus and the Apostles was literally HIJACKED by the early Church leaders in Rome.

The Jewish Jesus wasn't really who the Pagan Leaders in Rome were following; and likewise, the Jewish Peter wasn't really their first bishop or pope—the Pagan Roman Paul was.

To tidy things up and give the Church in Rome's real leader his authority, something needed to happen. They needed to clean-up Paul's rather messy confrontation and controversy with Peter and the Apostles, and they did so through the same mechanism Marcion had used to gain traction with his Roman church—a lying writ. A letter, a book, with a massaged history that showed Paul not as an interloper or a charlatan, but as someone who Peter and James and John and the rest of the Apostles had befriended and accepted as one of their own.

The controversy between Peter and Paul has not been lost on Christian scholars who know not just the Bible, but other extant (surviving) early Christian writings as well; writings the Catholic and Protestant Churches would rather not have survived. In fact, both Catholic and Protestant scholars have adamantly dismissed and attempt to downplay or refute any early Christian manuscripts that might call into question Paul's disagreement with the Apostles as “spurious”, “unreliable”, even the “work of the devil from the pit of hell!” Again, note the drama.

As a side note, when you see the Church engaging in this kind of drama, it is for the benefit or audience of the ignorant laity, not the scholar. Scholars will blow that kind of adolescent nonsense off and then look at you like you're a nitwit. Drama only flies or gets traction with the uneducated.

But nothing is more “unreliable” or “spurious” than a lying charlatan apostle being added to a Bible canon by a group of Roman Pagans with an ax to grind over the Jewishness of the real leaders of the Jerusalem (ie. true Christian) Church.

This is the biggest problem that the Roman Catholic Church and now Protestant Church have: without Paul, the Christian Church has no line of succession back to the Apostles in Jerusalem.

None.

Yes, they can say that they can trace their lineage back to the first “pope” or “bishop”, which was supposedly Peter. But that line of succession must run through Paul, the Apostle to the Pagans (Gentiles / non-Jews), which gave them the authority of the Jewish Apostles, which the early church fathers were not; Jewish, that is.

None of them were Jews.

Not one.

They were all interlopers of the faith and Gospel of the Jewish James, the Jewish Jesus, the Jewish Peter, and the rest of the Jewish Apostles.

The reality is, Paul was really the Catholic Church’s first bishop or pope; it was not Peter as they adamantly like to claim.

So, somehow, these early Pagan Roman Church leaders needed a way to massage the controversy and bring Paul into the line of succession with the Jerusalem Synagogue (Church).

They did so with a truly spurious work of fiction, a massaged history of the events with a bevy of half-truths and outright lies. It was a book ostensibly written by Luke called *The Acts of the Apostles*.

While the book purports to be the acts of all the Apostles, one reading of the work shows that fully half of the book is predominantly the Acts of Paul. The first half of the book is Paul winning over the friendship of the Jerusalem Church—an event that history shows us never actually happened. The latter half of the book is simply the acts of Paul, it is all about Paul, and nothing but Paul.

The fact that Luke is essentially running interference for Paul has not gone unnoticed by mainstream Christian and secular scholars and historians:

“... the purposes of the book of Acts is to minimize the conflict between Paul and the leaders of the Jerusalem Church, James and

Peter. Peter and Paul, in later Christian tradition, became twin saints, brothers in faith, and the idea that they were historically bitter opponents standing for irreconcilable religious standpoints would have been repudiated with horror. The work of the author of Acts was well done; he rescued Christianity from the imputation of being the individual creation of Paul, and instead gave it a respectable pedigree, as a doctrine with the authority of the so-called Jerusalem Church, conceived as continuous in spirit with the Pauline Gentile Church of Rome."²²

Why does it matter? What difference does it make if the Church in Rome has clear lineage back to Peter, James, and John, et. al.?

Because the Gospel preached by the Church in Rome was Paul's Pagan Gospel. It was not the same Gospel of Jesus and the Twelve.

In fact, the two "Gospels" were nowhere near close.

Jesus preached a Jewish Gospel.

Paul preached a Pagan one.

As a modern Christians raised only with Paul's gospel, you don't know or see or even recognize that there was even a difference because you've been indoctrinated with only one version, Paul's Pagan version; and anything else, including the Jewish version as actually taught by Jesus and the Apostles; now seems heretical and even apostate to you!

The truth of Jesus has been made into a lie and the lie of Paul has become your "God's honest" Christian truth.

Light has become darkness and darkness has become light.

I know, it's an earthquake revelation.

It is.

²² MACOBY, Hyam, (Christian / Jewish / Talmudic scholar) *The Mythmaker*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, London, 1986 p. 139

Even now some of us don't believe it's even possible.

How could GOD allow such a thing to even happen!?

Stop.

This isn't about GOD.

Stop trying to pull GOD into something they had nothing to do with.

The Church did this.

Evil men within the Church who preyed on unsuspecting people with a lying writ.

GOD didn't lie to you. The Church did.

And they are still lying to you and people by the billions are still falling for it.

So, perhaps now the real question that needs to necessarily be asked is: What does the "Jewish" Gospel that Jesus and the Twelve actually look like?

I'm going to be honest: we don't know *exactly* what it might have looked like, meaning exactly what Jesus might have taught, because the Church in Rome did a fairly good job of either editing that out or muddying the waters with their revisionist history within their Bible.

But we can glean a fairly good idea by looking at the extant writings of some of the New Testament and also what the latter Prophets wrote within the Jewish Tanakh, something Jesus and the Apostles would have indeed been reading during their period.

However, before we deep dive into the true Gospel of Jesus and the Apostles, I want us to explore a bit deeper what was happening within the early Church during the second, third and fourth centuries when this group of Pagans were fleshing out their Bible canon; and I also want to explore Paul's own take on the Apostles from his own letters.

9

“Judaizers” in the Church!

*“When you tear out a man’s tongue,
you are not proving him a liar, you’re only telling the world
that you fear what he might say.”*

— George R. R. Martin

Earlier in chapter 5, I mentioned some people Paul calls the “Super Apostles” (NIV). The NASB translates Paul’s Greek as “the most eminent apostles.” I think we can agree that Paul is indeed referring to the Twelve here.

But now we have a problem.

In his second letter to the Corinthians, Paul openly insults these “Super Apostles”. This insult is not lost on Christian scholars, and it is not lost on Bible translators either. To massage the discord Paul is having with these “Super Apostles”, scholars and translators have had to bend and twist the context of who Paul is indeed talking about; they have had to “assume” that Paul wasn’t actually referring to James and

Peter and the rest of the “most preeminent Apostles” (NASB), but that Paul was insulting some other group of “Super Apostles” (NIV) in Jerusalem. Or that Paul was just being sarcastic in calling these low-life infiltrating Judaizers “Super Apostles”.

But again, these scholars *must* make such an assumption because of their tradition that assumes Paul is not in disagreement with the Twelve. But remove the man-made tradition, remove the assumption of Bible inerrancy and infallibility, openly observe that Paul doesn’t like the Twelve, and the plain text of Paul’s letter makes absolute perfect sense without the need to “spin” or massage the text out of its original and intended context.

Mainstream Christian commentary on 2 Corinthians 11:5 shows how Christian scholars attempt to push the passage into a new mold, attempting to say that who Paul was debating were OTHER wayward members of the early Church who were “Judaizing” the faith of (Paul’s version of) Jesus with their adherence to the Law.

Other scholars have attempted to say that some popular Pagans (Gentiles) had infiltrated the early Corinthian synagogue and that Paul was merely contending with them.

Right.

Not.

Pagan Gentiles (non-Jews) were NOT welcomed in the Temple or in the Jewish Synagogues.

Period.

At all.

Not unless you were a proselyte, a Pagan converting to Judaism (typically because of marriage) were you granted some access to the synagogue; and even then, they still wouldn’t let you in the Temple; and you sure as hell would not be TEACHING other Jews.

Not. Even.

In many ways, the Jews were just as anti-Pagan as the Romans were anti-Jewish. It's not hard to see why. Neither group really trusted the other.

So, let's look at some commentary about these Super Apostles. The NIV Study Bible's commentary attempts to illustrate that Paul was in fact not disputing with some "renowned" pagan Gentile teachers who had somehow infiltrated the church, but rather with other "Messianic Jews" who were preaching a different message than the one Paul himself was preaching:

11:4 a Jesus other than the Jesus we preached. They presented a Jesus cast in the mold of Judaistic teachings (Paul's opponents were Jews; see v.22...)

11:5 those "super-apostles." Paul's sarcastic way of referring to the false apostles who had infiltrated the Corinthian church and were in reality not apostles at all, except in their own arrogantly inflated opinion of themselves.²³

Neither of these two commentaries are correct in their assumptions, except to note that Paul's opponents were indeed Jews preaching a "Judaistic" or Judaized Jesus.

Paul's opponents were what the Roman Catholic Church and even Protestant Church today would call "Judaizers".

Judaizers.

What does that mean, exactly?

First, let's remind ourselves that Jesus and the Apostles were in fact Jewish men. They preached a Jewish Gospel.

It's who they were.

²³ The NIV Study Bible, 10th Anniversary Edition, Zondervan Publishing, 1995, pp. 1,775

Did these Bible scholars just call the Jewish Jesus a “Judaizer”?

Yes.

They did.

We already know that the early Roman Catholic Church leadership was not Jewish. And they loathed anything remotely Jewish because it was just not popular with their period customers in Rome. Marcion was doing bang-up business preaching a non-Jewish Jesus via Paul and Luke and the early Catholic Church in Rome was doing the exact same thing.

“But Paul was Jewish, Keith!”

Yes and no.

And here is where things get a bit muddy; but the facts are not hard to see or sort out.

Paul may have been Jewish by blood, and even raised in and around Jewish people; but Paul was NOT Jewish in the cultural sense. Paul was a very well-educated Roman citizen and a fully “Hellenized Jew” of the period. Many Jews of the period were. They spoke only common Greek, maybe some Hebrew if they’d been taught by someone from the Temple or close to it. The whole reason for translating the Jewish scriptures into Greek, a book called the Septuagint or LXX, was because relatively few Jews were even speaking Hebrew at this period in history. Most of them spoke Greek.

Paul knew and was aware of Jewish customs, he’d grown up in and around them, studied Torah under Gamaliel to some extent, but Paul’s hometown was Tarsus, a stone’s throw from Antioch, a center of the Pagan universe in the Roman world.

Earlier we talked about the fact that the 4th century Catholic Church, given power and authority under Constantine, changed the Christian day of worship from the 7th to the 1st day of the week. Up until this time Christians closest to the teaching of Jesus and the Apostles worshiped on

the same day as the Jews, just as the Jewish Jesus and his Jewish Apostles had. This was the last day of the week, known to the Jewish world as “Shabbat” or “Sabbath” in English. If you were an early Christian of the first century learning under Peter, James, John, et. al., you would have worshipped on the same day they did, the 7th day Shabbat.

Also note that the vast majority of first century Christians, were Jews; just Jews; and nothing but Jews. If Paul can be credited with anything, it was that he perhaps introduced the Twelve to the concept that yes, accepting Pagans into the Jerusalem synagogue was a good thing. Maybe Jesus had already started that trend and this is where Paul got the idea in the first place? We’ll never know. But just keep in mind that there were a lot more Pagans than there were Jews. It doesn’t take a math genius to observe that eventually these Pagan Gentile converts would outnumber their Jewish brethren at some point.

And over time, that is exactly what happened.

As the Jewish synagogue grew out of Jerusalem and into the Pagan Gentile Church in Rome, culture would overshadow teachings. The anti-Semitic Catholic and Marcion churches in Rome were both busying themselves attempting to rid Christianity of anything remotely Jewish.

The very first ecumenical (church-wide) Church Council of Laodicea was established to cement a number of “canons” (standards) that the developing Roman Catholic Christian Church would abide by. Among them, in addition to establishing what books of the Bible the Church considered official, were changes to the day of worship.

According to the Pagans (Gentiles) running the Church in c. 364 CE, Christians were no longer permitted to rest on the Sabbath, or keep the Passover as they had done alongside their Jewish brethren for centuries.

Canon 29 reads,

"Christians must not judaize by resting on the Sabbath, but must work on that day, rather honoring the Lord's Day; and, if they can, resting then as Christians. But if any shall be found to be judaizers, let them be anathema from Christ."

Just so we know, "the Lord's Day" is *Dies Solis*, Sun's Day, the first day of the week, the worship day dedicated to the Roman sun god, among other Pagan gods of the period.

Canon 37 reads,

"It is not lawful to receive portions sent from the feasts of Jews or heretics, nor to feast together with them."

Canon 38 reads,

"It is not lawful to receive unleavened bread from the Jews, nor to be partakers of their impiety."

Anti-Semitic much?

Make note that the number of "Christians" observing the Jewish feasts and Jewish Sabbath, just as Jesus and the Apostles had done, must have been prevalent; significant enough well into the 4th century that these early Pagan leaders of the Catholic brand of Christian faith felt it necessary put their collective foot down to put a stop to these unholy Judaizing practices! (*Yes, I'm being sarcastic.*)

But what this history tells us is that the Church in Rome founded upon the Gospel of the Pagan Paul was busy excising the Jewishness of not just the Apostles, but the Jewish Messiah as well.

Paul preached one (version of) Jesus.

The Apostles preached another.

And like our esteemed NIV Bible commentary shows, that anti-Semitism is still alive and well within the mainstream Christian Church of today, and all of it inherited by the anti-Semitic Church in Rome via their anti-Semitic Pagan Bible.

Paul Insults the Super Apostles

Just to add a bit more background, what was it, exactly, that Paul says that gets these modern Bible scholars so hot under the collar to make sure you don't read Paul insulting the Twelve?

Let's have a quick look.

Paul admits that the Super Apostles have been preaching a JESUS and a SPIRIT and a GOSPEL that is "different" than the one he originally delivered to the church in Corinth. Paul openly admonishes the church in Corinth with:

*"But I am afraid that just as Eve was deceived by the serpent's cunning, your minds may somehow be led astray from your sincere and pure devotion to Christ. For if someone comes to you and preaches a Jesus other than the Jesus we preached, or if you receive a different spirit from the one you received, or a different gospel from the one you accepted, you put up with it easily enough. I do not think I am in the least inferior to those super apostles."*²⁴

"Super Apostles."

In the Greek the term is *lian apostolos*, or "most preeminent apostles". Breaking it down even further, the Greek word *lian* essentially means superlative, well-known, renowned, great, preeminent, exceedingly, beyond measure!

²⁴ 2 Corinthians 11:3-5 NIV

I think we get the picture.

To make it even more superlative, Paul even prefaces the phrase *lian apostolos* with the Greek term *hyper*, which most of us recognize already as meaning: very, intense, extreme.

What is irritating to me is the fact that these Bible scholars and translators know that who Paul is talking about is indeed the Twelve. But their accepted tradition just cannot abide Paul insulting the Twelve. So they have to massage the text to make it look like the people Paul is talking about are some kind of religious nobodies; and that these nobodies are interloping on to Paul's turf, so to speak. They just cannot allow you to see Paul insulting the Twelve.

They can't.

It would utterly destroy Paul's credibility.

So they take a very clear descriptive phrase like *hyper lian apostolos* and water it down to something that could be taken more marginally, less seriously. "Super apostles" works; it sort of obfuscates, muddies the waters enough to keep you guessing without being an outright lie; but we've just reduced three well-known words in the Greek to two. The translators are indeed obfuscating. The NASB calls them merely the "most eminent apostles". And the Good News Bible's paraphrase offers, *very special so-called "apostles"* with apostles in quotes.

The Geneva Bible published c. 1599 and Young's Literal Translation published in 1862 get the translation spot-on with calling them the "very chief Apostles" and capitalizes the proper noun. Boom! Now we're getting somewhere.

So, would you like to now guess whom these *hyper lian apostolos*, these extremely renowned apostles, these "very chief Apostles" really are?

Yea. You guessed it.

The Twelve.

And Paul just admitted that—

- the Gospel
- the Spirit, and
- the Jesus

being preached by these other “very chief Apostles” is DIFFERENT than the one he’d preached to the Pagans (Gentiles) in Corinth.

Just so we know, the Apostles did not have two gospels, one for the Jews and one for the Pagans (Gentiles). There was only ONE GOSPEL taught to all and it was the one that Jesus taught the Super Apostles; and it was this same Gospel that the Twelve had to re-teach the Pagans in Corinth.

I am not making this up.

Read the text!

This is not some oddball interpretation or misguided perspective here. Paul admits he taught the people in Corinth one Gospel, Spirit, and Jesus, and they received another one from the Apostles.

Paul admits what he preached was “different” than that of the Twelve.

And now Paul is ticked!

Why?

Because his customer base isn’t following him anymore. And they’re not offering him cash for his preaching. Paul went to the Church in Corinth ostensibly with the pedigree of a Jew and the backing of the Jerusalem Synagogue (Church); and now the real Apostles have showed up undone his damage, so to speak, and now Paul is ticked! So much so that he insults not only the people of Corinth but the Apostles themselves as well.

Paul also just burned his bridge with the Corinthians.

So now we begin to see a much more accurate picture of where Paul and his ministry is heading.

Paul's Gospel is Dead

What your fave church also won't tell you is that by the end of the first century, the ministry of Paul of Tarsus was all but dead all throughout Asia Minor, including within Paul's frequent haunts like Ephesus.

Peter, James, and the rest of the Apostles issued letters of authority to their official representatives to keep interlopers like Paul and other charlatans from using them and their *hyperlian* reputation as the means of stealing from whatever town they entered.

Paul was not only a liar and a charlatan, he was a thief as well, using his Jewish heritage as a means of duping the uneducated Pagan Gentiles out of their money with a bogus "Mithraic" gospel they already somewhat recognized, but with a Jewish twist. Paul even gets stung when the Jerusalem Synagogue refuses to give him a letter of authority. Paul spins his lack of such letter like this to the church in Corinth:

"Are we beginning to commend ourselves again? Or do we need, like some people, letters of recommendation to you or from you? You yourselves are our letter, written on our hearts, known and read by everyone. You show that you are a letter from Christ, the result of our ministry, written not with ink but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts.

*Such confidence we have through Christ before God. Not that we are competent in ourselves to claim anything for ourselves, but our competence comes from God. He has made us competent as ministers of a new covenant—not of the letter but of the Spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life."*²⁵

²⁵ 2 Corinthians 3:1-6

Paul was nothing if not a master of spin and hyperbole. This is also where we can see glimpses of Paul's patented *New Covenant*, where Paul spins up something that is uniquely his and not borne by any of the other witnesses in the Bible, even within the other books of the New Testament. Yes, we get it with Luke, but again, Luke is part of Paul's rouge group, so that is to be expected.

Before we dig deeper into Paul's *New Covenant* that is not supported by the Apostles, I want us to notice something about Paul that moves us a little into the supernatural. This is not something that is made up, these are Paul's own words; but it is indeed something that the Christian Church COVERS UP and does NOT want you to see.

In the next chapter, I will show you point blank how Christian Bible translators deliberately change the translated text to prevent you from seeing the truth.

10

Paul's Thorn

"When a well-packaged web of lies has been sold gradually to the masses over generations, the truth will seem utterly preposterous and its speaker a raving lunatic."

— Dresden James

Hebrew used in the Tanakh or Old Testament is a rather simple language and is somewhat more prone to fiddling with by Christian Bible translators. However, by the time we get to Paul and *Koine* (common) Greek in the first century, one of the predominant languages of Rome, the language is very well understood and leaves little room for finagling—especially if you're trying to hide something.

How many times have you sat in church listening to some pastor or other church member wonder out loud what Paul's "thorn" might have been? Many a christian scholar and pastor or church leader have waxed eloquently, sometimes for an entire sermon or Sunday School class, about how Paul suffered

immensely in his service to Christ. Paul was beat up. Paul ran from his enemies (they were angry Jews no doubt). And then finally, Paul was afflicted with some terrible disease. Yet he still pressed on in his service to God. “Oh, poor Paul!” we lament.

The issue with Paul’s so-called “thorn” is that scholars have well known what Paul’s “thorn in the flesh” was since day-one. We know because Paul tells us point blank what it was.

Yes, you read that right.

We already know what Paul’s thorn was.

But because Paul has become our *de facto* Apostle and purveyor of all things Christian, we just cannot bring ourselves to admit that what Paul says happened to him is, well, what he says happened to him.

So, let’s grab a little background on Paul before we dive deeper.

Paul admits (or is accused of via Luke’s Acts) that he’s a murderer. He went around persecuting the followers of Jesus, including killing them. That’s not something you just back away from and say, “Oops, sorry, I was wrong to murder your—” husband, wife, children, brother, sister, or aunt and uncle, or whomever.

2,000 years after the fact, Christianity tries to water down this rather evil aspect of Paul’s character, but the brutality of the man was well-known; and because he had the backing of the State, he could be just about as ruthless as he wanted.

Because of Paul’s murderous reputation, he didn’t just walk into the Jerusalem Synagogue and shake hands with Peter and James and suddenly everything was forgiven.

The fact of the matter was, the Apostles had deep suspicion, animosity, and perhaps not a little human loathing for Paul. They didn’t like him and they sure as hell didn’t trust him. And even after his so-called conversion, he had numerous

spats with Peter, not just the one we read about in the Catholic Bible.

Add to this that Paul was never given formal letters of authority by the Jerusalem Synagogue, and that Paul was rejected by the Twelve even after Paul offered them what some scholars admit was a huge bribe. Paul calls it an offering; but whatever, the Apostles rejected it.

What is also not well-known history and something the Church is eager to cover up, is Paul's rivalry with James, Jesus' brother (sometimes called "James the Just"). James served as High Priest in the Temple on numerous occasions. Jesus, James, and John the Baptist (not the Apostle) were cousins of a very well-to-do family. Contrary to the Roman Catholic version of the history, the family of Jesus were not paupers. Quite the opposite in fact. Jesus' family was quite prominent within the first century Jerusalem. You didn't get to serve as High Priest in the Temple or even teach within the Temple if you were a nobody.²⁶

At some point, Paul and James had some kind of physical altercation where Paul is recorded as having thrown James from the Temple wall (or down the Temple steps, historical accounts vary) breaking his [James'] leg. Scholars debate whether or not this happened before or after Paul's assumed conversion on the road to Damascus, but it does set the stage that James and the rest of the Apostles had no love lost and carried deep suspicion for the Hellenized murderous Benjamite, Paul.

In any event, what the Catholic Church put into its Bible, via Luke's *Acts of the Apostles*, sought to massage away these deep issues of mistrust, and without these facts that I have just

²⁶ TABOR, James, *The Jesus Dynasty: The Hidden History of Jesus, His Royal Family, and the Birth of Christianity*, Simon and Schuster, 2007

exposed you to, we get a very one-sided half-truth, a LIE, about who and what Paul really, truthfully was.

Paul persecuted, tortured and murdered the followers of Jesus. Paul broke James' leg while attempting to kill him. Paul argued openly in anger in public with Peter. Paul was not given letters of authority to preach in the name of Jesus or the Jerusalem Synagogue. And Paul unabashedly insults the hand-picked Apostles of Jesus.

Are we starting to get a little clearer picture here?

Add to this, that along the way, according to Paul's own words, GOD stepped into Paul's life with a warning shot.

Note this is AFTER Paul's ostensive conversion.

In 2 Corinthians 12:7 Paul very clearly states that because of his "boasting" God has tormented him with a "thorn in his flesh." In most modern translations of the Bible, we read Paul saying it this way,

"... there was given me a thorn in my flesh, a messenger of Satan, to torment me."

First, let us remember that this "thorn" is a PUNISHMENT from GOD. Paul is being chastised here; punished for something we in Christianity just cannot quite put our finger on. Oh, sure, we parrot Paul and say it was because of his "boasting", but in the backs of our minds, a lot of Christians wonder why the punishment was so severe?

Boasting?

Something isn't adding up here.

Now take note that what we in modern Christianity have traditionally called a "thorn" is not an actual thorn at all. The word that gets translated as "thorn" is *skolops* in the Greek. This Greek word does not refer to a mere splinter, but rather a large wooden pale, a pole, a pointed stake, more like something used

to anchor a large tent.²⁷ Rather than being something that might be a minor annoyance to you as you work in the garden, it is actually a rather large issue! For reasons that will be made clear in a moment, Christian tradition has sought to downplay Paul's "large wooden stake" in his flesh and portray it as something that was a mere annoyance, or just a mere "thorn".

And this is merely the tip of the iceberg; the massaging of the translation of Paul's admission by Christian scholars gets a lot worse.

What usually gets translated as "messenger of Satan" is actually *aggelos satan* in the Greek. The Greek term *aggelos* simply means "messenger" or "one who is sent"; it is also the Greek root of the English term "angel".

Angel?

Yes. Angel.

We need to carefully note that the word *aggelos* can be translated into English in one of two ways depending upon the nature of the subject being referred to. *Aggelos* is always translated as "messenger" when referring to a human being, and always translated as "angel" when referring specifically to a supernatural being. Whether *aggelos* is translated into English as "messenger" or "angel" is entirely dependent upon the nature of the noun to which it belongs; whether physical, such as a man, or supernatural, such as GOD.

Aggelos is not a difficult word for scholars to translate. It is used 186 times in the New Testament. There are six instances where translators consistently render *aggelos* as simply "messenger" when in reference to human subjects. When used in reference to supernatural subjects, the term *aggelos* is consistently rendered 179 times as "angel".

²⁷ Thayer's Greek Lexicon

Paul himself uses the term *aggelos* 13 times within his epistles, and in all instances he is referring to a supernatural being. He even refers to himself as an *aggelos* of God. This elevation of his own character is something that is not at all out of character for Paul; but even here the translators render the passage correctly because even though Paul is talking about himself, the sender is still God, so rendering *aggelos* as “angel” is the correct translation since the messenger was (ostensibly in Paul’s case) being sent by God.

That is a long way of saying that Christian scholars know how to translate the term properly.

However, in the vast majority of Bibles, the one and only time *aggelos* is rendered in translation as “messenger” instead of “angel” when clearly referring to a supernatural subject (a supernatural being) is when the translators refer to Paul’s thorn—Paul’s *aggelos satan* that was sent by God to punish Paul. No, the one and ONLY time Bible translators make an exception to the rule is to call Paul’s *aggelos satan* a mere “messenger” of Satan.

But Satan is clearly a supernatural being.

So, to render the Bible passage honestly and with consistent translation with every other use of the term *aggelos* within the Bible, and to correctly translate what Paul is indeed saying, the passage should read:

“... there was given me a large wooden stake in my flesh, an angel of Satan, to torment me.”

Let that sink in for a moment.

What is an “angel of Satan”?

We’re not going to mince words here: an “angel of Satan” is by anyone’s definition a demonic spirit, a demonic messenger, a demon.

Period.

This is no mere “thorn”.

It was major ordeal.

And it is also why Paul called the issue “*skolops*”, and not just a mere “thorn”.

Furthermore, this issue is without question a punishment, a consequence that GOD has levied upon Paul and then refused to remove.

Paul says that he prayed three times for GOD to remove the thorn and each time GOD tells Paul—No.

GOD refuses to accept Paul’s repentance.

Why?

It’s a very troubling question.

A question Christian scholars do not want to even admit actually exists. Modern Bible translators also realize this, which is why they have attempted to water down Paul’s admission with a deliberate mistranslation of Paul’s words.

This is completely disingenuous translation, but it is also understandable. Who wants to be the popular mainstream scholar or pastor who is tasked to tell the rest of Christendom that Paul was tormented in his flesh by an actual real demon of Satan that GOD sent and then refused to remove?

It is completely understandable to see why Paul’s punishment by GOD has been reframed; recast as nothing more serious than a mere thorn, a physical ailment of some kind.

Now, lest we still believe that this phrase *aggelos satan* is being used allegorically for a physical disease or other ailment, consider that in all of these uses of the term *aggelos* within the New Testament, it is always used to denote a being, a messenger, whether physical or spiritual, and never a physical condition or disease. Remember, the word *aggelos* specifically means one who is sent, a messenger. *Aggelos* has nothing to do with infirmity or a disease.

This is a DELIBERATE mistranslation of the Greek by many if not most Bible scholars.

As such, it is a LIE.

A lie within the pages of the Bible put in place by men—not GOD.

It is a deliberate attempt at massaging the text, to water it down, so that we do not paint Paul in as bad of light as he himself reveals.

In perpetrating this massaging of the text, modern Bible translators have deliberately inserted ERROR into the Bible and done so on purpose to HIDE something they don't want you knowing.

GOD isn't protecting the Bible from their deliberate mistranslation.

"That's not true, Keith! You're just inserting your own uneducated translation!"

No, I'm not.

I'm not, because other Bible translators DO get the translation right. The late Bible scholar and translator, Dr. Robert Bratcher who previously worked with the International Bible Society (IBS) and American Bible Society (ABS) in translating the Good News Bible, also translated the CEV (Contemporary English Version). It seems Dr. Bratcher had gotten himself into a bit of hot water with the folks at the IBS because he attempted to keep his translations as close to the source as possible, which is why within the CEV, we see a much more accurate translation of Paul's thorn:

*"One of Satan's angels was sent to make me suffer terribly, so that I would not feel too proud."*²⁸

²⁸ 2 Corinthians 12:7 CEV. The DRA, ERV, PHILLIPS, MSF, Wycliffe, and others also have "angel of Satan" or equivalent.

And there are a handful of other Bible translations that get the translation right as well, rendering the text correctly as “angel of Satan”.

So now you know I’m not just pulling personally biased translations out of thin air. The CEV is one of the more accurate modern English translations while most everyone else has gone squishy in order to not cast Paul in any kind of bad light.

Beware of “Ravenous Wolves”: Jesus’ Prophecy of Paul

A previous chapter was titled “Peter and the Wolf”, discussing Peter’s confrontation(s) with Paul. This chapter title was a bit of a foreshadowing, alluding to some understanding that the Jews of Paul’s day knew about him, understandings that have been hidden and lost to us Pagan (Gentile) Christians because we are never taught much, if any, Jewish/Hebraic custom or lore.

Language is indeed part of one’s culture. Quite often if you are unfamiliar with the culture and lore (history) you will miss something important, even ominous, within what is being said with whatever language.

Hebrew is no different. In fact, the more simplistic the language, the more nuanced it can be by tradition and culture.

Because modern Christians have little to no understanding of Hebraic culture, what is obvious to a Hebrew, a Jew, flies right by the Pagan (Gentile / non-Jewish) Christian.

It’s not your fault. You weren’t raised a Jew.

Bible translators, however, do not have your excuse. They do have, or are supposed to have, deep understandings of the Hebraic world and period (historical) Hebraic thought and culture.

One of these not so deep cultural nuances is a Jewish phrase that goes way back into Hebraic culture, all the way back to the time of Jacob and the original twelve sons of Israel. Most of us don't spend that much time in the Tanakh (Old Testament) reading Jewish history and even if we did read it, we don't recall that Benjamin was the youngest of the twelve sons whom Jacob prophesied as a "ravenous wolf", as one who tears and devours his prey and then divides the spoils.

In other words, Jacob was offering a prophecy, telling us what would come from Benjamin's line, a murderous deceitful thief ...

"Then Jacob summoned his sons and said, "Assemble yourselves, so that I may tell you what will happen to you in the [end of] days to come. ... Benjamin is a ravenous wolf; in the morning he devours the prey, and in the evening he divides the spoils."

*"All these are the twelve tribes of Israel, and this is what their father said to them when he blessed them. He blessed them, every one with the blessing appropriate to him."*²⁹

Nice "blessing" (prophecy) to get from your ailing father, but the history is what it is. To you and I, it's meh, much ado about nothing; but to a Jew, a Hebrew, it's part of your culture, your family. You know what tribe you're from and the history of it. Somehow GOD had showed Jacob something of who would come down the line of Benjamin, and it wasn't good news for the future nation.

²⁹ Genesis 49:1, 27-28

A Tale of Two Benjamites

There is an irony and a corollary that escapes quite a few Christian believers and even many Biblical scholars. King Saul of Israel and Saul-called-Paul of Tarsus have some very stark similarities in their lives, not the least of which is that they share the same name.

Both Paul and King Saul also had very similar “thorns” in the flesh. Like Paul, King Saul was also arrogant and refused to listen to GOD. Both men were on similar paths of murderous behavior. King Saul was persecuting and slaughtering the priests under Samuel and Saul-called-Paul was persecuting and slaughtering the followers of Jesus, including the Apostles themselves.

Perhaps not so coincidentally, both Saul and Paul were also Benjamites, from the same tribe of Benjamin. Again, Benjamin was the son whom Jacob prophesied as a “ravenous wolf” and one who tears and devours prey. King Saul’s arrogant and murderous behavior could easily be described as that of a “ravenous wolf”. Later, the Prophets themselves would write of Israel’s own evil leadership in the same manner, describing an evil religious leadership as roaring lions who tear and devour men as their prey.³⁰

This very Hebraic imagery is lost on most of us within the modern Christian world because we’re not culturally Jewish; but it was *not* lost on first-century Christians, especially the Jewish ones living in and around Jerusalem and Judea.

Perhaps it was prophetic that Jesus also used this very same imagery when he spoke of false religious leaders (false prophets, false apostles), calling such false leaders, “ravenous

³⁰ Ezekiel 22:24-26

wolves". When the Jews who were listening to Jesus heard this, they knew the lore; they would be looking for a very specific kind of someone, namely a lying, thieving, murderous Benjamite:

"Beware of the false prophets [leaders, apostles], who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravenous wolves. You will know them by their fruits [what they do and say; how well they uphold the Law and Commandments of God]. Grapes [truthful teachings] are not gathered from thorn bushes [dishonest teachers] nor figs from thistles, are they? ...

*Not everyone who says to me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of My Father who is in heaven will enter. Many will say to me on that day, 'Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and in your name cast out demons, and in your name perform many miracles?' And then I will declare to them, 'I never knew you; depart from me, you who practice lawlessness [who void or have contempt for the Law of God]."*³¹

Christian Bible translators are loath to admit this, but Paul fit Jesus' prophecy to a T. Some of them know this, they have picked up on the corollary and just like the mistranslation of *aggelos Satan*, they make another nuanced change to the text to water-down or hide the Hebrew reference of Jesus describing false prophets (false apostles) as "ravenous wolves".

Note that once again, the NIV's translators deliberately mistranslate this passage as "ferocious wolves" in what appears to be an attempt to distance Paul from the very specific "ravenous wolf" corollary—a corollary, incidentally, that the NASB Bible actually cross-references from Genesis.

³¹ Matthew 7:15-23 NASB, [amplification supplied]

So yes, the NIV's translators are not stupid, they do see the Hebraic correlation Jesus makes quite clearly; and they don't want you seeing it and attaching it to the other "ravenous wolf" murderous Benjamite plagued with a demon in the Bible—King Saul.

Like King Saul, Paul was indeed a murderous Benjamite. Like King Saul, Paul prophesied as the Prophets and performed miracles. And like King Saul had done, Paul abandoned the Law of God. There is no question that the Gospel that Paul taught didn't just downplay, but wholly dismissed the Law of God as irrelevant.

And in the end, just like GOD cursed King Saul, GOD also cursed Paul with a demon that tormented him, an "angel of Satan". A demon God refused to take away.

Again, Paul fits the "ravenous wolf" corollary perfectly.

I also want us to understand something very clearly. GOD is not in the business of chastising people with punishments that do not fit the crime. Yes, Christians have been told that no sin is greater than another in the eyes of God.

That is NOT true.

Christians need to stop reading Paul, stop listening to bad Roman Catholic tradition, and start reading the Prophets more closely to understand that GOD's chastisements, perhaps we could call it GOD's version of Karma, are designed to fit the crime and help us to see how our actions have hurt others. When GOD corrects us, the punishment indeed fits the crime, so to speak.

Paul's crimes were similar to King Saul's and GOD punished Paul accordingly. Yes, the liar attempts to spin his GOD-given punishment as the result of his "successes" in the ministry and for his "boasting" about such. But getting saddled with a demon, an angel of Satan, for boasting? That is one of Paul's biggest lies ever.

And as Christians who are told to look at Paul as one of the greatest apostles who ever lived, we just buy it. Well, because we don't know any better. We've been trusting that the Church we just randomly chose is teaching us truth and not just man-made Pagan tradition.

I also want us to note the severity of both Saul's and Paul's demonic condition. Paul pleads with God three times to take away this demon—and each time, GOD says, No.

Three times.

Effectively, GOD is saying to Paul, “No. I'm done. You're on your own.” God abandoned King Saul to his sin in the same way.

From these examples, we can glean that there is in fact a point of no return with GOD. I don't think that anyone of us in the modern era have ever reached this depth, maybe some of us have. Hitler comes to mind; perhaps some serial killer, drug cartel, or mass-shooting murderer. We'll never know.

The point is there is a “ravenous wolf” ensconced within the pages of the Christian Bible. His lying writings were put there by what can only be described as evil Pagan men with a financial agenda. It had nothing to do with Paul being an actual “Apostle” and more to do with the anti-Semitic Paul preaching a message that was popular in Pagan Rome.

11

Falsifying the Law

"I desire mercy, not sacrifice."

— GOD

A

s everyday Christians living in the modern era, it's entirely possible for us to live our entire lives attempting to walk with GOD and never ever realize that the Gospel we have been taught has been a wayward Pagan version.

This revelation by no means asserts that GOD has abandoned us. Not in the least. Christians today are some of the Godliest, loving, caring people you will ever meet. As Christians we have inherited some quirky understandings of not just GOD, but the Law of God as handed to us by the ancient Priesthood and the Pagan Roman Church.

But forget about what we think we know about GOD for the moment and simply look at what we DO as the people of GOD. Christians, when we're behaving ourselves as most of us

do, utterly embody the Law and Commandments of GOD. Which is actually a little odd considering that Paul was all about what you believed, not what you did. Paul was all about salvation through faith (ie. belief), and it didn't matter what you did. Remember? The Law is a "curse" according to Paul.

If we read the book of James, we note that James is 180-degrees of what Paul taught. James (the book of) taught that faith without DEEDS (works, actions) is a dead faith.

Perhaps millions of books have been written attempting to reconcile both Paul and James. I've read some scholars attempt to massage the two teachings as "two sides of the same coin" and other such nonsense. In fact, the reason the book of James is at the back of the Bible is because Luther hated James. Luther was firmly ensconced in Paul's gospel and to Luther, and rightly so, James represented a diametrically opposing view. Luther was simply reading James properly and to his mind, it looked like James was "Judaizing" the faith of Christ as espoused by Paul.

And he was right. James was "Judaizing" the faith of Christ because Jesus WAS a Jew, and so was his brother, James.

But what Luther and the other Reformers got wrong was that it was Paul who was dead wrong, not James.

And that is what this whole idea of a Second Reformation should be attempting to correct.

Luther and the Reformers made a grand push away from the errors and evils of the Roman Catholic Church. They did. But in many ways, they were still shackled by their own upbringing and still very much anti-Semitic Roman Catholics themselves. To their minds, Paul was right on track and he, not James, became their go-to Apostle. From Paul, the Protestant dogmas of: *Sola Scriptura*, *Sola Fide* (Faith Alone), *Sola Gratia* (Grace Alone), *Sola Christos* (Christ Alone), and *Soli Deo Gloria* (Glory to God Alone) were invented.

But these are indeed very Pagan (Gentile / anti-Jewish) Christian dogmas and they are all centered around something called BELIEF.

But what does the Jewish Gospel look like? And how does it differ from what Paul was teaching?

I want us to take a look at what Jesus and the Apostles, as Jewish men, most likely taught and I think you are going to be pleasantly surprised.

If the mainstream modern Christian Church is any example at all, we can logically reason that GOD doesn't care what you believe or don't believe. A true Gospel cannot be dependent upon people having certain learned or taught knowledge; otherwise people who have never even heard of Jesus or Christianity would be bound for hell.

In that regard the so-called "Great Commission" is a farce. GOD doesn't need you to be spreading Rome's version of a Paul's Gospel in order to save the world.

GOD can save the world without the Church getting in the way.

In that regard, GOD also doesn't care how much faith you have or don't have.

None of that matters.

GOD ONLY cares about what you DO. Meaning, how you treat others.

And that is it.

I know that this revelation is 180-degrees from what Paul teaches, but we're not listening to that guy anymore. The whole goal of Reformation is to begin to see who GOD is anew. Through the eyes of James, Jesus, and the Apostles, and what they (most likely) taught.

About this time some of you are going to be demanding that, "No, Keith, that is not what Peter and James and the rest said what the Gentiles should do! The Apostles were teaching that everyone needed to follow the Law, or at least parts of it!"

You're listening to Paul again.

Stop it.

We don't really know what the Apostles were or were not teaching because within the Roman Catholic Bible Paul all we have to go on is what the liar Paul said that the Apostles said.

Paul's words cannot be trusted.

Stop trusting them.

The fact is, Paul and the Pauline corpus needs to be removed from the Christian Bible—literally. This includes the books of Luke, the books of Peter (Peter did not write them, Paul's group did), and the book of Hebrews (that's a mess of quasi-Jewish hogwash). I'm also pushing to dump the Gospel of John because first of all, the Apostle John didn't write it, a group of Johannian adherents did and they were very much grounded in Paul's camp. The Catholic Church would not have included the gospel book if it didn't fully support their guy Paul. So, out it goes. And there are other reasons for the Gospel of John to be jettisoned from the canon, but we'll get into that a bit later in this chapter.

"Keith! You can't just dump books out of the Bible!"

Yes, you can.

The Reformers did it just 500 years ago; officially less than 150 years ago. Luther wanted to dump the last 5 books of the current Protestant Bible as well.

So yes, it's been done before by CHRISTIANS, by the people of GOD! People who were led by the Spirit of GOD.

It is only man-made Church tradition that says you can't.

If the Reformers did it with GOD's ostensive approval, then we in the modern era can as well once we realize the mistakes of the previous generations.

But more than just dumping lying books from the canon, we first need to dump the man-made TRADITIONS that are not even in the Bible to begin with, starting with the tradition that demands the Bible is somehow the inerrant "Word of

God” or that it is somehow God in book form. Calling the Bible inerrant and wholly inspired is a huge misnomer tradition that needs to be unlearned because, first, it’s not accurate.

GOD never told anyone to create a Bible.

Never.

Beyond that, the Bible was NEVER intended to be something people worshipped as inerrant. But that is exactly what we in modern Christianity have turned the Bible into. It’s “God’s Word”; ergo it’s become God in book form.

“But Keith! It shows God’s true character!”

No. It doesn’t.

AND THAT IS THE POINT!

What it does show is how badly man messed up when God told us to do one thing and evil people did the exact opposite, INCLUDING re-writing the writ to make it look like God was on their side! The Roman Catholic Church did it, but surprise-surprise, the ancient Priesthood was just as guilty of it as well!

The Lying Pen of the Scribes

Allow me to share a small verse with you that utterly DESTROYS the man-made doctrine of *Sola Scriptura* and Biblical inerrancy. Christian theologians outright dismiss this verse because of what it does, it destroys their tradition of thinking that GOD protected the Bible from error.

When Israel’s leadership had so badly disobeyed God that he allowed Babylon to take them into captivity, GOD, speaking through the Prophet Jeremiah chastised the leaders, including the priests and elders, for what amounts to falsifying the Law of God!

You read that correctly.

Let’s see these verses in context:

You [Jeremiah] shall say to them [Israel], 'This is what the LORD says:

*"Do people fall and not get up?
Does one turn away and not repent?
Why has this people, Jerusalem,
Turned away in continual apostasy?
They hold on to deceit,
They refuse to return.*

*I have listened and heard,
They have spoken what is not right;
No one repented of his wickedness,
Saying, 'What have I done?'
Everyone turned to his own course,
Like a horse charging into the battle.*

*Even the stork in the sky
Knows her seasons;
And the turtledove, the swallow, and the crane
Keep to the time of their migration;
But My people do not know
The judgment of the LORD.*

Here's the money quote of Jeremiah 8, it's verse 8:

*"How can you say, 'We are wise,
And the Law of the LORD is with us'?
But behold, the lying pen of the scribes
Has made it into a lie.*

and now the rest of the prophecy ...

*The wise men are put to shame,
They are dismayed and caught;*

*Behold, they have rejected the word of the LORD,
So what kind of wisdom do they have?*

*Therefore I will give their wives to others,
Their fields to new owners;
Because from the least even to the greatest
Everyone is greedy for gain;
From the prophet even to the priest,
Everyone practices deceit.*

Let's unpack Jeremiah 8:8 with a bit of amplification of the underlying Hebrew:

*"How can you [scribes, elders] say, 'We are wise,
and the Law [Torah] of the LORD is with us'?
but behold, the lying pen of the scribes [leaders, elders]
has made it into a lie.*

The NIV says the same but with a bit better understanding, at least to me:

*"How can you say, 'We are wise,
for we have the law of the LORD,'
when actually the lying pen of the scribes
has handled it falsely?'"*

... the lying *pen* of the scribes, meaning the elders of the Temple, REWROTE the Law of God into a FALSEHOOD, with their LYING pens.

Ouch.

Within this passage, GOD, speaking through the Prophet Jeremiah in no uncertain terms declares that the Law as originally given has been falsified, edited, by lying pens.

The translators of the Amplified Bible offer that the scribes and elders lied and turned the law into “a mere code of ceremonial observances”. That’s their take, but I’m quite positive it was much worse than that.

Whatever the scribes and elders did to Torah (the first five books of the Bible) under the leadership of Hezekiah (and perhaps even well before), GOD condemns as a LIE.

These priests and elders edited what God had originally given and in doing so, they turned both Judah and Israel into an unrepentant people so wicked that God found need to punish and disperse the people through Assyrian and Babylonian defeat.

In other words, the Law of God as written within the first five books of the Bible is FALSE, or at the very least contains falsehoods. The extent of these falsehoods we will never know because what we have as Torah today came from (or through) the Hezekiah Priesthood. We don’t know what may have existed before the scribes got out their lying pens and altered the histories and books of the Law.

Now this revelation by GOD via Jeremiah is not going to settle well with our Jewish friends either, many of whom consider Torah to be inerrant and wholly protected by God, just as Christians have been indoctrinated to think about the Catholic Church’s New Testament and the rest of the Bible.

But we cannot ignore the words of GOD here.

The books of the Bible were being FALSIFIED long before the Roman Catholic Church would even exist!

And Israel paid the price for their sin after inserting man-made pagan tradition that GOD found so repugnant that he destroyed Israel and its Temple and then cast a people who’d become so evil into captivity.

And all of this happened simply because a handful of evil, self-religious leaders led the people down a pagan path through the mechanism of a lying writ their leaders insisted

was the irrefutable, infallible, inerrant, wholly inspired Word of God.

As such, it is a huge misnomer to even attempt to call the Bible “inerrant” or “wholly inspired” or “infallible”.

Your church quoting Paul teaches you that “all scripture is God-breathed”, but I’ve just shown you that it’s not, it’s not because GOD says point-blank that it’s not.

GOD says it’s not truthful—the Law has been falsified by lying pens.

Sorry, but GOD trumps Paul.

End of story.

James and Jesus and the Disciples indeed realized this. Probably because they were all reading Jeremiah.

This would have been a huge contention between James, Jesus, John (the Baptist) and the Pharisees, including the Sadducees. Jesus was often accused of not teaching or not following the Law. We’ll get into more about this and why later.

Sacrifices

As Gentile Christians indoctrinated by Paul, we read Jeremiah as little more than ancient history; something that doesn’t pertain to us; because, well, we’re “not under the curse of the Law” anymore. But when you are a Jewish man living under the brutal Babylonian and now Roman regimes because your forefathers screwed up big time, you WANT to know what happened and what they did to cause GOD to abandon you.

I’m going to let you in on a little secret: Israel didn’t fall because they weren’t following the Law of God.

Israel fell because they WERE following it.

But it was a new version of the Law that had been re-written to include, of all things, Pagan animal blood sacrifices. Sacrifices that would be used to feed and enrich the Levite Priesthood.

Have you ever looked at a layout of the ancient Temple in Jerusalem? Outside of holding the typical things we already know about, such as the Holy of Holies, the Temple was basically a massive butcher shop and bakery.

Sacrifices came in the front door, including various grain offerings, and bread and meat were sold out the back door.

What most Christians do not know is that the historical Jesus and his brother James were vegetarian. As such, we can also glean that the rest of the Disciples were most likely also vegetarian.

“Ah, Keith, Peter was a fisherman. He ate fish.”

Yes, but did he continue in that profession after he’d been called by Jesus as a Disciple?

This whole vegetarian issue doesn’t settle well with Paul-loving Christians who have read Romans more times than they can count where Paul says that, in a nutshell, “it doesn’t matter what you eat or don’t eat. Everyone should be convinced in their own minds.”³²

Consequently, the early Roman Catholic Church decidedly went out of its way to show (their version of) Jesus eating fish within its own versions of the Gospels; this also included Luke manufacturing a dream in *Acts of the Apostles* showing Peter being told by (Paul’s) Jesus that he had declared all manner of animals good to eat.³³

³² Romans 14:1-4

³³ Acts 10:9-22

Based on the historical record and Tanakh evidence, I am convinced that it was the slaughtering of animals in the name of GOD that became Israel's ultimate downfall.

GOD removed Israel's blessing and protection when it began to engage in what is decidedly an evil Pagan rite and custom—one that was engaged in by Israel's neighbors, but should not have been by Israel itself.

GOD punished King Saul for doing so.

GOD punished Hezekiah for the same sin.

Incidentally, regarding Hezekiah, Jewish history attempts to remember the king as being the most holy of all the kings of Israel. Yet GOD punished Israel under his ostensive benevolent rule. It makes one wonder if the *lying pen of the scribes* also falsified the books of Kings as well. GOD would have no need to punish a truly good and holy people led by a good and righteous king.

We can also see that Hezekiah and the prophet Isaiah disputed. This doesn't bode well for the ostensibly benevolent righteous king.

Just making the point.

Since we know that the priests and elders had falsified Torah with their lying pens during if not before the reign of Hezekiah, it only makes sense that they would also alter the history of Genesis to make their sin not just palatable but ordained. They sought to give their sin an early pedigree, as if it had been asked for by GOD from the earliest beginnings of man.

Who was Really Righteous: Cain or Abel?

There is a part of the story of Cain and Abel that has always mystified me: Why, after Cain killed Abel, did GOD protect

Cain? It doesn't make any sense. Unless you've twisted the story, which it seems the ancient priesthood did.

In the story, Cain is seen offering a sacrifice of produce from his fields to GOD. Meanwhile, Abel is seen slaughtering his livestock and sacrificing animals. But here is where the story gets weird. God blesses Abel for his blood sacrifice but curses Cain for his grain offering. Cain is so angered that he (Cain) didn't follow God's instruction that he grabs a rock and kills his brother.

Huh?

This gets blamed on jealousy, which the Priesthood's (version of) God chastises Cain for having. But then God puts some kind of mark on Cain that protects Cain from anyone who might want to kill him.

Why does God do this again?

The story makes no logical sense.

Unless you reverse the roles.

Let's do that and see what the story now looks like:

Both brothers offer their sacrifices to God, but Abel slaughters an animal. An act of pagan brutality. One that so incenses Cain that he can no longer stand by while his brother commits such a bloody heartless atrocity. In an act of true righteous compassion, and to prevent his brother from killing even more animals, Cain fights with his brother to stop him, and at some point strikes his brother dead. We don't know how the fight went; perhaps it was an accident? I'm just speculating.

However, in what seems to me to be the true version of the story, Cain's assault is an act of compassion for life.

And now we get to see the real reason why GOD protected Cain. Yes, Cain assaults and kills his brother; but was it an accident? I reason that he did so out of compassion, not jealousy, as the Priesthood would like us to believe.

But because Cain indeed slew Abel, he now fears for his own life that other pagans will come after him to kill him. It is

then that GOD places a mark on Cain that protects him from such retribution.

This version of the story makes much more logical sense than what got recorded in Genesis. It's logical; especially as we unearth the lie that GOD required sacrifices to begin with.

Once we understand that GOD never required animal sacrifices, that this was a Pagan addition to the Law, one for which GOD punished Israel greatly for doing, a much clearer picture begins to emerge of the true Character of GOD from within the pages of Bible.

12

Abolishing Falsehood

*"It takes courage and intelligence to unlearn the wrong beliefs
you've held onto for decades."*

— Unknown

The biggest problem with attempting to tell a lie, especially a historical lie, is that no one is ever so good at it that they are able to clean up every loose end that will ultimately expose their lie for what it is: a half-truth, or a revision of history, even an outright fabrication. They may get away with it for a time, even centuries or even millennia, but at some point, the LIE gets exposed, and the truth comes out—even within the pages of the Bible.

I am, at my core, a very logical person.

As such, something that has always mystified me is man's propensity, call it a susceptibility or even a superpower if you like, is the ability to see something where it does not exist; and also to not see something where it is blatantly on display.

Nowhere is this annoying human characteristic more on display and more practiced than within the arena of politics and religion, and more to the point, the Christian religion.

I take to heart a passage from Isaiah where GOD entreats us: “Come, let us REASON together.”³⁴

The entreaty of GOD implies not some erudite complex uber spiritual secret knowledge that can only be attained by some mystical state of belief; but rather something sound, simple, and rational; something that is easily understood, by anyone, even a child.

Still, we as Christians persist in a kind of unreasoned cognitive dissonance when it comes to sorting truth from man-made fiction. At the root of our self-delusion is something we crave even more than logic and reason—and that is our beloved relationships.

Our acceptance by others.

Human beings will jettison all rational thought if it means maintaining our beloved relationships, especially with someone we have known for a long time and value spending time with.

Churches create these kinds of deep friendships and it becomes painful when we discover that our beloved friends and family, priests and pastors, church leaders, in essence lied to us. Of course, they did not do so on purpose or with any kind of malice in mind; they were simply following the tradition and the market; learning what the market wanted to hear and then preaching that pop-culture message of tradition to their customers.

I get it.

And I’m not really faulting anyone for doing that.

³⁴ Isaiah 1:18

Sometimes the lie can be so deep, so entrenched in our culture and relationships, as it is in this case, that it will take full-blown Reformation to correct it. Even then, the lie won't get corrected by everyone. The Roman Catholic Church still thinks Protestants are heretics. Still thinks itself holy and that it has never done anything wrong. Still thinks that it is the mouthpiece for God. A Second Reformation will likely do no better than the First Reformation did. A Second Reformation won't change the Catholic Church at all; it will only split the Protestant Church.

So be it.

I didn't create the lies. But I don't have a problem exposing and correcting them.

I don't want to see a split in the Protestant Church; like Luther, I want to see Reformation, where the Church is pulled back on-track and closer to GOD. But I know that's not going to happen. People are too stuck to their traditions. There's too much power and money involved and at stake.

But it's not going to keep me from trying to effect change and bring new light and Reformation.

It's not going to keep me from peeling back the lies and exposing the truth.

Getting back to this cognitive dissonance about seeing and not seeing error where it exists—the doctrine of Bible inerrancy sets up the biggest myth of all in both Judaism and Christianity. Orthodox Jews believe Torah to be inerrant just as Christians believe the whole Bible to be.

But CONTRADICTION within the Bible belies the man-made doctrine of Biblical inerrancy and exposes it for what it truthfully is—a falsehood.

But because we have erected the man-made belief that God somehow protected the Bible from error and that it was God who wholly inspired the Bible in its every word, Christian pastors, leaders and scholars have created every kind of

linguistic and apologetic mechanism imaginable in order to make the Bible's contradictions *not* look like what they are—contradictions.

Nowhere is contradiction more evident within the Bible than with this whole business of animal sacrifice.

While the Hezekiah priesthood did its best to rewrite the books of Law and even some of the early history to insert this heinous paganism into Torah, they couldn't control what came after them, especially with the latter Prophets where we see GOD condemning the practice of sacrifice. I'm not going to make an exhaustive review of where we see GOD declaring loathing for sacrifices, but suffice to say, we can see it well on display within these passages:

"To do what is right and just is more acceptable [to me] than sacrifice." —God ³⁵

"Your sacrifices do not please me." —God ³⁶

"I desire mercy, not sacrifice." —God ³⁷

"[I] detest the sacrifice of the wicked, but the prayer of the upright pleases [me]." —God ³⁸

"I gave your ancestors no commands about burnt offerings or any other kinds of sacrifices when I brought them out of Egypt. But I did command them to obey me, so that I would be their God and they would be my people. And I told them to

³⁵ Proverbs 21:3

³⁶ Jeremiah 6:20

³⁷ Hosea 6:6

³⁸ Proverbs 15:9

live the way I had commanded them, so that things would go well for them.” —God ³⁹

This last admonishment by God should open and shut the door on what really happened. God says, “I never gave you any commands about sacrifices!”

But the Christian dogma of Biblical inerrancy just will not allow us to see such contradictions. We see all the tradition within Genesis and Exodus, all the laws laid out Leviticus, the bloodletting of Numbers, and even more laws about sacrifice in Deuteronomy. We see all of these chapters and chapters of sacrificial laws. We see Israel building the Temples after coming out of Egypt each one getting bigger and more ostentatious. Is it any wonder we just automatically think, “Wow that’s a lot of instruction. God was very specific in all these rites.” Of course, we’re going to assume that this is what God wanted!

Then along comes Jeremiah with one verse and because of our Christian beliefs, well, we must ignore the passage; ignore the words of GOD. Because to do otherwise, to accept the words of GOD via the Prophet would be to admit that an egregious error has been entered into the Bible.

Not to mention that our man-made tradition of thinking the Bible inerrant has now been contradicted *by* GOD.

This is where our man-made Christian tradition of *Sola Scriptura* overrides and destroys our understandings of GOD. Since we *must* believe that the Bible is without error, we must ignore the contradiction. In Torah, we see books and books of God saying, “I want all of these bloody sacrifices”; then along comes Jeremiah and God says, “I never gave you any of these laws.”

³⁹ Jeremiah 7:22-23 GNT

Our man-made tradition even messes with the translation of the scriptures. Bible scholars see the problem probably better than most. The NIV Bible even allows the Christian tradition to change the translation of the Hebrew to somehow make the contradiction *not* a contradiction anymore. The NIV translators inserted the word “just” into their translation to make it look like God wasn’t being contradictory.

Here’s the NASB and the NIV translation for comparison of Jeremiah 7:22:

“For I did not speak to your fathers, or command them on the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices.” [NASB]

“For when I brought your ancestors out of Egypt and spoke to them, I did not just give them commands about burnt offerings and sacrifices,” [NIV]

Notice how the NIV’s addition of the word “just” completely changes the meaning of the passage? But this is a decidedly Christian addition to the text. The underlying Hebrew does not imply that God “just” gave them commandments regarding sacrifices. The underlying Hebrew is clear—GOD gave us “no commands” regarding sacrifices.

This is yet another man-made ERROR inserted into the NIV Bible now, an error in translation, inserted by MODERN scribes, if you will, and only for the sake of maintaining errant Christian tradition.

I believe James and Jesus recognized the issue of animal sacrifice and that it was not something that God ever commanded, and that is what they preached!

However, this Gospel of no longer offering sacrifices in the Temple would have been a Gospel message that would have horrified the primarily evil first century priesthood! Not only

because James and Jesus were preaching against what was clearly written in the Law, but also because teaching the people to not bring sacrifices to the Temple would be cutting into the Pharisee's and Sadducee's religious money machine.

The Temple was a revolving door of animal and grain sacrifices, a slaughterhouse and bakery that supplied the elites with a continuous and endless supply of fresh meat and bread to eat and sell, including additional cash via the money changers. It was a slick business operation, and one that both James, Jesus and their cousin John (the Baptist) had been born into.

And seeing how both Jesus and John were continuously at odds with the Pharisees and other religious leaders, it would not be any stretch of the imagination to understand that they hated the family business.

This is most likely, at least to my very logical mind, why Jesus, John, and even James and the rest of the Disciples would have been seen and accused of not preaching the Law of God.

Fulfilling the Law

In Matthew 5:17-18 we see something interesting that I want to bring to our attention. Jesus is recorded as saying:

"Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. For truly I tell you, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished."

Some of us will now think that this is Jesus upholding the Law of God as being somehow perfect. But this passage has been interpreted by many people in many ways over the

centuries. It's kind of a contradiction all by itself. It doesn't make any logical sense. My take is that the original passage has been massaged by the editors of Matthew. The Church needed to see Jesus upholding the Law for the Jews while Paul was disavowing it for the Pagans.

Within the Clementine Homilies, we again see Peter discussing this very passage and it makes perfect sense if you understand that the Law as messed with by the Priesthood,

Then said Simon: 'I understand that you speak of your Jesus as Him who was prophesied of by the scripture. Therefore let it be granted that it is so. Tell us, then, how he taught you to discriminate the Scriptures.'

Then Peter: 'As to the mixture of truth with falsehood, I remember that on one occasion he [Jesus], finding fault with the Sadducees, said, "Wherefore ye do err, not knowing the true things of the Scriptures; and on this account ye are ignorant of the power of God." But if he cast up to them that they knew not the true things of the Scriptures, it is manifest that there are false things in them. And also, inasmuch as He said, "Be ye prudent money-changers," it is because there are genuine and spurious words [written within the scriptures].

And whereas He said, "Wherefore do ye not perceive that which is reasonable in the Scriptures?" He makes the understanding of him stronger who voluntarily judges soundly. And his sending to the scribes and teachers of the existing Scriptures, as to those who knew the true things of the law that then was, is well known. And also that He said, "I am not come to destroy the law," [Matthew 5:17-20] and yet that He appeared to be destroying it, is the part of one intimating that the things which He destroyed did not belong to the law. And His saying, "The heaven and the earth shall pass away, but one jot or one tittle shall not pass from the law," intimated that the things which pass away before the heaven and the earth do not belong to the law in reality. Since, then, while the heaven and the earth still stand,

sacrifices have passed away, and kingdoms, and prophecies among those who are born of woman, and such like [kingdoms, prophecies and laws that were merely man-made], as not being ordinances of God.'

While the Old English translation of these passages from the Homilies may be a bit difficult for us to read, in a nutshell Clement (or the author or authors of the Homilies) cements the point that Jesus indeed taught Peter and the rest of the Apostles that there were false things within the Law of God.

This is wholly in keeping with what we read in Jeremiah 8: that the law was altered by the lying pen of the scribes.

Now take note of the last paragraph:

"Since, then, while the heaven and the earth still stand, sacrifices have passed away, ... [these were] not being ordinances of God."

GOD never commanded sacrifices. We are not the only Christians to recognize this. Other early Christians knew what Jesus and the Apostles were teaching as well: they were preaching that the sacrificial system as created by the ancient priesthood was completely pagan garbage.

The sacrificial laws were never the ordinances of GOD.

Ever.

"Okay, Keith, wait, hold on just one second. If God never commanded sacrifices, then why did Jesus have to die? And what about the entire book of Hebrews? It tells us all about the sacrifices and how they were inferior to Jesus' sacrifice! Only Jesus' atoning blood was able to cleanse Humanity from our sin!"

Stop.

You keep listening to Paul again and you're not grasping the Earth-shattering freedom you've just been given.

You may be a little confused now. You really, really want Jesus to be your human sacrifice that somehow washes away your inherited sin. It's what your beloved church has saddled you with thinking. And it makes you feel super special that "God DIED" for you.

I get it.

But we need to peel back a few more layers of the lies and expose where Paul's (version of) Jesus really came from. We need to rebuild a new foundation of understanding that is more in keeping with who GOD really and truthfully is.

13

Jesus or Mithras?

*“It is difficult to get a man to understand something
when his job depends on his not understanding it.”*

— Upton Sinclair

As we peel back the layers and layers of lies upon lies, we’re slowly beginning to see a GOD that looks very different and a lot more interesting than the harsh, unyielding, demanding god of bloody sacrifice that had been created by the ancient Priesthood.

But I want to take a step back for a moment to have another look at Paul once again and the discordant “different” gospel that Paul was preaching versus the one that James, Jesus, John (their cousin), and the Apostles most likely taught.

You might be wondering, if GOD didn’t actually require sacrifice to forgive, then what was the whole point of Jesus’ sacrifice on the cross?

I am not going to answer that for you.

YOU must answer that for yourself.

I am not here to tell you what to think or what to believe. I am just here to give you the facts and a historical view of them that has been hidden from you.

What I will say is this: Jesus NEVER taught anyone to worship himself. We do, but only out of, or because of, some inherited Church tradition.

Jesus taught us to pray to, and to worship GOD, our Father, not himself. I've never understood this whole tradition of praying to Jesus. It makes no sense because it's not even Biblical. In fact, the scriptures contradict the Church's tradition. Yet we still do it.

So, let's take a look at the "historical", as opposed to the "traditional" Jesus built by Paul and the Pagan Roman Catholic Church.

First of all, let's remind ourselves that Paul admits that the "Jesus" and the "Gospel" and even the "Spirit" that leads him are "different" than that being taught by the "Super Apostles".

Keep in mind that the Gospel you now know and have been taught by your randomly selected church is PAUL's gospel—not Jesus'. I say "randomly selected" church because when you chose whatever church you're now attending, you didn't choose it because you're a rock star Bible scholar and you wanted to find a church that preached the truth.

The chances are you are attending the church you are because of your family. You, more likely than not, grew up in your church or denomination. Or you started going because of a friend that invited you and you like the people.

The point is, you didn't start attending whatever church because they were preaching what you already knew. You INHERITED whatever knowledge you now have FROM the church you are now sitting in. Or from the various churches you have attended over your lifetime. This knowledge was not so much education as it was a one-sided INDOCTRINATION

and it has given you a perception and perspective, right or wrong, of what you now believe.

Sure, you can say that it was GOD who led you to whatever church, I'm fine with that; but just because GOD led you somewhere does not mean that GOD is going to keep you there, or that the knowledge these people are teaching is accurate. The size of one's church is also not indicative of God's blessing either. I read a Christian pastor comment once:

*"Woe to the man who believes
the size of his church is a sign of God's
blessing." — Unknown*

ALL of Christianity has in many regards an errant view and understanding of just who GOD is at the moment; and as the spirit of GOD moves to bring about another Reformation, it is my hope that your perceptions and perspectives will indeed change to see GOD better and much more clearly than what you ever learned from listening to Paul via the Roman Catholic Bible, which is, as far as the New Testament is concerned, all just the gospel according to Paul.

With these things in mind, let's dig a little deeper to see a little bit more of who Paul's Jesus is and where his (version of) Jesus came from.

Paul's Jesus

There is a reason why the Pagan leadership of the Church in Rome chose Paul as their "guy" and not the Jewish Apostles in Jerusalem. We've already covered that a Jewish Jesus didn't sell well with the Pagan Romans.

Marcion was doing bang-up business with his Pauline Bible canon and the leaders of the Church in Rome were all over that bandwagon.

Part of the reason why Paul's Jesus sold so well with the Roman Pagans was because Paul's Jesus already had a pedigree and was well-known within the Empire.

Paul's Jesus was quite simply—Mithras. A cipher for or a rebranding of the Pagan Persian god.

Most of us have never even heard of Mithras (also spelled "Mithra"); probably because our Christian leadership doesn't want us knowing about him.

Again, the Church is guilty of a LIE of omission here. If your god is based on or is a rehashing of a previously existing faith, you have a duty to tell people that.

In a nutshell, Mithras was a Pagan god who came to Earth from heaven in the flesh of man. Depending on the version of Mithras you read from antiquity, he was said to have been born out of a rock. Other accounts said that he was born of a human virgin. There were plenty of other Pagan gods in the Greco-Roman mythos who were born of virgins as well. So, it's not hard to see where Paul got his Jesus' virgin birth story. In any event, Mithras was killed as a human blood sacrifice to abate punishment for the sins of the whole world. He was buried in a stone tomb. And after three days he was raised to life again.

Sound familiar?

Adherents to the faith of Mithras believed that it was his blood that cleansed them from sin, and they would literally slay animals, covering themselves in animal blood so as to be "washed in the blood" from their sins. They also ceremonially ate Mithras' body and drank his blood as the means of internalizing their god within themselves.

No, I am not making this up.

The religion of Mithras originated in ancient Persia and predates James, Jesus and the Apostles by some 1,500 years.

Paul admits that he spent some time in Arabia—this is simply another term for ancient Persia. When Paul returns, his understandings of Mithraism are complete and he begins his ministry by preaching a version of Jesus that looks almost exactly like the Pagan Persian god.

Jesus is, in Paul's mind, the reincarnation of Mithras.

The fact of the matter is, Paul ALREADY knew about Mithras before he journeyed to Arabia. He grew up in Tarsus which is only a few miles from Antioch—and Antioch was the center of Mithraic worship in the Roman world.

Mithras was well-known in Rome by the first century and his cult only grew in popularity, to the point that Mithras was made the "Protector of the Empire" by the Romans in 307 CE, right before Constantine would declare Christianity to be the official religion of Rome.

As I just discussed, some versions of the Mithras story, well predating Christianity, make the Pagan Persian god the son of a human virgin with his birth attended by shepherds and Magi who brought gifts to a cave, the place of his birth. Rome would even adopt the same birthday for Mithras that would be shared with Rome's sun god. *Dies Natalis Solis Invicti* (Latin) was the "Birthday of the Invincible Sun" [god], and was celebrated on December 25, just after the Winter Solstice. Not so ironically, this would become the Church's official birthday for Jesus as well.

You may think I'm making this all up.

Trust me, I'm not.

The American Civil Rights icon, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., wrote some rather extensive work on the similarities between Jesus and Mithras:

Originally Mithra was one of the lesser gods of the ancient Persian pantheon, but at the time of Christ he had come to be co-equal with Ahura Mazda, the Supreme Being. He possessed many

attributes, the most important being his office of defender of truth and all good things... He hears all and sees all: none can deceive him.
[Footnote: Cumont, *Mysteries of Mithra*, pp. 2, 3.]

Tarsus, the home of Saint Paul, was one of the great centers of his [Mithra's] worship; and there is a decided tinge of Mithraism in the Epistles and Gospels. Such designations of our Lord as the Dayspring from on High, The Light, the Sun of Righteousness, and similar expressions seem to come directly from Mithraic influence."
[Footnote: Weigall, *op. cit.*, p. 129.]

Again tradition has it that Mithra was born from a rock, "the god out of the rock." It must also be noticed that his worship was always conducted in a cave. Now it seems that the general belief of the early church that Jesus was born in a cave grows directly out of Mithraic ideas. The words of St. Paul, "They drank of that spiritual rock... and that rock was Christ" also seem to be a direct borrow from the Mithraic scriptures.

*The Hebrew Sabbath having been abolished by [Roman Catholic] Christians, the Church made a sacred day of Sunday, partly because it was the day of resurrection. But when we observe a little further we find that as a solar festival, Sunday was the sacred day of Mithra; it is also interesting to notice that since Mithra was addressed as Lord, Sunday must have been "the Lord's Day" long before Christian use. [Footnote: *Ibid.*, p. 137.] It is also to be noticed that our Christmas, December 25th, was the birthday of Mithra, and was only taken over in the Fourth Century as the date, actually unknown, of the birth of Jesus.*

To make the picture a little more clear, we may list a few of the similarities between these two religions: (1) Both regard Sunday as a holy day. (2) December 25 came to be considered as the anniversary of the birth of Mithra and Christ also. (3) Baptism and a communion

meal were important parts of the ritual of both groups. (4) The rebirth of converts was a fundamental idea in the two cults. (5) The struggle with evil and the eventual triumph of good were essential ideas in both religions. (6) In summary we may say that the belief in immortality, a mediator between god and man, the observance of certain sacramental rites, the rebirth of converts, and (in most cases) the support of high ethical ideas were common to Mithraism as well as Christianity. In fact, the comparison became so evident that many believed the Christian movement itself became a mystery cult. "Jesus was the divine Lord. He too had found the road to heaven by his suffering and resurrection. He too had God for his father. He had left behind the secret whereby men could achieve the goal with him." [Footnote: Enslin, op. cit., p. 190.] ⁴⁰

Historian Franz Cumont, whom King references in his footnotes, elaborates,

The struggle between the two rival religions was the more stubborn as their characters were the more alike. The adepts of both formed secret conventicles, closely united, the members of which gave themselves the name of 'Brothers.' The rites which they practised offered numerous analogies.... Their conceptions of the world and of the destiny of man were similar. They both admitted the existence of a Heaven inhabited by beautified ones, situate in the upper regions, and of a Hell peopled by demons, situate in the bowels of the earth. They both placed a Flood at the beginning of history; they both assigned as the source of their traditions a primitive revelation; they both, finally, believed in the immortality of the soul, in a last

⁴⁰ From Martin Luther King Jr. in a paper entitled, *The Influence of the Mystery Religions on Christianity*. King wrote this paper for the course "Development of Christian Ideas".

judgment, and in a resurrection of the dead, consequent upon a final conflagration of the universe.

We have seen that the theology of the Mysteries made of Mithra a 'mediator' equivalent to the Alexandrian Logos. Like him, Christ also was an intermediary between his celestial father and men, and like him he also was one of a trinity. These resemblances were certainly not the only ones that pagan exegesis established between the two religions, and the figure of the tauroctonous god reluctantly immolating his victim that he might create and save the human race, was certainly compared to the picture of the redeemer sacrificing his own person for the salvation of the world. ⁴¹

I told you I wasn't making this up. It is actually well-known Roman history that Christianity's scholars attempt to ignore and would like to bury.

But the fact remains: Paul's "Jesus", Paul's entire "Gospel" in fact, was little more than a near complete plagiarizing and rebranding of the Pagan god Mithras and the religion that surrounded him.

It makes one wonder just exactly what different "spirit" Paul was preaching under the influence of? Well, we already know that: Paul admits that GOD punished him with a demon, and angel of Satan that tormented him.

Again, these are Paul's own words.

The only difference here is that I'm not watering down Paul's Greek like your Christian translators have done to hide what GOD actually did to punish Paul. Christian translators have themselves LIED to you about Paul, tried to hide his true

⁴¹ CUMONT, Franz Valéry Marie, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, Forgotten Books, 1956, 239 pages pp. 119-120

affliction and condition and what “spirit” was influencing his “gospel”.

I’m also revealing hard FACTS and history your Church is hiding from you and doesn’t want you to know.

The pagan religion of Mithras is all well-known and well-established history. Again, it is not by any stretch unique or so-called “original research”.

Paul’s Jesus, and by extension Paul’s Gospel; the Jesus you think you know and pray to; the Jesus that was canonized into their Bible by the Pagan Roman Catholic Church; is not the true “historical” Jesus at all.

I know this is a bombshell revelation.

It is.

This is why a Second Reformation is needed and this is why it is necessary. We’ve been basing our view of Jesus and of GOD on a Pagan charlatan fake apostle who was influenced and tormented by a demonic spirit!

The GOD of James and Jesus and the Apostles is not a god who demanded sacrifice.

“Wait, Keith! If God didn’t require sacrifice, how did He forgive us?”

Good question. What was the true mechanism for GOD’s forgiveness?

I think we can easily glean that from the Gospels. In Mark 1:4-5 we see James’ and Jesus’ cousin John:

“John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness, preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. And all the country of Judea was going out to him, and all the people of Jerusalem; and they were being baptized by him in the Jordan River, confessing their sins.”

Even in Luke 3:3 we see the record of John being called by GOD to preach,

“a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins.”

REPENTANCE.

Not sacrifice.

This is the true Gospel of James, Jesus and the Apostles. And this is the true character of a truly loving GOD. One who does not command the death of someone ELSE to appease their anger or pain over something YOU did.

Sin is always an ACTION. Something you DO. Sin is never a state of being. You COMMIT a sin; you are not the sin.

I supposed it could be argued that people who commit a lot of sins are “sinful” people, but at the end of the day, it is only your actions that make you that way, not just because you were born Human.

Mainstream modern Christianity’s adoration of the Pagan Paul must come to an end if we are to see GOD much more clearly than we have been led to see via the Roman Catholic Church’s Pagan Pauline Bible.

We must return to an understanding of what Jesus and the Apostles actually taught.

With Paul’s ungodly influence, the entire New Testament has become riddled with Paul’s Pagan Jesus, Paul’s Pagan gospel via the Church and Paul’s demonic spirit. It is an influence that now must be sifted out so that a much more accurate portrayal of GOD can be seen.

I believe by this point I have peeled away enough of the layers upon layers of the framework of LIES that we can now see that there is indeed a charlatan apostle within the pages of the Bible.

I’ve used more words than are probably necessary to make that point; it’s a failing (or a gift?) of mine. But I want to make sure you get the significance of all of this.

What does the Gospel of Jesus and the Twelve actually look like with Paul's singular witness an ungodly influence removed?

In the next chapter we will explore just that.

14

The Witness of Two or Three

“In religion and politics people’s belief and convictions are in almost every case gotten at second-hand, and without examination by authorities who have not themselves examined the questions at issue but have taken them at second-hand from others.”

— Mark Twain

You have hear it said that the truth is determined by the witness of two or three. This is an ancient Jewish custom, and it means that you need to have at least two and preferably three witnesses to prove whatever.

Bible scholars have long considered Paul’s testimony of Jesus the *de facto* testimony of truth because Paul appears to have multiple other “witnesses” to his Gospel teachings.

But if we really dig down and prosecute Paul’s testimony with a much more critical (meaning exacting) eye, we discover that Paul’s testimony is not corroborated by other witnesses at

all and that his gospel rests solely with himself and only on his own testimony.

In his highly lauded book, *The Case for Christ*,⁴² author Lee Strobel, a former atheist turned Christian, purports to build a kind of legal court case for the existence of Jesus and his assumed divinity. The problem is, Strobel doesn't really interview "witnesses". He simply interviews people already in the tank for Paul and (Pagan) Christian tradition. NONE of the people he interviews were there or saw Jesus or even met Jesus.

To be fair, I'm not really picking on Strobel, I've never met him; I'm sure he's a great guy. I'm merely pointing out the fact that none of Strobel's "witnesses" are legitimate; meaning legal. They weren't there and their "hearsay" witness would never be allowed in any kind of court. (Sorry, Lee, not picking on you, just making the point.)

As we noted earlier in this book, forgeries were rampant in the ancient world. Books were being written in the names of some very prominent people, mostly for reasons of commerce, but also for more nefarious reasons—to teach or support something that didn't really happen. And nowhere is this attempt at rewriting history through forgery more glaring than with the false witness of the books of Peter.

The Books of Peter

Nothing stands out more in the support of Paul's pagan gospel than the books of Peter. I have been hinting around that these books are pseudepigrapha, forgeries, books written in

⁴² STROBEL, Lee, *The Case for Christ: A Journalist's Personal Investigation of the Evidence for Jesus*, Harper-Collins Publishing

the name of the famed Apostle, and now we're going to look at why and why they were not actually written by Peter.

Luther evidently loved the books of Peter; probably because they offered Peter's support of Paul, and even contained some doctrinal support for Paul's Pagan gospel.

However, it doesn't take too much scholastic training to see that these books were not written by Peter. Since the Reformation, scholars have long known that the books of Peter were at best meddled with and at worst, outright forgeries designed with the sole purpose of supporting a charlatan apostle who had no relationship whatsoever with the Super Apostles, and no relationship with the ONE Super Apostle whom he hated—namely Peter.

The Pagan Church in Rome needed to create a clear line of succession giving them the authority the Super Apostles through Paul (the so-called "Apostle to the Gentiles") and it would be the books of Peter that would accomplish this necessary task.

Not many of us realize this or even care after 2,000 years of entrenched Pagan Church tradition; but legally, if you will, without Peter's endorsement, Paul's Apostolic Credentials, so to speak, rest solely upon himself.

Paul has NO TIES to the Jerusalem Synagogue without the endorsement of Peter.

None.

In other words, Paul is his ONLY witness. Paul absolutely needs the endorsement of Peter; without it, he's seen as the interloper that he truthfully is.

So, let's first look at the book of 1 Peter. The reason many scholars contend that the book of 1 Peter is not the work of the famed Apostle is not only because of the deeply Pauline doctrines the book espouses, but also because the Greek of 1 Peter is not just good, but exceptional. It is, in fact, some of the best Greek in all the New Testament. Its sheer eloquence

surpasses that of the well-educated prose of Paul and is simply not the work of a simple Galilean fisherman.

F.W. Beare observes:

*The epistle is quite obviously the work of a man of letters, skilled in all the devices of rhetoric, and able to draw on an extensive, and very learned, vocabulary. He is a stylist of no ordinary capacity, and he writes some of the best Greek in the whole New Testament, far smoother and more literary than that of the highly-trained Paul.*⁴³

Even causal readers of the book will point to the fact that of course Peter didn't write it, the book itself states that Peter dictated it to someone named *Silvanus*.⁴⁴ This easily explains why the Greek can be so exceptional.

Okay, but just who is this Silvanus?

Silvanus is simply the proper name for Silas; the same Silas found traveling with Paul in Luke's *Acts of the Apostles*.⁴⁵

Now the brake lights go on.

To any everyday Christian this appears to be no big deal. Paul and Silas and Peter were all buddies! Right?

Not. Even.

While we in the uneducated Christian world will just assume that it would have been no big deal for Peter to ask Silas to write his letter, such a notion stirs rebuttals of deep dissent within highly trained scholastic circles. Scholars know a lot more about the history of these men than you and I ever will.

⁴³ BARCLAY, William, *The Daily Bible Study Series, The Letters of James and Peter*, Introduction to Peter (1), p. 142

⁴⁴ 1 Peter 5:12

⁴⁵ 2 Corinthians; 1-2 Thessalonians

Considering the deep conflicts over the keeping of the Law between the Apostles and Paul's group (which included Silas), the heavily contradictory Pauline theology being espoused by the books of 1 & 2 Peter, and the admission that Silvanus was not just the stenographer but the literary architect of the Greek of 1 Peter, well-educated scholars find it very difficult to see how this book is anything other than a complete work of outright fraud.

In other words, Peter did not write the letter NOR did he dictate its contents.

The Jerusalem Synagogue (Church) was large and well known in the latter part of the 1st century. Peter had at his disposal any number of very well-educated people in Jerusalem to whom he could tap to dictate his letters in Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, or Latin. He did not need Paul's sidekick Silas—and in fact would have likely regarded Silas utterly untrustworthy as part of Paul's rogue group.

Other Bible scholars are of this same understanding:

One cannot save Petrine authorship by arguing that Peter employed a secretary. If one argues that this secretary was Silvanus, the traveling companion of Paul (eg. Selwyn 1958) or an anonymous amanuensis of the Roman church (Michaels 1988) the letter then becomes the product not of Peter, but of the secretary, since it is the latter's language that the epistle exhibits (see Beare 1970).⁴⁶

Other evidence contained within the book itself testifies against 1 Peter being a book that was actually written or even dictated by Peter.

W.G. Kümmel observes:

⁴⁶ EVE, Eric, *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, p. 1263

*I Peter presupposes the Pauline theology. This is true not only in the general sense that the Jewish-Christian readers, the 'people of God' (2:10), are no longer concerned about the problem of the fulfillment of the Law, but also in the special sense that, as in Paul, the death of Jesus has atoned for the sins of Christians and has accomplished justification (1:18 f; 2:24). Christians are to suffer with Christ (4:13; 5:1), obedience to the civil authorities is demanded (2:14 f), and the Pauline formula *en XRISTW* is encountered (3:16; 5:10, 14). The frequently advanced proposal that I Peter is literarily dependent on Romans (and Ephesians) is improbable because the linguistic contacts can be explained on the basis of a common catechetical tradition. But there can be no doubt that the author of I Peter stands in the line of succession of Pauline theology, and that is scarcely conceivable for Peter, who at the time of Gal 2:11 was able in only a very unsure way to follow the Pauline basic principle of freedom from the Law for Gentile Christians.⁴⁷*

The book of 2 Peter exhibits even deeper problems. Even from the Reformation era, not even John Calvin believed that Peter wrote the book of 2 Peter! In the modern era, William Barclay notes within his *Daily Bible Study Series* that it is difficult to believe that 2 Peter was actually written by Peter the Apostle:

It is the well-nigh universal judgment of scholars, both ancient and modern, that Peter is not the author of Second Peter. Even John Calvin regarded it as impossible that Peter could have spoken of Paul as Second Peter speak of him (3:15-16), although he [Calvin] was

⁴⁷ KÜMMEL, WG, Introduction to the New Testament, p. 424

*willing to believe that someone else wrote the letter at Peter's request.*⁴⁸

It is clear that these books have been in deep dispute since the Roman Catholic Church added them to their Bible. Even our own modern Christian scholars concur that the people whose names they bear did not actually write them.

However, mainstream Christianity continues to insist that these very doctrinally Pauline books are valid books written by the Apostle Peter. Today's evangelists and preachers continue to ignore the very deep historical disputes over such books as completely immaterial, while continuing to insist that such issues have been *settled* and are therefore no longer issues for our modern laity to review and study.

"Pay no attention to the man behind the curtain!" to quote the famed classic movie.

Allow me to offer you an axiom: Whenever someone demands that something is "settled", whether in science or scholarship or politics or whatever, it's NOT settled. In fact, such a declaration only means that the can of worms needs to re-opened as wide as possible and its contents dumped out into the light of day for all to see. Only the LIE demands that you cannot examine it in the light of day.

⁴⁸ BARCLAY, William, *The Daily Bible Study Series, The Letters of James and Peter*, p. 285

15

A “Renewed” Covenant

*“Cataracts are the third leading cause of blindness.
Religion and politics remain the first two.”
— Unknown*

At the beginning of the previous chapter, we learned that the truth is determined by the witness of two or three. We are quickly discovering, however, that Paul has NO WITNESSES to his Gospel other than himself and his group. Whatever the early Catholic Church placed into their canon of Scripture, they made sure it was supporting Paul; and if it wasn't, it wasn't beyond them to mess with the text to add whatever they needed to massage the words of Jesus or push a Mithraic version of Jesus into the Gospel account for the sole purpose of making it look like the Gospel of Jesus and the Twelve was really the same Pagan Mithraic Gospel Paul preached—even to the point of manufacturing and forging entire books if necessary.

Early on, these Pagan Church leaders in Rome were taking their cues from Paul to create a new “gospel” that both held the pedigree of the ancient Judaic faith; but then also changed the entire message of the Jewish faith into something that was much more palatable, much more familiar, much more salable, to the Pagan populous of Rome. They were able to accomplish this, or rather Paul was, by combining both and at the same time separating them into what Paul called an Old and New Covenant, or Testament, or in our modern tongue, an Old Contract versus the New Contract.

The early Church appears to have loved the concept and in evolving their canon of scripture, the Church in Rome adopted both the Jewish canon to give itself history but then utterly all but dropped and ignored the pedigree to focus on only the so-called New Contract.

As we read earlier, the Roman Church divided their new monstrosity of a canon into Old and New “Testaments” or Contracts. The Old Contract was that dusty dying Judaic Law of animal sacrifices and feast days and stupid laws like you can’t shave or mix fabrics or have statues of your gods, et. al.

But the New Contract completely eschewed all of that old Mosaic Law stuff as deprecated because Jesus’ Mithraic sacrifice made the Old Contract obsolete.

That was then ... “but now ...” has become the Christian mantra because of Paul.

What makes the whole idea of an Old versus New Covenant utterly ridiculous is the fact that it makes GOD into a LIAR and a hypocrite.

If we worship an eternal and unchanging GOD, then there’s no reason for GOD to have to change their mind—about anything. In fact, we see this being illustrated in the Prophets,

“He who is the Glory of Israel does not lie or change his mind; for he is not a human being, that he should change his mind.”⁴⁹

GOD is eternal and unchanging. Whatever Law or Commandments were originally given to us before the Priesthood got hold of it, was most likely short and not dependent upon anything man would create, including a Temple.

Here’s another axiom for us to keep in mind: If a Law or Commandment of GOD is dependent upon anything temporary, or ephemeral, or something that could change, then it’s NOT of GOD.

GOD is not going to give us something axiomatic that isn’t permanent.

The whole idea of a “New” Covenant, then is a total misnomer. A man-made construct, just like a lot of the Law itself has become due to the “lying pen of the Scribes”. In fact, I’d say MOST of the Law we read in Torah is bogus man-made bilge, built more on Human cultural traditions than the eternal Ones. (Yes, I said “Ones”. We’ll get to who GOD is later in the book.)

For now, I want to make an attempt to help us see what is most likely a bogus law and what might actually be a true axiom of GOD. Here are my thoughts on the matter of how to discern whether or not a “law” or commandment is man-made or is truly of GOD:

- Does a law pertain to the Temple? Then it’s a bogus law. The Temple is gone. It was temporary. Any law dealing with or requiring the Temple is now moot.

⁴⁹ 1 Samuel 15:29

- Does a law pertain to blood sacrifices? Then it's a bogus law. Sacrifices were only to be carried out in the Temple. Now that the Temple is gone, forgiveness under the law is impossible. An eternal GOD would never setup such a construct. Add to this that GOD says they never commanded sacrifices in the first place and the entire bloody sacrificial system becomes bogus.
- Does a law tell you what you can and cannot do as a matter of culture? Then it's a bogus law. Not everyone has the same culture. And just because your culture does or doesn't do whatever, doesn't mean it's a sin just because your pet culture is or isn't observing it.

I think you get the picture.

GOD is not going to give us laws and commandments that are "mutable" or at some point might need to change.

As Samuel points out, why should GOD need to change?

GOD *doesn't* need to change.

"Ah, Keith, God says he will make a New Covenant with us."

No, GOD *never* said that.

That is a bogus Christian re-writing of the Hebrew by Christian and Messianic (Jewish Christian) translators. Let's have a quick look at the passage in Jeremiah 31:31:

"The days are coming," declares the LORD, when I will make a new covenant with the people of Israel and with the people of Judah."

First of all, this passage is NOT talking about YOU, dear Pagan Gentile Christian; it is specifically talking about Israel and Judah.

Are you Israel and Judah?

No, you're not.

Ergo, the passage doesn't even pertain to you.

At all.

Secondly, what gets deliberately mistranslated as “new” from the Hebrew by Christian scholars and even many Messianic Jews following in the same footsteps of Paul, is the Hebrew term *chadash* which means to “make anew”, “to renew”, or “to repair”. You can find credible scholars and Hebrew linguists on both sides of the argument of whether *chadash* means “new” or “renewed”, but at the end of the day we need to keep the passage in context, not only in-context with itself, but in context with the character of GOD.

First, GOD is not talking about the Christian Church here; GOD is ONLY talking specifically to Israel and Judah. The passage has nothing to do Christians whatsoever.

Stop inserting yourself into the prophecy. It doesn't pertain to you.

Additionally, despite what your pastor has told you, you are not the new “chosen ones” of GOD because Israel rejected GOD's original Contract. Blah, blah, blah. That is Paul's nonsense gospel and we're not upholding Paul anymore here. Paul is a liar and a murderous swindler and we're done with his so-called bogus Mithraic pagan witness about anything.

At the end of the day, this whole idea of a New Covenant, or a New Testament, or a New Contract is utterly unsupported by anyone but Paul and Paul's group.

Again, why would GOD need to change—anything?

Israel broke the agreement. It's not out of the question for GOD to just RENEW or REPAIR it once Israel repents of their sin. In fact, that is what REPENTANCE is all about. Renewing our righteousness with GOD and repairing what we did wrong to others.

This is not a difficult concept to understand.

But we want so badly for there to be a New Covenant!

I get it. It's going to be very hard for we as Pagan Christians living under the Pagan Catholic Church's Bible to unpack Paul from our understandings of GOD.

The real problem here is that the mainstream modern Christian Church has built itself on Paul, just Paul, and little more than Paul.

In fact, Paul is the REAL founder of the Christian Church. He is. No question.

It's not Jesus.

Paul overrides Jesus and the Apostles at every turn.

Paul overrides the Law.

Paul overrides the Prophets.

Paul even overrides GOD speaking via the Prophets!

In fact, EVERYTHING must be massaged and re-interpreted through Paul before it becomes truth. Otherwise, if it contradicts Paul, it's bogus theology.

Do you see the absolute mess we've made here by declaring the Roman Catholic Bible to be the absolute inerrant, wholly inspired and infallible Word of God?!

We're now trapped by Paul; a charlatan apostle who has no business even being in the Bible if you are interested in following the historical Jewish Jesus and following and worshipping the GOD Jesus knew!

As a final note to this chapter: IF you want to follow a pagan "Jesus" espousing a pagan "new covenant" with Paul as your pope, that's fine. Knock yourself out. It is what Christianity has been doing for the past 2,000 years.

But you will not be following the historical Jesus and his Apostles. You'll merely be following a rogue group of Pagan Romans who put together a Bible that was designed to sell to the most Pagan Romans they could sell it to. In time, this Pagan group managed to worm their way into the grace of the new Emperor, Constantine, who made their Pagan brand of faith the official State religion of Rome—and that pivotal event is

what cemented the rogue apostle's nonsense pagan gospel into Christianity for the next 1,500 years and beyond!

So, yes, you can believe in Paul's Jesus and Paul's gospel and Pau's (demonic) spirit; but it will not be representative of the historical Gospel that the Jewish Jesus and Apostles actually taught.

16

Paul's Lawless Gospel

*"Never lie to someone who trusts you and
never trust someone who lies to you."*

— Unknown

By now we are beginning to get a pretty good idea that there are indeed TWO Gospels being preached from within the pages of the Roman Catholic New Testament: One is the hidden or obfuscated faith of James, Jesus and the Twelve; and the other is a kind of new faith being preached by Paul and his group.

Some of us might be wondering, "Paul was standing against the Law, it looks like Jesus was junking the Law as well. If there are false things in the Law, weren't Jesus and Paul basically teaching the same thing? Both preached a Law-less gospel. Right?"

It might look that way on the surface, but Jesus was still upholding the Law of GOD, just not the false things that were within it.

Let's quickly look at the distinctions:

Jesus and Paul took their stands against the Law for very different reasons. Jesus was junking things from the Law because like GOD said through the Prophet Jeremiah, "the lying pen of the scribes" had added falsehoods to it. The priesthood added cultural and ceremonial ideals that had nothing to do with the Character of GOD and everything to do with their own self-serving goals, namely creating an income for the Temple through blood sacrifices brought into it.

And it is true that Paul was teaching that one didn't need to follow what many Christian pastors would call "ceremonial laws". The Jews, culturally, had a lot of those.

James and Jesus were bent on reforming the Law back to its simplest form, without the priests' "fences" getting in the way. In essence, "fulfilling," what the Law was originally intended to do—namely treating each other the way we ourselves would want to be treated.

Judaism has had a long and rocky relationship with the Law ever since it was "invented". There are laws about this; laws about that; laws proscribing what's to be done with the Temple, yadda, yadda, yadda. Now that the Temple has been destroyed, those laws are now moot; but without the Temple, there is no way for Israel to get right with God (through proper legal sacrifice).

Much if not all of the Law is pure nonsense. It's all but completely cultural to a people who lived literally thousands of years ago.

But it gets even worse than this. In Hebraic tradition, the Jews also built "fences" around the Laws of God in order to avoid breaking them.

Huh?

Yes. A fence was a kind of *mitzva*, if you will, a law around a law that would prevent you from breaking the original law.

No, I am not making this up.

Even today, many orthodox Jews, in order to avoid breaking the Commandment of not working on Shabbat (or even the appearance of working on Shabbat) refuse to walk more than a certain distance to synagogue. This is called a *mitzvah*, it is a “fence”; it keeps you from breaking the Commandment of not working on the Sabbath. You’re supposed to be resting on the Sabbath.

I know, to you and me, it sounds absolutely silly, but to orthodox Jews living not just 2,000 years ago, but even today, these rules around the rules are quite serious.

I’ll give you some examples. Some of the things you’re not supposed to do on Shabbat, according to modern orthodox Judaism are:

- writing, erasing, and tearing;
- business transactions;
- driving or riding in cars or other vehicles;
- shopping;
- using the telephone;
- turning on or off anything which uses electricity, including lights, radios, television, computer, air-conditioners and alarm clocks;
- cooking, baking or kindling a fire;
- gardening and grass-mowing;
- doing laundry;

Only one of these in the list is actually what the Fourth Commandment stipulates not doing, which is working for a business to earn money or doing business; none of these other things are actually part of the Commandment. But they are

FENCES designed to keep you from working (not resting) on the Sabbath.

THIS is the kind of nonsense Jesus rebuked the Pharisees and Sadducees for creating.

Remember Jesus chastising the Pharisees with,

“You have a fine way of setting aside the commands of God in order to observe your own traditions!”⁵⁰

Christians do the exact same thing with all of our man-made traditions. We build just as many fences that have nothing to do with, or completely overwrite the laws and commandments of GOD.

The fact is, all of the Law we see in Torah (the first 5 books of the Bible) are fences designed to do nothing more than keep you from breaking the ONE LAW that GOD actually gave Humanity to live by—which is the Golden Rule: treating each other the way we would want to be treated.

Everything else is a man-made fence.

“But Keith, isn’t that what Paul was tossing out then too!?”

I am sure that Paul and Jesus had many similarities in what they were teaching. After all, you cannot sell a lie outright, you have to surround it, wrap it in some truths to make it believable. And I am sure that is exactly what Paul was doing.

But Paul was also creating his OWN Laws! The New Covenant is the epitome of man creating his own laws!

NOWHERE within the milieu of Hebraic thought is “human sacrifice” ever condoned, let alone commanded, by GOD. We’ll expand on this a bit later in the next chapters as well. But Paul’s Jesus was clearly attempting to do just that, become a Mithraic human sacrifice to atone for the sins of the

⁵⁰ Mark 7:9

world. Paul then manufactures a great deal of things about Jesus that never happened, some of which we read in the Gospels, added by the Roman Church to support their buddy and figurehead Paul.

Ironically enough, Paul never once quotes Jesus.

Ever.

For someone who ostensibly learned from Jesus through his spiritual encounter with him, Paul doesn't teach what Jesus actually taught.

So, while Paul is adamant about junking the Law, it was NOT for the same reasons Jesus talked about.

At the end of the day, Jesus reforms the Law of GOD, fulfills it in the sense that he restores it back to its original state — a ONE LAW, which is essentially the Golden Rule, from which all the law and the prophets extend from.

Forget about building fences.

Just DO what is just and right to begin with.

Paul doesn't seem to care about the Golden Rule. In his world, his Jesus is a human sacrifice designed to absolve Humanity from their sins. In this sense Paul is literally rewriting Torah, overwriting centuries of Hebrew culture and replacing it with his version of Mithras.

Of course, the Jews in Paul's day would have been horrified at the thought of a human sacrifice; and because of this they wanted nothing to do with Paul or his Mithraic gospel. But the heathen, the Pagan Gentiles living in Rome, they ate it up! It was something they already knew and it was something that was already familiar to them.

Let's continue diving a bit deeper into Paul's witness and see if we can glean a bit more evidence of the difference between Jesus and Paul.

17

Removing Paul's Witness

"The truth is never as painful as discovering a lie."

— Unknown

Now that we know that the religion of Paul was not what Jesus and the Apostles indeed taught, it's about time we get to the point of what's left regarding the Gospel message of Jesus and James and what they likely taught that was ticking off the Temple priests.

Let's engage in an exercise that I want you to carry out on your own. It's all about removing various witnesses from the Bible so we can see what testimony is corroborated by other witnesses.

For starters, what happens when we remove, say, the witness of James from the Bible? (That is, we take the book of James out of the canon.) What changes about our understanding of the Gospel if we no longer can use (the book

of) James as our witness for say, the concept of the New Covenant?

Most of us would say, “Not much, if anything.” We can find our understanding of the New Covenant message from within other witnesses (other books). In fact, some would say good riddance to James because he typically mucks things up by contradicting Paul and the rest of the Bible.

As a side note, whenever you read or hear someone, anyone, using the phrase “the rest of the Bible”, usually what they really mean to say is “the rest of the New Testament”. They don’t really mean the whole Bible including the Tanakh because there is NOTHING in the Tanakh that actually supports the New Testament—at all. But we’ll get deeper into this a bit later ...

So, let’s put James back in and let’s remove Matthew now. What about our understanding of the Gospel, and more specifically the New Covenant, changes?

Again, not much. Sure, we lose a little history, like the Beatitudes and what not, but our understanding of Jesus and the Apostles doesn’t really change. We can support our understandings via other witnesses (ie. other books).

Let’s put Matthew back in and remove the witness of Mark. Okay, we lose a tiny bit of history, most of which is repeated in other Gospels and not much else changes.

Putting Mark back in, let’s remove the witness of Peter now, both books. What changes? Again, little to nothing. Peter is pretty much a rubber stamp of what we already know about the Gospel.

The same pretty much goes for Luke. Now mind you, removing Luke as a witness removes both the Gospel of Luke and Luke’s Acts of the Apostles. What changes? Again, we lose some history from Acts, but the Gospel message pretty much never changes. We can still support our New Covenant.

Now comes the big one. What happens to the Gospel when we remove Paul's witness? Keep in mind this witness is not just one book, but includes Romans, Galatians, and the rest of the Pauline epistles; and if we want to get really exacting, we need to remove anyone from Paul's group as well—which would include Luke—and the books of Peter which we learned earlier were most probably written by Paul's group as well.

So, what happens to our understanding of the Gospel now?

The Gospel suddenly becomes very JEWISH.

Without Paul's singular witness, without Paul's group, we no longer have any basis for salvation through *Sola Fide*, "faith alone". It's gone. Because there is no support for it with the Jewish Apostles. Yes, we can attempt to say that Peter's witness supports it, but we already know that Peter was not the author of either of these books. These forgeries are indeed part of Paul's group.

"Well of course when you removed half of the NT, Keith, everything is going to change!"

You're making my point, though.

It shouldn't matter how much or how little you remove.

Everyone should be supporting everyone else.

But they don't.

Matthew should support Paul. Be he doesn't.

Oh, in little bits and pieces of Mithraic tradition we see Jesus being raised from the dead, et cetera, but when it comes to salvation through faith alone, no, Matthew does not support Paul's witness. Neither does Mark.

Ironically, Luke doesn't even support Paul's witness. Oddly, Luke's Gospel and Acts more supports James' and Mark's and Jude's witness than it does Paul's. It's almost as if Luke doesn't want to get into the nitty-gritty details of Paul's Gospel or what Paul was really preaching. In fact, it's like Luke AVOIDS discussing the details of Paul's Pagan Gentile gospel at all.

The only other book that even comes close to supporting Paul's gospel is the Gospel of John.

Let's keep Paul out of the way for another minute and pull out the Gospel of John as well. Now what happens with our witnesses?

The "Gospel" preached by Paul completely falls apart. It's gone.

Even with Luke still in the Bible, Paul's Gospel tanks all but tanks without any supporting witnesses whatsoever.

"Not true, Keith! Hebrews! That book supports Paul's gospel!"

Yes, it does. And you're again making my point.

Even though Hebrews has an ostensibly unknown author, for centuries scholars thought Paul was the anonymous author of Hebrews, so it was clearly written by either Paul himself or a collaborative effort by others within his group. In any event, the book of Hebrews does support Paul's gospel; but it is not really a reliable witness since it has no known author, and I would simply include it as part of the Pauline corpus, Paul's group, as a witness because of that.

In any event, the point is made, when you remove the singular witness of Paul (and the group Paul created) from the Roman Catholic Bible, the Gospel of Paul that teaches salvation through faith alone in Jesus' human sacrificial death on a cross and resurrection, utterly falls apart with little to no support from other witnesses, especially when it needs the witness of two or three.

Christianity, as assembled and practiced by the Roman Catholic Church, is in reality the sole invention—of Paul.

18

Rebuilding the Witness of Jesus

*“No one is more hated
than he who speaks the truth.”
— Plato*

Now that Paul is out of the way and not interfering in our understandings of GOD, salvation, forgiveness, and the Law, I want to dispel quite a few Christian-only notions of the Law, sin, salvation, etc., that are not something Jesus would be teaching. I want to correct a number of Christian myths, beliefs that are only based on inherited man-made tradition.

Also, keep in mind that I am not putting words in Jesus' mouth. The things we will be looking at are based on core period Jewish understandings that would have been taught by any Jewish messiah; in fact, let's start with just that—the term itself, “messiah”.

Messiah

This term “messiah” has been built by Christian tradition into something that it was never intended to mean from the Hebraic. Messiah is the English derivative of the Hebrew term *mashiach*. *Mashiach* simply means “anointed”, ostensibly by GOD, for a purpose. The fact is ALL the prophets of GOD were *mashiach* or messiah. Moses was messiah. Jeremiah was messiah. Isaiah was messiah. And Jesus, of course, was considered to be *mashiach*, or messiah.

However, Christianity attempts to pull Jesus into an exclusive relationship with the term, making the adjective into a proper noun, as if Jesus can be the one and only “Messiah”. Not true. This is something we as Christians need to unlearn. Jesus was not the only “messiah”. We could say that all the Apostles were “messiah” as well since it is safe to assume they were all called by GOD. Think whatever you like about Jesus, I’m merely making the point that calling Jesus a messiah is probably accurate. But elevating Jesus to the only one who can have and use the position, is just man-made Roman Catholic tradition getting in the way.

No Sin is Greater than Another?

This is also NOT true. We continue to quote Paul who says things like “the wages of sin is death”, again, we’re learning an untrue hyper-inflated view of what sin really is. There are indeed minor sins and there are sins of egregious and heinous consequence. GOD does not punish the mass-murderer with the same Karma, if you will, than the child who just told a lie about getting into the cookie jar. It’s utterly ridiculous the fantastic standard Pauline Christianity builds in order to push

its agenda of “without our brand of faith, you are going to hell”.

And that is all this “no sin is greater than another” hogwash is designed to be—a marketing ploy. Erect this ridiculous fantastic unattainable standard of perfect existence, or you’re going to hell without our brand of religion to fix it.

In fact, even if you are a good and moral person, you STILL need our brand of faith because you inherited a boatload of sin from someone else you didn’t know and never even heard of.

It’s not true.

Many in Christianity already know this, but the tradition persists. In 1 John 16-17 (NIV) we read:

“If you see any brother or sister commit a sin that does not lead to death, you should pray and God will give them life. I refer to those whose sin does not lead to death. There is a sin that leads to death. I am not saying that you should pray about that. All wrongdoing is sin, and there is sin that does not lead to death.”

The author of 1 John contradicts Paul’s patented “the wages of sin is death”. Not all sin leads to death. Also, we see in Matthew the wise Pharisee asking Jesus, “Which commandment is the greatest within the Law?” implying that there are indeed greater and lesser “commandments” within the Law.

Your Righteousness is “Filthy Rags”

This is also not true. It is a woeful misreading of a passage found in Isaiah 64. Have you ever been told by a priest or pastor that you should never take a verse out of context? Well, that is exactly what traditional Christianity has done with this

verse, utterly lifted it out of its original context to make a very errant point.

Isaiah 64, the whole chapter, is a lament about the sin of evil people in Israel. Here's part of that chapter to give us some context:

*You come to the help of those who gladly do right,
who remember your ways.
But when we continued to sin against them,
you were angry.
How then can we be saved?
All of us have become like one who is unclean,
and all our righteous acts are like filthy rags;
we all shrivel up like a leaf,
and like the wind our sins sweep us away.
No one calls on your name
or strives to lay hold of you;
for you have hidden your face from us
and have given us over to our sins.* ⁵¹

In context, it is the *ostensibly righteous acts of sinners* that are like filthy rags to GOD! Do you remember earlier in the book I was pointing out what Jesus said about “the eye is the lamp of the body”? This is a prime example of what both Isaiah and Jesus were talking about. “If what you think is good is actually evil, there is no hope for you.”

The priests and elders had added all manner of bogus, evil laws and commandments to Torah and now no one knew what was truly right or wrong in the eyes of GOD. Animal sacrifices, a heinous pagan rite, had become “righteous” in the eyes of Israel, but in the eyes of GOD, the nation had been led into an

⁵¹ Isaiah 67:5-7 NIV

egregious evil and sin. Yes, their assumed righteous acts, bloody as they'd become, were indeed like filthy rags in the sight of GOD. They no longer knew right from wrong. "If then what you think is light is really darkness, how great is that darkness!"

God Cannot Look Upon Sin?

I don't know how this monstrosity keeps getting spread through Christianity, but it needs to stop. GOD looks down upon us each and every day. GOD walks with us.

"No, Keith, he doesn't see us, he just sees Jesus!"

No, GOD doesn't. If your god cannot look on you because of your sin, then you worship a weak and pathetic god.

This idiotic notion that GOD is somehow so holy that they cannot look upon sin comes from another misquote, a misreading of a passage taken way out of context from the writings of the Prophet Habakkuk. Let's look at the passage; we just need to look at one verse for this to be self-explanatory.

*"Your eyes are too pure to look at evil,
And You cannot look at harm favorably.
Why do You look favorably
At those who deal treacherously?
Why are You silent when the wicked swallow up
Those more righteous than they?"*⁵²

If we never get past the first line of the verse, then yea, it sure looks like GOD is so pure that they cannot look at evil (or sin). Then drop down a couple of lines,

⁵² Habakkuk 1:13 NASB

*Why do You look favorably
At those who deal treacherously?*

This same verse when actually read in context and in toto completely destroys the whole notion that GOD cannot look upon sin or evil. GOD indeed looks and sees those to commit sin every day.

19

The Real Gospel of Jesus

*“Education is the kindling of a flame,
not the filling of a vessel.”
– Socrates*

Perhaps the two biggest misunderstandings about sin and forgiveness within Christianity are the concepts of “Inherited Sin” and “Substitutionary Atonement”. And again, mainstream modern Christianity has created these misnomers because of another misnomer tradition, *Sola Scriptura*, believing that everything within the Bible has been inerrantly inspired of God.

Nowhere is this misnomer belief more pronounced than within Christianity’s errant notions of sin and forgiveness.

Because of Paul and Paul’s inherent superpower to overshadow and literally overwrite anything within the Bible, Christianity has built this huge misunderstanding of what sin

is. While it is partly Paul's fault, it is also the fault of Christian theologians for not reading their Scriptures as well as they should have been. For someone who supposedly learned under Gamaliel, Paul should have been reading Ezekiel better than he was and so should have our modern Christian theologians and leaders.

Inherited Sin

In near lockstep with our Jewish brothers and sisters, Christianity teaches that sin entered our world through a "Fall of Mankind" when Eve disobeyed GOD in the garden of Eden and partook of the knowledge of GOD, suddenly knowing both good and evil. It was *her* sin, it is said, that then caused Adam to sin, which then caused the fall of mankind from the grace of GOD. As a result, GOD sent Adam and Eve out of the garden for all time. All their children, it is said, inherited their "sinful nature" and because of this inherited sin, we are all separated from GOD.

Judaism itself even manufactured its own errant traditions surrounding this whole idea of inherited sin, concocting the proverb saying that,

"The fathers have eaten sour grapes [sinned] and their children's teeth are set on edge [paid the price for their father's sin]."

Now enter the Prophet Ezekiel. GOD, speaking through the Messiah Ezekiel, corrects the record once and for all:

The word of the LORD came to me: "What do you people mean by quoting this proverb about the land of Israel:

"The parents eat sour grapes,

and the children's teeth are set on edge'?

"As surely as I live, declares the Sovereign LORD, you will no longer quote this proverb in Israel. For everyone belongs to me, the parent as well as the child—both alike belong to me. The one who sins is the one who will die."⁵³

GOD, in one fell pronouncement, utterly destroys the entire notion and concept of "inherited sin".

In other words, we did NOT inherit the sin of Adam and Eve.

No one did.

Not you. Not me.

Yes, this tosses a huge wrench into the works of the entire Christian message and utterly destroys, in every way imaginable, the errant foundations of what sin is that were put in place by not just Israel, but the Christian Church as well.

But GOD is more than clear here: the children are NOT punished for the sins of their parents or ancestors. No one inherits the sin of their parents. Period. Each one will die (be punished) for their own sin.

I want to make a distinction here as well. It is likely that this Jewish proverb was originally created as a lament about how children inherit the culture of their parents. If you have evil parents, the likelihood of their children being evil is fairly high as well. But then somewhere along the way, this "inheriting the sins of the fathers" via culture got extended to mean that the children would be punished for their father's sins as well. This is what GOD is correcting. There is such a thing as raising evil children; but the children do not inherit, nor do they pay the price for, their parent's sin.

⁵³ Ezekiel 18:1-4 NIV

Substitutionary Atonement

In case you don't know, "Substitutionary Atonement" is an aspect or area of Christianity known to scholars as "Soteriology"⁵⁴. Embedded within Christian soteriology is the idea, notion, or doctrine that someone else can pay the penalty or price for your sins. Like the fallacy of Inherited Sin, GOD has already spoken regarding the whole idea of so-called Substitutionary Atonement; and GOD says it's NOT possible.

No one pays the price for the sin of another.

Each will die for their own sin.

Period.

Evidently Paul was being lax in his Hebraic studies again because long before Paul, and long before Jesus, James, John and the rest of the Apostles would be born, GOD was laying down the law about this heinous belief.

Let's return to Ezekiel 18 once again, because this chapter from the Messiah Ezekiel is paramount to our understanding of the true Character of GOD.

The word of the Lord came to me: "What do you people mean by quoting this proverb about the land of Israel:

*"The parents eat sour grapes,
and the children's teeth are set on edge?"*

⁵⁴ Soteriology (noun), mid 19th century: from Greek *sōtēria* (salvation) + *-logy*. Soteriology is the discussion of the doctrine(s) of how salvation, forgiveness by God, is achieved.

“As surely as I live, declares the Sovereign LORD, you will no longer quote this proverb in Israel. For everyone belongs to me, the parent as well as the child—both alike belong to me. The one who sins is the one who will die.

Now GOD begins an explanation of what sin really is. Take note that these are examples, they are not intended to be some exhaustive list, like the Ten Commandments,

*“Suppose there is a righteous man
who does what is just and right.
He does not eat at the mountain shrines
or look to the idols of Israel.
He does not defile his neighbor’s wife
or have sexual relations with a woman during her period.
He does not oppress anyone,
but returns what he took in pledge for a loan.
He does not commit robbery
but gives his food to the hungry
and provides clothing for the naked.
He does not lend to them at interest
or take a profit from them.
He withholds his hand from doing wrong
and judges fairly between two parties.
He follows my decrees
and faithfully keeps my laws.
That man is righteous;
he will surely live,
declares the Sovereign LORD.*

What is being illustrated here is literally the Golden Rule: Treating others the way you would want to be treated.

In Matthew 22:36, a wise Pharisee asks Jesus which is the greatest commandment? Jesus answers by quoting two laws

from Torah, Love GOD and Love your Neighbor as you would love yourself. Then Jesus says something powerful—

“For all the Law and the Prophets completely depend on these two commandments.”

Another way to say this is that all the Law and teachings of the Prophets EXTENDS from these two commandments. And in the brief listing of examples above, GOD is illustrating how someone can actually BE righteous, and that is to treat others the way they would want to be treated.

“But Keith, no one is righteous in the eyes of God without Jesus!”

NO. That is not true.

That is a bogus Christian tradition. GOD says if you DO what is righteous, “that man is righteous”.

These are the words of GOD! I didn’t make them up.

Now GOD continues with the opposite example of what is evil,

“Suppose he has a violent son, who sheds blood [murders] or does any of these other things [listed below] (though the father has done none of them):

He eats at the mountain shrines.

He defiles his neighbor’s wife.

He oppresses the poor and needy.

He commits robbery.

He does not return what he took in pledge.

He looks to the idols.

He does detestable things.

He lends at interest and takes a profit.

Will such a man live? He will not! Because he has done all these detestable things, he is to be put to death; his blood will be on his own head.

We can clearly see where GOD is going with all of this. This unrighteous son is committing all kinds of sin—by treating others in a way that he himself would not want to be treated.

And this is the very definition of sin.

Again, this is not some exhaustive list of sins, these are examples that GOD is using to get a point across.

Now GOD continues with examples of the son of the violent son:

“But suppose this [violent] son has a son who sees all the sins his father commits, and though he sees them, he does not do such things:

*He does not eat at the mountain shrines
or look to the idols of Israel.*

He does not defile his neighbor’s wife.

*He does not oppress anyone
or require a pledge for a loan.*

*He does not commit robbery
but gives his food to the hungry
and provides clothing for the naked.*

*He withholds his hand from mistreating the poor
and takes no interest or profit from them.*

He keeps my laws and follows my decrees.

He will not die for his father’s sin; he will surely live. But his father will die for his own sin, because he practiced extortion, robbed his brother and did what was wrong among his people.

This opens and closes the door on the whole concept of Inherited Sin; GOD says it doesn’t exist.

“Yet you ask, ‘Why does the son not share the guilt of his father?’ Since the son has done what is just and right and has been careful to keep all my decrees, he will surely live. The one who sins is the one who will die. The child will not share the guilt of the parent, nor will the parent share the guilt of the child. The righteousness of the righteous will be credited to them, and the wickedness of the wicked will be charged against them.”

Because of Paul, Christianity has built the huge misnomer tradition that attempts to say that “no one is righteous in the eyes of GOD”. But here we clearly see GOD stating: “The righteousness of the righteous will be credited to them, and the wickedness of the wicked will be charged against them.”

I know this 180-degrees of what we learn sitting in church, but again, these are the words of GOD, written hundreds of years before Paul would even be born.

So, what is the implication here? I’ll spell it out for us:

YOU DON’T NEED A SACRIFICE TO BE RIGHTEOUS in the eyes of GOD.

You just need to REPENT and DO what is just and right.

“But Keith, that’s heresy! All have sinned and fall short of the glory of God!”

I never said people don’t sin.

Everyone sins. We all do.

Sinning and falling short of the glory of GOD does not damn you to hell for all eternity.

And therein lies the Church’s most egregious error and logical fallacy.

What I am showing us is that Christianity via Paul is WRONG by elevating and amplifying sin to an impossible level that GOD never ever intended.

Committing a sin doesn't forever destroy our relationship with GOD. GOD doesn't hold us to some impossible unattainable standard of pure righteousness, that is: if you commit even one tiny little sin, it severs our relationship with God damns us to hell forever. That is a man-made tradition, and it is not of GOD.

"But once we sin, it's over! We need Jesus' sacrifice on the cross to restore us to righteousness!"

NO. We don't. Not according to GOD. Let's read further here in Ezekiel,

"But if a wicked person turns away from all the sins they have committed and keeps all my decrees and does what is just and right, that person will surely live; they will not die. None of the offenses they have committed will be remembered against them. Because of the righteous things they have done, they will live. Do I take any pleasure in the death of the wicked? declares the Sovereign LORD. Rather, am I not pleased when they turn from their ways and live?"

You have likely never read these words of GOD before ever in your life. Or if you have read them, they were shown to you in some context of Jesus' atoning sacrifice—which doesn't exist here within these passages. Christian soteriology has been overlayed on top of what GOD has already said here. Christianity effectively adds its own man-made traditions to what GOD has already said.

But as we have read previously, GOD gave no commands concerning sacrifice; it is not necessary. Again, these words were written centuries before Paul would even be born.

"Oh, but God knew Jesus was coming and he knew that the sacrifice of Jesus would be included here."

NO. That is a bogus Christian construct that attempts to bend, twist and squeeze itself into what GOD has already said. There is no sacrifice required for GOD to forgive. Not animal.

Not Human (meaning Jesus). As we have seen reflected in the Prophets, GOD never commanded sacrifice to begin with.
Ever.

GOD is capable of forgiving without a sacrifice.

Here's the question: do you need a sacrifice of blood in order to forgive your child if they tell you a lie?

No, you don't.

Then how is it that you are more forgiving than the God you purport to serve? How is it you can forgive without blood, but you feel God can't?

You see how ridiculous this is? How utterly horrifying it is to accuse God of NOT being able to forgive unless another part of God's creation, DIES?

It makes no logical sense.

Let's continue with the words of GOD:

"But if a righteous person turns from their righteousness and commits sin and does the same detestable things the wicked person does, will they live? None of the righteous things that person has done will be remembered. Because of the unfaithfulness they are guilty of and because of the sins they have committed, they will die."

This is where things with GOD get interesting. You can act all righteous on the one hand and commit unrighteous acts on the other; GOD is not going to remember your "good deeds" or righteous acts if you continue to keep treating others badly.

And this is likely what Paul's problem ultimately became.

This is why GOD punished Paul so egregiously and refused to remove the demon that he had saddled Paul with. Even with all of Paul's ostensibly righteous acts, there was still deep sin in Paul's life; something we will likely never know, and it was NOT mere boasting. But it was bad enough that

GOD shackled Paul with an angel of Satan for which they refused to remove.

Think I'm being too harsh with Paul? Let's see what GOD says,

"Yet you say, 'The way of the Lord is not just.'

Hear, you Israelites: Is my way unjust? Is it not your ways that are unjust?

If a righteous person turns from their righteousness and commits sin, they will die for it; because of the sin they have committed they will die.

But if a wicked person turns away from the wickedness they have committed and does what is just and right, they will save their life. Because they consider all the offenses they have committed and turn away from them, that person will surely live; they will not die.

Yet the Israelites say, 'The way of the Lord is not just.' Are my ways unjust, people of Israel? Is it not your ways that are unjust?

Israel wanted to have it both ways. And this is exactly what Christianity practices as well. "I don't need to worry about doing right. Jesus covers my sin!"

No, he doesn't.

NO ONE else can cover YOUR sin.

No one can pay the price for your evil.

No one would want to.

Not even Jesus.

"That's just cheap grace, Keith! There's no cost!"

NO. Wrong! It's the most expensive kind of grace there is!

The cheap kind of grace is where you get someone else to pay the bill for your misdeeds and your sin. If someone else is paying your way, YOU never learn how to be righteous, you never learn how to pay your own way if someone else is always footing the bill, so to speak.

REPENTANCE is not cheap grace because within repentance you LEARN; repentance teaches you THROUGH ACTIONS how to BE righteous!

Just as one cannot inherit the sin of another, NO ONE can pay the price for the sin of another. And here is where GOD opens and shuts the door on this whole business of Inherited Sin and Substitutionary Atonement,

“Therefore, you Israelites, I will judge each of you according to your own ways, declares the Sovereign LORD. Repent! Turn away from all your offenses; then sin will not be your downfall. Rid yourselves of all the offenses you have committed and get a new heart and a new spirit. Why will you die, people of Israel? For I take no pleasure in the death of anyone, declares the Sovereign LORD.

Repent and live!”

I absolutely love this last paragraph of Ezekiel 18 because when combined with the examples outlined within the entire chapter, GOD illustrates the whole “plan of salvation”, and it does not include a Mithraic Human sacrifice of Paul’s Jesus, or any sacrifice for that matter.

Period.

GOD doesn’t need sacrifice to forgive.

Now that is a POWERFUL and COMPASIONATE GOD!

Christianity is all about being filled with the heart and spirit of GOD. And here we see GOD telling us exactly how that is achieved:

“Rid yourselves of all the offenses you have committed and get a new heart and a new spirit. ... Repent and live!”

THIS is the Gospel of the Jewish Jesus, James, Peter, John and the rest!

There were indeed parts of the Law Jesus ignored because they were not original to GOD's Law. Salvation as taught by Jesus and the Apostles was not complicated. It was not mysterious. It was compassionate. It was logical. It was most likely based on what we read here in Ezekiel 18.

It was simple.

Easy to understand.

And it was through consistent ACTION that resulted in creating good and righteous people of Godly character with new hearts and new spirits of righteousness.

I know you may be struggling with the traditions you've learned in the Church with what is being plainly revealed to you now from within the pages of the Scriptures here. You really want to see Jesus as a human sacrifice that cleanses you from your sins. You've fallen in love with the Church's version of Jesus. You may even think Jesus talks to you about how his sacrifice has saved you.

You have some soul searching to do.

"But—Keith! Jesus was *prophesied* to come! The virgin shall be with child and he will die for the sins of the world!"

No, he wasn't.

I'm sorry to have to correct the record again here, but these are "Christianized" misinterpretations and misappropriations, deliberate mistranslations of the ancient underlying Hebrew.

In the next chapter we'll look at these misinterpretations of Isaiah and even how the Gospel books themselves were later edited by the Catholic Church in an attempt to lend credibility to Paul's Mithraic Jesus.

20

Misquoting Isaiah

*"You will never understand the damage
that you have done to someone until the same thing is done to you.
That's why I am here."*

— Karma

A subtle controversy has been bubbling beneath the surface of Christianity for a number of decades now, and it has to do with additions made to the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. Bible translators and other scholars are partially responsible for the controversy, but it has been picked-up, noticed by lay scholars and even everyday Christians now as well.

Quite often when reading something in the Bible these days you will see footnotes or margin notes made by the

translators, things like “most MSS say ...” or “the most reliable manuscripts have ...”⁵⁵

This is a way for Bible scholars and translators to legitimately acknowledge there’s a problem, a discrepancy, with the original manuscripts either in the Hebrew or Greek—usually it’s the Greek manuscripts that cause the problems. Even then the term “original manuscripts” is in and of itself a kind of lie because we don’t have any “original” manuscripts of the Bible’s books.

None.

Zero.

Zip.

Nada.

All we have are copies of copies of copies, etc.; and we don’t know how far away (the number of generations) these copies might be from the original document or even who wrote these copies of copies of copies; nor do we know what edits, additions and deletions, might have been made in the process.

“There were no ‘edits’, Keith. Every copy was protected by God!”

No, not true. The footnotes of these scholars and translators telling us “the most reliable MSS have ...” utterly show that there were changes from one copy to the next.

“Well, they were just minor issues, Keith! The main part of the manuscript was preserved!”

No, that is not true either.

As was noted earlier, there were a myriad of copies of all kinds of books and letters, all handwritten, floating around for sale in the ancient Roman world. Most all of them were

⁵⁵ MSS is a scholarly term used to describe various extant (surviving) books, pages and fragments of ancient manuscripts. It literally just means “manuscripts”.

forgeries, or at the very best, bits and pieces of hearsay from other copies added in to make the new forged copy a “new and improved” product.

Mainstream Protestant Christian churches of today also understand this and many of them have updated their Statements of Faith or “What We Believe” about the Bible with something like,

“We believe the Bible to be inerrant and wholly inspired of God in its original manuscripts.”

That’s a fine thing to say you believe; you at least acknowledge that the Bible as we have today is not inerrant. However, we don’t know what the original manuscripts might have said or not said. So, the statement of faith essentially becomes vacuous.

It’s a smokescreen.

It’s utterly meaningless.

Your church still teaches that the Bible you hold in your hand today is inerrant when they know it’s not because NO Bible in print today is based on or written from any “original manuscript”.

The so-called “original manuscripts” don’t exist anymore.

They are what scholars call “non-extant”, meaning they have been lost to time or destroyed by people who didn’t agree with what they said.

So, that tenet of belief within our various statements of faith is just another LIE. Churches have absolutely nothing to back it up with. Other than yet another man-made BELIEF in yet another man-made tradition.

On the other hand, the real science and paleography behind the Bible preaches a very different story; one your church doesn’t want you to hear or notice.

When the footnote of your Bible says, “most MSS say ...” or “the most reliable manuscripts say ...”, this is proof that the manuscript fragments that are “extant”, that still exist, are not in harmony from one copy to the next. And while scholars continue to navel gaze at what one MSS says versus another, the real facts are, Matthew didn’t write the book of Matthew to begin with!

And if by slim chance Matthew did originally write the original book, the copy of a copy of a copy, etc., that we have today, would have dated back to the first century when Matthew lived and would have had any number of hundreds of copies made of it well into the second or third century when the book was finalized by the Pagans running the Catholic Church in Rome. These Roman Pagans are not going to allow a Jewish Apostle, not a real one anyway, anywhere near their Bible to contradict their only real apostle—Paul!

The point is, with everyone massaging the text to add or remove their pet views and beliefs about what Jesus might have said or not said, can you imagine what the 200th generation of a copy of a handwritten book the length of Matthew could get transformed into?

Here’s a relatively minor example we’ve already touched on: Historically, the brothers James and Jesus were vegetarian. But the Roman Catholic version of Matthew that we have has Jesus eating fish. And this is a relatively minor adjustment to the text by people who want the approval of GOD to eat meat. They simply changed the text to whatever they wanted Jesus saying or doing that supported whatever Pagan views they had.

“But God would never allow that to happen, Keith! God protected the Bible!”

That is unfortunately, a lie.

The facts show differently.

God did NOT protect the Bible from human error. GOD didn't protect the Law from the lying pen of the scribes and GOD didn't prevent the Pagan leaders of the Church in Rome from doing likewise by inserting a charlatan apostle into the tome.

"Well, the MSS we have God protected and they are the correct ones! These MSS don't have any errors in them. They are the most accurate!"

No, they're just as bogus as any of the others. You are just manufacturing more excuses in the hope of trying to salvage something you know is not true. You're reaching. I get it. I used to try to defend what the Church had taught me with the very same kinds of assumptive arguments. Because at the end of the day that's all I had, my assumptions that the Church was right, somehow, and that whoever was questioning the Church was just automatically wrong.

Christian Apologetics regarding the Bible has descended into this kind of nonsensical rhetoric. It is getting to the point now, with the mounting evidence like you are reading within these pages, that Christian scholars are beginning to admit: the ONLY thing that makes the Bible inerrant, wholly inspired and infallible is people's BELIEF that it is.

Period.

But the Bible is not inerrant; it's not without error.

Even today, modern Bible translators are CORRECTING the Bible from error that was inserted into it by other Christian leaders centuries ago.

Lucifer: A New Name for the Devil

In 1978 the International Bible Society got itself into quite a bit of hot water when they removed the name "Lucifer" from

the NIV translation of the Bible. It wasn't the first time this had happened, the ASV and RV had already done so some 70 to 100 years earlier respectively.⁵⁶ But back then it didn't hit the television news cycles. Many other modern Bible translations had also already followed suit throughout the 20th century, removing the misnomer name "Lucifer" from the Bible.

However, unwitting Christian laity and even many in Church leadership were livid by the change. "They're trying to take the devil out of the Bible!" was the charge from many a pastor from the pulpit.

No, they weren't trying to remove the devil from the Bible. They were, however, CORRECTING an ERROR not just in translation but in bad Christian interpretation.

GOD was not protecting the Bible from man's errors.

The inserting of the name "Lucifer" into the Bible dates back to the 5th century when the Bible was being translated into Latin, the official language of Rome, by Jerome of Antioch. The then sitting Pope, as the story goes, regarded the subject of Isaiah 14:12 to be the devil, Satan. The Hebrew term in question here is *halel*, which simply means "light". It is merely an adjective, not a proper noun, meaning a name.

In any event, Jerome translates the Hebrew adjective *halel* (light, halo) into the Latin adjective *lucifer* (light, luminous), which is an accurate translation. But the period church leadership errantly believed that the subject of Isaiah 14:12 is GOD talking about the devil. Suddenly the adjective becomes misinterpreted as a proper noun, a name, for the devil, and BOOM! All it takes is a little time and more Roman Catholic tradition and suddenly the devil not only has a new name, but

⁵⁶ English Revised Version, c. 1885 / American Standard Version, c. 1901

we build and entire mythical history of “Lucifer’s” life in Heaven before his fall.

None of which is actually Biblical.

It’s not true. It’s an error. A mistake. IN the Bible. Isaiah never called anyone “Lucifer”.

Isaiah didn’t speak Latin.

“Oh, Keith, it’s just a minor name transliteration issue. You’re making a mountain out of a mole hill.”

No, I’m not; but you are downplaying a HUGE ERROR in the Bible. One that got corrected in the late 1970’s in one of the most read Bible translations there is. This is not merely some name transliteration issue. The Church leadership in the 5th century created a misnomer tradition of believing the subject of Isaiah 14:12 was the devil, and now billions of Christians the world over are STILL thinking and believing that the devil’s name in Heaven was “Lucifer”.

Perhaps hundreds of thousands of Christian books have all been written, sermons preached, and End Times circulars printed, ALL of them calling the devil “Lucifer” even though there is now ZERO Biblical support for the name or the beliefs surrounding it.

The doctrine of Bible inerrancy is a sham belief.

It is a LIE.

This issue with Lucifer is MASSIVE ERROR, a man-made tradition that Christianity now tries to sweep under the rug as much ado about nothing. Because to ADMIT to the correction logically destroys the entire doctrine of Biblical inerrancy, infallibility and, perhaps more egregiously, total inspiration.

GOD did NOT protect the Bible from Human error.

Again, millions and millions of Christian books have been printed, beloved pastors like Oswald Chamber, Billy Graham; and ostensibly infallible modern prophets, like Ellen White, all of them mistakenly falling for the ERROR and creating a new name for the devil they never once ever had.

What's even worse, your church leadership realizes full well that "Lucifer" was never a name for the devil, yet they continue to propagate the error, continue to preach the LIE to their congregations because that is what people are used to.

Remember when I said pastors lie?

This is a prime example.

If your pastor uses the name "Lucifer", ever, in their sermons, you are being spoon-fed a LIE.

Now let's look at a couple more misnomer translations, ERRORS, that need to be corrected as well.

A Virgin Birth?

Christian leaders are constantly harping on the fact that passages within the Bible need to be read IN CONTEX in order to be understood properly. We complain that too many Christians try to bolster their points by pulling snippets of verses out of the Bible that are out of context with what has been written.

"You mean like God cannot look upon sin?"

Yes, exactly that kind of thing.

So, I whole-heartedly agree with anyone teaching that verses need to be quoted "in context". Now if we could just get the Church to follow its own advice.

Unfortunately, there are a number of readings of, translations of, the ancient Hebrew where the Church utterly abandons sound scholarship in order to push Jesus into the Tanakh so that they can say, "SEE! Jesus was prophesied to come!"

Just so we know, Jesus does NOT appear within the Tanakh scriptures.

Ever.

"That's not true, Keith! Jesus is all over the Old Testament!"

No, he's not.

Unfortunately, these are unequivocally deliberate Christian misinterpretations of the underlying Hebrew, and bad ones if you want to get right down to it. But because we *really* want to see a prophecy for Jesus coming to save the world from our sins through his Mithraic Pauline Human sacrifice, we will abandon all well-established sound scholarship and just jump right into a misnomer translation by brutally twisting the ancient text into a new reality that does not exist.

In Matthew 1:22-23 we find the author of the book making an interesting claim:

All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had said through the prophet: "The virgin will conceive and give birth to a son, and they will call him Immanuel" (which means "God with us").

The prophet being spoken of here is Isaiah, and the passage from the book of Isaiah is 7:14, which reads:

Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: The virgin[d] will conceive and give birth to a son, and will call him Immanuel.

Note the NIV's (and many other translations as well) footnote for the term that gets translated as "virgin". The footnote implies that the translation COULD ALSO be interpreted as just "young woman".

In the Hebrew, the term for "young woman" is *'almâ*. And it quite literally means a "young woman", "a woman of marriageable age", "maid", or even a "newly married woman" (who is now no longer a virgin). *'Almâ* CAN mean "virgin", but that is not what the term itself specifically means.

It means "young woman".

Period.

In period use, yes, young women were typically considered “virgins” until they were married. So, in that sense, ‘*almâ* CAN mean a virgin. ‘*Almâ* can also mean a newly married “young woman”, who is now NOT a virgin anymore.

However, Christian scholars have gone way out of their way and created all kinds of machinations to make sure that ‘*almâ* can never be translated as anything but a “virgin” such as this rather short-sighted tidbit from one Christian scholar,

“There is no instance where it can be proved that ‘almâ designates a young woman who is not a virgin. The fact of virginity is obvious in Gen 24:43 where ‘almâ is used of one who was being sought as a bride for Isaac.”⁵⁷

With all due respect to the above so-called scholar, he’s evidently not the best at Hebrew. This is also evidence that so-called scholars can say anything, it doesn’t mean their translations or interpretations are correct or right. ‘*Almâ* can and does mean a “young woman”, including one who is already married and therefore no longer a virgin, but she is STILL a young woman. So, this particular scholar is dead wrong. Christian scholars often, in my experience, say things trying to sound all authoritative, but are in fact, dead wrong.

All this means is that Christian scholars trying to PROVE that “young woman” is somehow also *always* a virgin means that they are reaching, stretching the translation just so they can say Matthew isn’t wrong.

However, most serious Bible scholars already know that the passage in Isaiah 7:14 is NOT talking about an actual “virgin”; but that is how they translate the term because that is

⁵⁷ HARRIS, R. Laird, et al., *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*, p. 672

what they read in Matthew and since the Bible is inerrant, that means Matthew is correct.

Unfortunately, the author of the book of Matthew, like Paul, didn't know his Tanakh scriptures very well. In the first century there were a myriad of "virgin birth" gods; Paul's Mithraic version of Jesus was but one of the many. This is also something your pastor never tells you sitting in Church. The whole virgin birth story is not unique to Paul's Jesus and as such it is not unique to Christianity.

But because we think this whole virgin birth business is unique in history, it just adds more exciting intrigue to the Jesus story. "This has never happened before!" or so we think.

But that is just not true.

Many mythoi describe their deities as being born of a human virgin and they well predate Christianity by centuries. Even some versions of Mithras, whom we've previously discussed, make him the son of a virgin instead of being born from a rock.

This massaging of the translation between the author of Matthew and Isaiah gets so bad, in fact, that some translations of the Bible have simply abandoned ship on it said something like, "Matthew interprets Isaiah 7:14 as 'virgin'," which is true, but it's still not an accurate translation of Isaiah.

If we read the whole chapters of Isaiah 7 and 8, IN CONTEXT, we quickly discover that this is not a prophecy about Jesus at all; and the "young woman" referenced in the story, is actually Isaiah's own wife—WHO IS ALREADY PREGNANT!

So much for the "virgin" part of the story.

The fact is, this is a prophecy about Isaiah's own children, not Jesus.

Many if not most Christian scholars realize this as well; so then we get machinations like this little gem from some Christian leaders: "The prophecy is about Isaiah's own wife

and children, BUT the passage has a DUAL meaning, for both Isaiah's children AND Jesus!"

Facepalm.

Now we are really reaching, grasping at straws to save the errant man-made tradition. This is no longer Bible scholarship now. It's just bogus corrupt apologetics attempting to pass itself off as scholarship. It's no better than Irenaeus claiming that there can only be four Gospels because there are four celestial winds. Again, it's things like this that utterly destroy the misnomer tradition of *Sola Scriptura*.

Unreliable Manuscripts

Let me drop another bombshell since we're in the midst of this issue about Matthew's virgin birth story—the entire first two chapters of Matthew are not original to the book.

In fact, today, you can find Bibles that have the first two chapters of Matthew utterly removed because Bible scholars, some of the more honest ones, anyway, have learned that these chapters do not exist in the earliest available and most reliable MSS.

These chapters were later additions.

Remember when I said that enterprising scribes were borrowing from each other to make their salable products better? Well, this is a prime example of that happening. The earlier MSS of Matthew do not have chapters 1 and 2.

Someone added them at some later date. They were probably attempting to create a product that was superior to the other Mathew books floating around Rome. "Ours has Jesus' true Hebrew genealogy all the way back to Adam and proof of his virgin birth!" someone from the early Roman Catholic Church might have waxed eloquently.

However, the genealogy of Jesus back to Adam has some issues as well, it's not accurate. The author of this genealogy made mistakes.

Matthew isn't the only book with later additions. The same goes for the latter verses of Mark 16 that show Jesus' resurrection. The NIV notes:

The earliest manuscripts and some other ancient witnesses do not have verses 9–20.

Which means without any shadow of a doubt that these books were being meddled with by, shall we say, "the lying pens of the early Church". People were changing, adding, and removing entire chapters of what would become the books of the Bible very early in its development.

These are unassailable FACTS, my friends. Upheld by hard paleography and history. These facts are printed IN your own Bibles. I did not make them up.

Unknown people were messing with the texts. And we do not know the extent to which the books were edited, massaged, or where outright lies were added or historical truths dropped, all in the name of a nameless, faceless someone's pet political or religious bents.

In a now famed (or infamous, depending on your perspective) series of books that are repudiated with utter horror by mainstream Christian leaders attempting to maintain their shallow man-made dogma of Bible inerrancy, world-class Bible scholar Dr. Bart D. Ehrman goes deep in telling the story behind the mistakes, changes and outright forgeries that ancient scribes made to the New Testament books and shows the great impact these nameless, faceless lying scribes had upon the Bible we use today.

Every Christian needs to know the truth, or at the very least the facts surrounding the creation of the Bible, who did it, and why. I cannot hold a candle to the scholarship of Dr. Ehrman,

so I will simply reference his work that has made a huge eye-opening impact in my own walk with GOD,

- Misquoting Jesus: The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why ⁵⁸
- Jesus, Interrupted: Revealing the Hidden Contradictions in the Bible (And Why We Don't Know About Them) ⁵⁹
- Forged: Writing in the Name of God—Why the Bible's Authors Are Not Who We Think They Are ⁶⁰

All these books are grand and eye-opening must-reads for anyone who wants to get to the bottom of who created the Bible and why, including much of the history surrounding the Bible's assembly by the early Catholic Church in Rome.

⁵⁸ EHRMAN, Bart D., *Misquoting Jesus—The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why*, Harper-Collins Publishers

⁵⁹ EHRMAN, Bart D., *Jesus, Interrupted: Revealing the Hidden Contradictions in the Bible (And Why We Don't Know About Them)*, Harper Collins Publishers

⁶⁰ EHRMAN, Bart D., *Forged: Writing in the Name of God—Why the Bible's Authors Are Not Who We Think They Are*, Harper Collins Publishers

21

Isaiah 53: The Suffering Servant

“Half of wisdom is learning what to unlearn.”

— Larry Niven

No passage in the Tanakh (Old Testament) gets Christians more excited about Jesus and his atoning sacrifice than a Christianized (ie. badly translated and misinterpreted) read of Isaiah 53, the story of the “Suffering Servant”. Within this passage, Christians have massaged the Hebrew text so badly, that we interpret seeing *Jesus* as the “Suffering Servant”, a prophecy of his dying for the sins of the world.

Unfortunately, that is not what is really happening with this chapter. But first a little background.

Although animal sacrifices had become common within Israel before GOD put a stop to them by destroying the Temple and turning Israel over to her enemies, NO WHERE in the milieu of Hebraic thought does the concept of Human Sacrifice

for any kind of atonement ever enter the picture. The thought is wholly Pagan, and without question, utterly evil. GOD would simply never ask for such a thing!

“Ah, wait, Keith. God told Abraham to sacrifice his son Isaac!”

NO. GOD did not.

This is another reason why Christians should not be attempting to use Jewish texts to support their Pagan ideas.

This story within Judaic circles is known as the *Akeda*, *The Binding of Isaac*.

What Christians are never told, mostly because we aren't culturally Jewish and we're seldom if ever truthfully educated in the Hebraic, is that this episode within Torah creates a huge contradiction and conundrum for Judaism's own ostensive belief in the inerrancy of Torah. Jewish scholars have been aware of this rather glaring contradiction for centuries, if not millennia.

This event within Torah is considered by most Jewish scholars to be Judaism's most ethically troublesome passage. On the one hand, Torah is considered utterly infallible and without error; on the other hand, God will not void His Covenant by asking man to violate God's commands.

Period.

Christian scholars, on the other hand, all too easily dismiss the deep contradiction in the story without realizing the discordant issues the *Akeda* represents to mainstream Christian Soteriology and the Character of GOD. We just think that Isaac is a cipher, a foreshadowing, or a “type versus anti-type”, of Jesus, a Human sacrifice to come. We don't realize that in commanding this, GOD is essentially breaking GOD's own Law by ordering Abraham to commit the murder of his own son.

It is nothing less than a pure act of evil.

GOD would NEVER command such a heinous thing.

Rashi, a Hebrew acronym for Rabbi Shlomo Yitzchaki, or Rabbi Shlomo Yarchi, (circa late 11th century), was the author of the first comprehensive commentaries on the Talmud and Tanakh. Rashi was and remains a very highly respected Rabi within Judaism:

*Acclaimed for his ability to present the basic meaning of the text in a concise yet lucid fashion, Rashi appeals to both beginning students and learned scholars. His commentaries, which appear in all printed editions of the Talmud and Torah (especially the Chumash), are an indispensable companion to both casual and serious students of Judaism's primary texts.*⁶¹

Rashi's commentary on Genesis 22 includes the following,

Said Rabbi Abba: Abraham said to Him, "I will explain my complaint before You. Yesterday, You said to me (Genesis 21:12): 'for in Isaac will be called your seed,' and You retracted and said (Genesis 22:2): 'Take now your son.' Now You say to me, 'Do not stretch forth your hand to the lad.'"

*The Holy One, blessed be He, said to him (Psalm. 89:35): "I shall not profane My covenant, neither shall I alter the utterance of My lips." When I said to you, "Take," I was not altering the utterance of My lips. I did not say to you, "Slaughter him," but, "Bring him up." You have brought him up; [now] take him down."*⁶²

⁶¹ Adapted from Wikipedia.com, "Rashi", 9-11-06 Wiki uses as a source Chaim Miller's article "Rashi's Method of Biblical Commentary" found on chabad.org, which is a web site for Jewish history.

⁶² Gen. Rabbah 56:8, Judaica Press, Complete Tanach with Rashi's Commentary on Genesis (Bereishit) 22.

While Judaism shares the same misguided belief that Torah is somehow inerrant and utterly inspired of GOD, and therefore infallible in its teachings, the *Akeda* has all the misguided trimmings of the “lying pen of the scribes” all over it. Why these evil scribes needed to see Abraham attempting to sacrifice Isaac is anyone’s guess, but we can be assured that a truly holy and righteous GOD is not going to command any of us to do something that violates his Law; a Law that should stem from the Golden Rule.

Perhaps not surprising, such circumstances have happened within the modern era as otherwise good Christian people have murdered their own children; wholly because they heard what they thought was the voice of God telling them to do so. Many of us are understandably shocked and horrified over such actions of these otherwise *good* Christians.

One such story is that of Deanna Laney, a highly religious Texas woman who slew two of her sons and severely injured another, all because she felt God was telling her to do so. Laney’s attorney argued that Laney believed that “the word of God was infallible. It destroyed her ability to discern the wrongness of her act.”⁶³

Laney herself explains, “I thought it was the Lord speaking to me, ‘You’re just going to have to step out in faith. This is faith. You can’t see the why. You just got to obey’ ... It was like, I had been given the instructions, and it was a matter of obeying or disobeying.”⁶⁴

While we in Christendom repeatedly *sanitize* the story of God telling Abraham to sacrifice Isaac, how can we honestly condemn Deanna Laney for acting on her faith and obeying

⁶³ CNN.com/2004/LAW/03/29/children.slain/index.html on 09/17/06

⁶⁴ CourtTV video of Deanna Laney’s testimony dated 12/15/03

God if we believe God asked the same thing of Abraham? Is there really any difference? No! There is no difference in ethical and moral behavior here.

Murder is murder; it is an act prohibited by GOD.

As such, GOD would NEVER ask anyone to murder his or her child, even as a test. Would you obey what you thought was God asking you to kill your own child?

No. Of course not.

Most of us would add, “that would not be God asking such a thing!”

Correct.

As such, GOD would never ask Abraham to sacrifice Isaac, even as a test of faith. GOD doesn’t need to “test” anyone’s “faith”. GOD already knows all there is to know about who and what you are.

Isaiah 53

In like manner, Christendom strongly insists that Isaiah 53 is a prophecy of a Messianic human sacrifice set by God to atone for the sins of the world. We naturally and honestly want to infer this from Luke’s statement in Acts 8,⁶⁵ although Luke never actually says that Isaiah 53 is the prophecy he is talking about. But this is what Christian scholars have indeed inferred. Luke (that would be Paul, if you want to get right down to it) evidently saw Isaiah 53 as a prophecy he could mangle into something talking about his version of Jesus.

Besides the issues of GOD never commanding sacrifices to begin with, or that GOD would never void their Law by commanding a Human sacrifice; the most basic problem with

⁶⁵ Acts 8:32-33

assuming that Isaiah 53 is a prophecy about Jesus is that it takes not just the verse but an entire set of chapters WAY OUT OF CONTEXT.

Isaiah 53 doesn't just pop up out of nowhere. It is actually the culmination of an impressive and massive prophecy about Israel that begins around chapter 41 of the book of Isaiah and culminates in chapters 53 and 54.

Within Isaiah 41-54 GOD, speaking through the prophet Isaiah, discusses the events surrounding GOD's *servant* Israel. It is an epic prophecy has come to be known as *The Servant Songs*.

Chapters 41-54, and especially chapter 53, are typically translated by Christian scholars with a decidedly Christian bias that assumes the "suffering servant" is Jesus; when in fact the balance of these passages consistently refer to the servant collectively as "Israel".

At points within the *Servant Songs*, GOD is praising the "servant" for doing well (Christians will point out that this "servant" is naturally Jesus), while in another passage GOD is seen chastising this very same "servant" for his willful disobedience (who Christians now say is, of course, Israel).

Sometimes GOD both highly praises and harshly chastises the "servant" within the same chapter!

Sorry, but you can't have it both ways.

Consistent context is paramount within any translation or reading. The flip-flopping of context within the translation of Scripture is typically considered BAD SCHOLARSHIP—but because the Servant Songs (when translated by Christians) appear to support the Christian view of God asking for a human sacrifice to forgive the sins of the world, this flip-flopping of context has become ACCEPTED bad scholarship.

Interestingly, the Greek translation of Isaiah 53 within the Septuagint (also called the LXX)⁶⁶ does not at all imply any kind of sacrifice of atonement for sin. Bellinger and Farmer, two conservative Christian theologians note,

*The Greek version of Isaiah 53 offers the Christian exegete considerably less support than the Hebrew versions for the doctrine of atonement from sin through Jesus' sacrificial death and resurrection ... But taken in context, the LXX translators stopped short of seeing in the Servant's actions an atoning sacrificial death...*⁶⁷

The ancient Jewish scholars who originally translated the book of Isaiah within the Septuagint, indeed possessed a knowledge of the old Hebraic that is (deliberately?) lost on some of our modern Christian scholars. That culture would have been that GOD could not and would not possibly require a human sacrifice when GOD had consistently repudiated such a pagan practice within the Law.

Bellinger and Farmer go on to essentially conclude that the ancient translation of the Greek within the Septuagint must be a *biased* translation of the Hebrew.

It is interesting to note that these two Christian “scholars” fail to be concerned about the fact that their *own* translation of the simple Hebrew could itself be seeded with a mainstream

⁶⁶ The Septuagint or LXX, is the Koine Greek translation of the Tanakh (Old Testament) by Jewish translators completed circa 300 – 200 BCE. The name LXX comes from the tradition that 70 Jewish scholars were recruited to translate the Tanakh.

⁶⁷ BELLINGER, JR, William, and FARMER, William, (editors) *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*, Trinity Press, 1998, pp. 186, 188

Christian BIAS. This Christian bias is in and of itself tampering with the Isaiah text by attempting to read more into the passage than is actually there when viewed from the perspective of true Hebraic thought—which the Septuagint inarguably represents.

Incidentally, it would have been impossible for the ancient translators of the Septuagint (LXX) to insert a “bias” into their translation. First, it’s their own culture and language being written for Greek-speaking Jews. Second, the LXX was completed some 200 to 300 years BEFORE Jesus would even be born and the beginnings of the Catholic Church in Rome would be established. They had no reason to insert any kind of “bias” into their own Scriptures.

Again, in Hebraic thought, human sacrifice was a direct violation of GOD’s Law. GOD throughout the Scriptures literally and consistently condemns it via the prophets. Therefore, GOD would not be inspiring Isaiah to be prophesying such as any kind of atonement of sin—especially to *atone* for the sin of another! This is a concept, as we have read, that GOD outright repudiates via the prophet Ezekiel.⁶⁸

To summarize: the KJV, NIV and other major translations indeed deliberately mistranslate the Hebrew of Isaiah 53 and bend its context to make it indeed sound like someone is paying the price of another’s sin when GOD via Ezekiel 18 utterly contradicts this possibility.

In context, the true translation of Isaiah 53 is that the suffering servant is indeed Israel, not Jesus; and Israel is suffering and dying for their OWN sin, not the sins of others. Like we read in Ezekiel, while Israel did do some good things, it was their egregious sin (animal blood sacrifices, et. al.) that caused their ultimate downfall.

⁶⁸ Ezekiel 18:1-4

22

The True Name of GOD

"The beginning of wisdom is to call things by their right names."

— A Proverb

One of the many things that has mystified me about Christianity ever since I can remember is that we do not actually know the name of our own God. I remember asking this question to a youth group once. "What is God's name anyway? 'The Lord?'" I remember getting some kind of answer, I don't fully recall. But the point is, I'm not the only one who has ever asked this question.

"God" is not the name of GOD. It's *what* GOD is to us, not *who*. In English, we take a common noun, "god", and turn it into a proper noun, "God". But that still isn't a name. Likewise, "the LORD" is also not the name of GOD. That's a title.

"Jesus" is also not the name of GOD. Jesus told us to pray to GOD (our Father in Heaven), not to himself. We have turned Jesus into a god because of Paul and the Pagan traditions of the

Catholic Church, but that still doesn't answer the question—what is GOD's name?

Some in Christianity will tell you that GOD doesn't have name, at least none that GOD has given us. I remember hearing this answer as well later in life and for many years I indeed bought this explanation. I think mostly because no one in Christianity actually knew what GOD's name really was.

I have also found it interesting that when you press Christian leaders for God's name, they get irritated rather quickly. They don't want to discuss it. I've even had other Christians get angry at me even for even asking the question.

Case in point: If some Christian or Christian leader gets mad or angry at you because you asked a simple question, be prepared for a LIE; followed up by bullying if you refuse to believe the lie or persist in your quest for the truth.

It wasn't until my wife and I started down our so-called "Messianic" journey to learn about GOD through much more Hebraic perspective and became more and more exposed to and immersed in Hebraic thought that the curious issue of GOD's name began to bubble to the surface again.

As it turns out, both Christianity and ancient Israel have the same problem—they didn't know the name of their own god.

Why?

The reason why Christianity and ancient Israel didn't know the name of their own god was because GOD took it away from them.

You read that correctly.

GOD took it from them because they were committing evil in the name of GOD, acting in ways that were not indicative of who GOD really was.

How do I know this?

Because if we read the prophets, GOD tells us point blank the reason. Because of the evil that Israel did, GOD removed

their name from them. And because of what Christianity is or has become, GOD has also removed GOD's name from Pagan (Gentile) Christianity as well.

I think this is what makes Christians so upset regarding the name of GOD. We don't know GOD's own name. We don't know it and we don't use it; and this fact EXPOSES something Christians are loathe to admit—that Christianity isn't really the genuine religion GOD gave us to follow GOD by.

Here is what GOD says via the Messiah Ezekiel:

“I judged (Israel) according to their conduct and their actions. And wherever they went among the nations they profaned my holy name, for it was said of them, ‘These are the LORD’s people, and yet they had to leave the land.’ I had concern for my holy name, which the house of Israel profaned among the nations where they had gone.

“I swear by my great name,” says the LORD, “that no one from Judah living anywhere in Egypt will ever again invoke my name or swear, ‘As surely as the Sovereign LORD lives.’”⁶⁹

Naturally, the big question we need to ask ourselves is: What evil did Israel (and by extension now, Christianity) do that “profaned” the name of GOD so badly that GOD removed their name from us?

First, I want us to note a few things from these verses in Ezekiel. “No one from Judah living anywhere in Egypt” does not actually mean Hebrews living in Egypt, it is a metaphor for people living in sin, or living with sinful actions. Egypt was a Pagan nation that Israel came out of. The metaphor is interesting because the Hebrews were doing something in Egypt that they had learned

⁶⁹ Ezekiel 36:16-21 NIV / CEV / NASB; Jeremiah 44:25-26; See also Amos 6:8-11; Hosea 2

from the Egyptians that GOD despised. In bringing Israel out of Egypt, they were supposed to leave those sinful things behind.

Are you curious about what sin the Hebrews learned while in Egypt that they were not supposed to continue doing?

How about blood sacrifice for starters ... and I'll let you piece the rest of that not very difficult puzzle together on your own.

Israel's most egregious sin against GOD was indeed her learned desire to offer blood sacrifice (inherited from Egypt) and they indeed built from that an entire sacrificial system. GOD again and again condemns Israel for her sin; and again and again Israel persists in demanding that this is what GOD wanted.

Israel broke her Covenant with GOD and in so doing GOD removed their name from Israel's midst. Even to the point where Israel herself erected a deep tradition to never speak or write the name of GOD in public. In fact, the Hebrews went so far as to deliberately hide the name of GOD, not just from themselves, but anyone who might read their Scriptures. Even today, the tradition persists with many Jews writing God as "G-d".

Even before the Christian Bible would even emerge, Masorite scribes were busy removing the name of GOD from their own scriptures.

Revealing the Name of GOD

Dr. Shmuel Asher a Karaite Jewish scholar and rabbi who specializes in Ancient Hebrew Studies, explains,

Not only did our ancestors hide the name by the invention of their YHWH—Tetragrammaton, (יהוה) which is generally translated as Jehovah. Over much time they have sold this by-product to all religions, even in the Jewish community, that this was in fact the

name which we are commanded to use instead, while very carefully side-stepping the proper Name that was actually given to Moshe (Moses) on Mt. Horeb.

If that wasn't clear, I will clarify; all professional orthodox and many non-orthodox clergy know the true Name! It's you who do not! We are taught this true name, and even sing songs using this name that supposedly does not exist.

However, the reasons given to us for hiding it from all Gentiles are as follows: 1) So the pagans can't learn it and utilize its formidable power. 2) So that the common people do not defile it and treat it as common or base. However, when asked where this commandment is to hide the proper name of GOD from his people, all people, we get no good answer. That is because a truthful Torah answer does not exist.⁷⁰

Dr. Asher's revelation is stunning. Masorite scribes who translated their Bible, a Jewish text that is used to translate nearly every other modern translation, deliberately hid the name of GOD.

Within Dr. Asher's comments above, he mentions the something called the "Tetragrammaton". This is essentially the four Hebrew consonants that obfuscate the true name of GOD within the Hebrew Scriptures. Typically rendered within the Hebrew as יהוה or YHWH in the Latin alphabet, many scholars have attempted to render the phonetic as "Yahweh" or "Jehovah". Jehovah is a misnomer because a hard "J" sound does not exist within the Hebrew, so then this gets even further mispronounced as "Yahovah".

Yes, it's a mess.

Dr. Asher then raises a troublesome point:

⁷⁰ ASHER, Shmuel, Karaite Jewish scholar, *The Land of Meat and Honey*, Amazon

Now here is where the big issues begin for most people who are not brought up within the Jewish community or culture, knowing the many hidden truths like this one. Exodus 3:15 has been manipulated, and the YHWH = Jehovah has been added in order to facilitate and perpetuate hiding the TRUE name.

We [Jews] know that the YHWH—Tetragrammaton was a mechanism devised to be the tool used to actively aid in hiding His true Name. Even building on top of this by making it punishable law to say the name; this practice comes to us directly from the practices of pagan Babylon.

This YHWH title is closely associated with all manner of Kabalistic rituals through Gematria, as well as ancient and modern Masonic religious rites, the Catholic Church, and other satanic occult rituals. Unknown to most people, this YHWH title is found and used by all of the above.

Essentially what Dr. Asher is saying that the name “Yahweh” or “Jehovah” has been used in Pagan practice for millennia. But it is not the true name of GOD.

So what is?

When properly un-obfuscated, the true vowel points of the name of GOD are אֱהְיֶה or AHYH in our Latin alphabet, and pronounced “Aheych”, even by Hebrew speaking people today.

Again, this name of GOD, properly rendered, is found over 6,000 times within the Tanakh (Old Testament).

There is much more detail to reveal about how this change of the name of GOD came about and why; but suffice to say the people of GOD were given GOD’s true name and even commanded to use it by GOD.

But when we as a people, both Jews and later Christians began using, or shall I say misusing GOD’s name within a Pagan context, meaning we were declaring that GOD demanded blood sacrifice among other sinful actions that got

written into the Law, it was GOD who took their name away from us!

Judaism's Obfuscating of the Name of GOD

When Moses speaks with GOD for the first time on mount Herob, he asks GOD, "Whom shall I say has sent me?"

GOD replies with their full name:

"Aheyeh ashar Aheyeh" and he said, "So will you tell the children of Jacob *Aheyeh* has sent me to you."⁷¹

In Christian translations of the Bible this verse appears to be the one and only time *Aheyeh* is rendered correctly translated as "I am", thus the full name of GOD when transliterated becomes "I am that I am".

Yet, here is where the weird disconnect takes place, in the very next verse the name of GOD gets lost, obfuscated, and is rendered as יהוה (YHWH). In two places in the Tanakh the name of GOD is rendered correctly, but in 6,000 other places within the Tanakh, the name of GOD gets rendered *not* as אהיה (AHYH), but as יהוה (YHWH).

This is not just some name transliteration issue, but is rather a deliberate mistranslation of a proper name by intentionally replacing GOD's actual Name with a title; which becomes, in effect, an alternate name.

In Exodus 3:14, we read God saying, "My name is אֶשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה" ("I am that I am.") But in the very next verse GOD has

⁷¹Exodus 3:14 As translated at by ASHER, Shmuel, via <https://ancienthebrewlearningcenter.blogspot.com>

now changed their mind and is essentially telling Moses now, “even though I just told you my name is אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה”, AHYH (Aheyeh) tell the people that someone named יהוה YHWH (Jehovah/Yahweh) has sent you!”

The passage makes no sense. Until, that is, you understand what Jewish scribes were doing to the Name of GOD.

Christianity's Aversion to the Name of GOD

Christian translators are also guilty of hiding the name of GOD within the Bible, typically using “the LORD” in place of יהוה (YHWH) or “Sovereign LORD” when the text actually uses the word “Lord” in front of YHWH. It would be stupid to render the text as Lord LORD, so they massage it as “Sovereign LORD” instead. Again, deliberately mistranslating the text.

So deep has this aversion to GOD's actual name become within Christian tradition that the translators and editors of the RSV (Revised Standard Version) translation of the Bible actually took it upon themselves to demand that GOD's actual name was “entirely inappropriate” for any Christian to read from the Scriptures! Take note of the RSV's opening notes regarding the name of GOD:

“While it is almost if not quite certain that the Name was originally pronounced ‘Yahweh,’... the use of any proper name for the one and only God, as though there were other gods from whom He had to be distinguished, was discontinued in Judaism before the

Christian era and is entirely inappropriate for the universal [catholic] faith of the Christian Church.”⁷²

First, this Bible scholar obviously doesn’t know GOD’s true name. Secondly, he admits that they are deliberately hiding the name of GOD within the text because of some Judeo-Christian tradition and not because of what the underlying Hebrew actually says.

Furthermore, who died and made these Bible editors the sole arbiters of what is and is not “entirely inappropriate” for the universal (meaning Catholic) faith of the Christian Church? Now your Bible translators are DICTATING what they want you to know and not know!

This is also called a LIE.

Deliberately sabotaging the text of the Bible to favor a one-sided belief or tradition.

Then again, GOD did say they removed their name from those people who did not know who GOD truly was by committing sin in GOD’s name. That would appear to fit Pagan Christianity to some degree.

While Christians are not out sacrificing animals like the ancient Hebrews did, we are taught that the Christian God demanded such sacrifices; that the Christian God demanded a human sacrifice no less; and it is this view of GOD that still indelibly permeates the Christian psyche and understanding of what we think GOD wanted.

But I believe we are now beginning to see that sacrifices is not at all what GOD desired for the people of GOD to be believing, let alone doing.

⁷² From the opening notes at the beginning of the editors of The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version, Nashville: Cokesbury, 1952, [amplification supplied]

Restoring the Name of GOD

I think by now we should have a good understanding of why GOD hid their name; why the Hebrews obfuscated it; and why the current Christian Church continues to hide if not utterly eschew and even be repulsed by the true name of GOD.

Aheyeh is NOT Christianity's GOD.

Someone named Jesus is.

Perhaps the irony is that *Aheyeh* is the GOD Jesus and the Apostles knew and prayed to.

The moment we begin to see GOD anew for who GOD truly is; with new eyes and new light; then we will know that the dawn of GOD restoring their name will be upon us. GOD will indeed repair and renew their Covenant with anyone who honors the true Character and Spirit of GOD.

While much of what got written into the Tanakh was indeed specifically about Israel, and we need to keep such passages in context when reading them; *Aheyeh* is the GOD of all people and not just Israel. We can try to learn as much as we can about GOD by looking at Israel, they have certainly given us both good and bad examples of what and what not to do.

It is not out of character for GOD to give all of us the following divine directive, even call it a commandment if you like,

God also said to Moses, "Say to the Israelites, 'Aheyeh, the God of your fathers—the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God

*of Jacob—has sent me to you.’ This is my name forever, the name by which I am to be remembered from generation to generation.*⁷³

GOD commands us to remember and to call on Aheyeh by their true name! But it is a command that Christianity has disregarded, outright ignored, and deliberately hidden from the modern Christian world.

Have you ever found it odd or strange that we sing song after song extolling *the name of the LORD*. Yet we never actually praise GOD by a real name.

We claim the promise that,

*“The name of the LORD is a strong tower, the righteous run to it and are safe.”*⁷⁴

Yet we never come near the strong tower of GOD’s actual name; we continue to distance ourselves from GOD by holding dear to a mere title. The true translation of this passage from Solomon’s Proverbs should rightly be,

“The name of Aheyeh is a strong tower, the righteous run to it and are safe.”

GOD will restore the name of Aheyeh to a people willing to follow a truly righteous path; one that does not accuse GOD of wanting bloody sacrifice, including a human one, before GOD can forgive.

Finally, you may have noticed that throughout this book I have been writing GOD in all capital letters.

Why?

⁷³ Exodus 3:15

⁷⁴ Proverbs 18:10 NKJV

As nothing more than a matter of personal preference, when referring to Aheyeh, the true GOD whom Jesus and the Apostles followed, I prefer to write GOD in all capitals. I'm not trying to create yet another tradition, per se, it's just what I prefer to do. In some circumstances it has been a mechanism to differentiate the Pagan Roman version of the Christian God from the true GOD, Aheyeh, within my comments.

23

Apologetics: Defending the Indefensible via Fallacies

"I do not feel obliged to believe that the same God who has endowed us with sense, reason, and intellect has intended us to forgo their use."

— Galileo Galilei

The so-called field of "Christian Apologetics"⁷⁵ is in essence the attempt at taking a lie and making it into the truth; or taking a historical fact and bending it so badly through various mechanisms of deceit or perspective that it looks like it either never happened, or it happened differently, or that it was so minor that it's not worth discussing.

⁷⁵ Apologetics, noun, the branch of theology concerned with the defense or proof of Christianity. From the root "apologetic", also "excuse".

This is Christian Apologetics in a nutshell.

This book is all about restoring a truthful perspective; about “seeing” how the Church in Rome hijacked the Christian faith and then (re)built a PERSPECTIVE, a lying version or revision of history through its own brand of interpretation, its own brand of “versioning” the facts, and its own lying writs.

In scholastic circles this act of interpretation or bending and twisting of the historical record and especially the scriptures also has a formal name called “exegesis”⁷⁶. Exegesis of the scriptures is typically paired with another term called “hermeneutics”⁷⁷. Hermeneutics goes hand in hand with exegesis and basically becomes your assumptive perspective or process about how you choose or decide to interpret historical facts and/or passages within the scriptures.

Scholars and theologians pair a particular brand of hermeneutic with their exegesis. You really cannot have one without the other. The hermeneutic describes your process while the exegesis is the part of actually researching and discovering the critical or true meaning behind the text.

Hermeneutic, then, is just another term for your pet preconceived BIAS.

One scholar might say to another that they interpreted a passage or passages with a bad or misguided hermeneutic that ignores blah, blah, blah. It’s a much better framework for research than telling your colleague he’s a dumbhead. You can blame their stupidity on the errant “hermeneutic” instead of the person using it.

⁷⁶ Exegesis, noun, critical (meaning exacting) explanation or interpretation of a text, especially of scripture. Synonyms include: interpretation, explanation, exposition, elucidation, clarification, gloss [spin], annotation ...

⁷⁷ Hermeneutic, noun, hermeneutics (plural)—a method or theory of interpretation.

Whatever.

This entire book has been written with a hermeneutic as well; one that does not roll over to man-made tradition to assume that the doctrine of *Sola Scriptura* is accurate. In fact, the hermeneutic is decidedly against the whole premise of *Sola Scriptura* and for very valid exegetical reasons laid out within the book by myself and many, many other Christian scholars.

My hermeneutic is also quite decidedly more Jewish than it is Pagan. I do not attempt to push the Jewish Jesus into a non-Jewish mold as Christianity's typical hermeneutics do.

In building my hermeneutic, one of the things I have attempted to actively avoid are "fallacies" in delivering the facts of history to you. Unfortunately, this has not always been the case within typical Christian apologetics.

In my experience, most apologetics take place through the various application of one or more LOGICAL FALLICIES.

For instance, in revisiting our quotes from Chuck Swindoll's exegesis of the book of Hebrews, Swindoll implements a hermeneutic that assumes because some Christians were using the book of Hebrews in the second century, that that automatically makes the book authoritative. However, as I have already pointed out, this is a deeply FLAWED hermeneutic that relies on a Logical Fallacy to make an errant point.

In the event you're not familiar with these, essentially a Logical Fallacy is a kind of argument designed to look "logical" and "reasonable" within the context of an argument or test of facts. But in reality, the fallacy is not logical at all; it is in fact, a rationalization designed to make you think you're being logical and reasonable when you are in fact not being logical nor reasonable at all in your observations.

Logical Fallacies are created in an attempt to prove a LIE.

Here is an example:

FACT: The Roman Catholic Church changed the Christian worship day from the seventh day, Saturday, to the first day, Sunday, of the week.⁷⁸

This is a hard and cold unassailable historical fact with clear proof from Roman Catholicism's own annals. But this fact doesn't settle well with some Christians who don't want to be seen as worshipping on a different day than the one Jesus and the Apostles worshipped on. So, they either ignore the historical record; or they erect a logical fallacy, like the Bandwagon Fallacy, which goes like this,

"Christians were keeping a first day sabbath long before the Roman Catholic Church made the official change."

A Bandwagon Fallacy is essentially the argument that attempts to say that because "everyone" (whoever "everyone" might be) is/was doing whatever, that proves the fact is no big deal. It is an attempt to muddy the water, not make the waters clearer.

Typically, the Bandwagon Fallacy doesn't try to disprove the fact more than it attempts to rationalize the fact as moot, as in the case of the Catholic Church changing the Christian day of worship from the Jewish worship day that Jesus and the Apostles worshiped on, to a Pagan worship day.

The Church must dilute, rationalize away or distance itself from the fact that its worship day is now different than the one Jesus and the Apostles kept. The reason should be obvious: we're not really following the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles by keeping a Pagan (Gentile) worship day. It raises questions that Christianity may not be the true faith of Jesus

⁷⁸ Ecumenical Church Council of Laodicea, Canon 29, c. 364 CE

that the Church is teaching that it is. Asking such questions is a direct attack on the validity and legitimacy of our faith; but more than this, it is very close to impugning our Church leadership for failing to follow the true faith of Jesus.

The first step in destroying a logical fallacy is to realize what these fallacies are to begin with and to know your historical facts.

The argument that “Christians” were already worshipping on the first day of the week does not excuse what the Catholic Church officially did. This implementation of the Bandwagon Fallacy works in conjunction with another Logical Fallacy, the Half-truth Fallacy, which is omitting relevant details of fact in order to slant the story, that is, to tell a lie.

However, by inserting one word, we can destroy both the Half-truth and Bandwagon fallacies with the whole or actual truth of what really happened in history:

“PAGAN Christians were keeping a first day PAGAN sabbath long before the PAGAN Roman Catholic Church made the official change.”

And now the fallacy argument is exposed and destroyed in the light of day. By observing that there were indeed both Pagan (Gentile) Christians and (or versus) Jewish / Messianic (“Judaizing”) Christians worshipping in the centuries following the deaths of Jesus and the Apostles, we *gain* understanding instead of losing it.

The Pagan Christians hated the “Judaizing” ones for reasons we’ve already discussed in-depth. But it was indeed these so-called “Judaizing” ones who were mostly likely following the real Jewish Messiah and Jewish Apostles and Jewish Gospel much more closely than their Pagan (Gentile) Pauline counterparts.

Remember, there were many, many factions of Christians by the 4th century when Constantine took over Christianity and made the Catholic Church's bogus version of history canon.

The Pagan Roman Church was in effect stealing the "Christian" brand and turning it into something the Jewish Jesus and the Jewish Apostles would not recognize, let alone condone.

The question needs to be reasonably asked: Were these Pagan (Gentile) Christians really and factually Christians? Or did they just steal the name and call themselves Christians because they were following a charlatan apostle?

It is for this reason that the Catholic Church REALLY needs Paul to be seen as one in harmony with the Jewish Apostles in Jerusalem. Because if he's not, if Paul is an interloper, a charlatan apostle, then the Catholic Church is a FRAUD, following a fraud apostle and preaching a fraud gospel with a fraudulent spirit—that would be the same fraudulent spirit that Paul had been punished with by GOD, an angel of Satan, by the way.

Another Logical Fallacy that is often used by Christians in an attempt to prove or disprove a fact is called the Composition-Division Fallacy, which is often paired with the Fallacy-Fallacy to make an errant point. The argument goes like this:

"Keith said that the Reformation was 500 years ago. The Reformation was really 600 years ago. Since Keith is wrong here the rest of his book is just as wrong."

This is an easy fallacy to understand, but all too often it's fallacies like this that get told to everyday Christians by their leadership and they just buy it because, well, their leadership

told them to believe it. Just because one fact may be slightly off, does not mean all of the facts are automatically wrong.

Another Logical Fallacy I would like to point out is the Ad Hominem Fallacy that we already looked at earlier in the book. This is the one where instead of attacking the argument or the facts, someone attacks the character of the person delivering the message. It is often paired with the Appeal to Authority Fallacy, Appeal to Emotion, Genetic Fallacy, and Bandwagon. It goes something like this:

“Keith is a heretic! Keith doesn’t have the holy spirit! Without the holy spirit, Keith is speaking lies about the Church. Since the Church has the holy spirit, God gives us the truth!”

This short paragraph will be what some Christian apologists or leaders will attempt to use to bully you into not reading this book—or any other book promoting Reformation and correction of the Church’s errors. The Reformers were called “heretics” and everything else in the above paragraph by the leaders of the Catholic Church. It didn’t mean that the Reformers were wrong or that the Catholic Church was right. Do not allow yourself to be bullied by people whose only real interest is themselves and their church’s financial bottom line.

Finally, the most egregiously used Logical Fallacy is often the Strawman Fallacy. This is when you make a point, such as:

“Paul did not have letters of Apostolic authority from the Jerusalem Synagogue ...”

And the reply comes back something like, “Paul was the greatest apostle who ever lived. Paul’s writings extol the very essence of Christian living, blah, blah, blah ...” The argument attempts to change the subject, essentially, moving the discussion away from the previous point and argue using

“strawman” points that have nothing to do with the hard fact that was just raised.

I created this chapter to make the point to be on your guard regarding people claiming to “refute” the facts laid out within this book. The facts laid out within this book cannot be “refuted” because they are historical record accepted by many Christian scholars as accurate. No, I am not making a Bandwagon fallacy argument myself, I’m just pointing out that the facts within this book come from the same historical records accepted by the same people who will not like this book’s revelations or its conclusions.

Also, this is not intended to be some exhaustive list of all the Logical Fallacies in play within so-called Christian Apologetics. You will have to do your own research and familiarize yourself with the dozens and dozens of them. A simple online search will reveal numerous sites dedicated to exposing these fallacies.

I bring this to your attention because, at the end of the day, YOU are the only one responsible for your relationship with GOD.

Not your pastor.

Not your church.

YOU.

I do not want any of us to fall into the same trap as the Roman Catholic and Protestant churches; no one should be building our understandings and relationship with GOD for us; especially not on a foundation of LIES.

24

The New Light of a Second Reformation

*"Self-education is, I firmly believe,
the only kind of education there is."*

— Isaac Asimov

At this point, *False Witness* has touched on most of the major points of error that the Church has either deliberately or merely mistakenly gotten wrong over the centuries. Because of what amounts to no small measure of Roman anti-Semitism, the early Church founders literally erased, intentionally, any semblance of the Jewishness of Jesus and the Apostles. The Church played lip-service to the fact that these Apostles were indeed Jewish, and then proceeded to expunge as much of what that Jewish/Hebraic culture meant from the core of Pagan Roman Christian thought. To the point that today, mainstream modern Christians wouldn't know a true

Hebraic thought or a Hebraic teaching or nuance if you painted us a picture, just as I have attempted to do here within these pages.

By now, you may be incensed, angry, even seething by what you have read, not at the Church who actually *lied* to you, but at *me* for pointing it out and daring to write a book revealing the layers upon layers of entrenched lies. And then you want to dismiss everything that you've read with one thought you just cannot get out of your mind:

"You're denying the divinity of Jesus, Keith!"

No. I'm simply not ascribing it to Jesus in the first place. A truly Jewish Jesus would NEVER have ascribed himself as GOD.

A lying Church led by a lying false apostle told you Jesus was divine and that he was a (Mithraic) human sacrifice slaughtered by the Church's god to appease his own anger over your sin.

None of which makes any logical or even spiritual sense.

Unless you're Pagan and want to follow a Pagan god.

I'm merely exposing the lie.

In any event, it's not necessary one way or the other for Jesus or any of the other Apostles, or Prophets or even Mary to be "divine" for GOD to forgive.

And that is what the book is really all about.

All GOD requires, is repentance. Not sacrifice.

At this point, I'm not going to tell you what to think or what to believe. You need to come to these conclusions on your own.

I will, however, give you a list of my OBSERVATIONS, and you can do with them whatever you like.

Here they are in summary:

A Second Reformation

Without question the new light of a Second Reformation is upon us.

I didn't start it.

GOD did.

For the past few centuries, and especially now within the past few decades, GOD has been raising up all kinds of messengers, *aggelos*, human "angels" if you will; new Reformers; all of them adding little pieces of the puzzle here and there to bring about a renewed understanding of who GOD really and truly is; and how the Pagan Church bastardized the real Character of GOD and bastardized what Jesus and the Apostles historically taught.

Yes, the truths of the Second Reformation indeed turn traditional Roman Catholic, and by extension, Protestant Christianity, on its head; literally gutting the lies and half-truths that have been spoon-fed to us for not just two millennia, but since the Hezekiah priesthood meddled with the Law, inserted pagan blood sacrifice into it, and sent all of Israel into sin and destruction.

When GOD led me to begin to see Christianity for what it was some ten-plus years ago, I knew I had to take a step back from the whole milieu and corpus of mainstream Christian thought and completely re-assess what was and was not "of GOD".

After setting aside the fallacies, misnomers, the half-truths and outright lies, the fact is, I was left with very little that I knew was "of GOD" that I could indeed hold onto.

At the end of the day, all I was left with was a tiny handful of truths, as I saw them, and they all looked a lot like what GOD said via the Messiah Ezekiel (chapter 18). And the most astonishing if not refreshing of these—GOD does not require

sacrifice to forgive. If there is a central message to the Second Reformation, the fact that GOD does not require sacrifice to forgive is indeed it.

The Law of GOD

First, I have had to come to grips with the notion or even fact that there really is no actual "Law of GOD".

It doesn't exist.

And if it ever did exist, it's gone now. Overwritten by the lying pen of the scribes.

Perhaps at one time, GOD had delivered to Moshe (Moses) a real list of do's and don'ts. But after the Priesthood was finished bastardizing the Law with their lying pens, whatever that list was is gone now. I'm not even buying the Decalogue, or what we commonly refer to as the Ten Commandments, as being "of GOD", because they contain too much Hebraic culture. If anything, the Ten Commandments are examples of how to treat each other, like we see in Ezekiel 18, but there is not really a GOD-given list we can hold on to.

And I am not sure there should ever be a "list" of such Laws.

Why?

Because if we're simply following the Golden Rule, you/we don't really need a list of do's and don'ts.

We don't. It is just not necessary.

Man created a few different lists of these do's and don'ts as "fences" to help ourselves see where the boundaries should be, but at the end of the day, there should NEVER be some official list of GOD's Laws because GOD never ever gave us but one LAW to follow.

The priesthood gave us lists.

Christianity has all kinds of lists.

But GOD never did that we know of. We should all instinctively know right from wrong based how we ourselves would want to be treated.

EVERYTHING extends from the Golden Rule. Don't do something to someone you would not want someone doing to you. Period. This includes how you treat beings higher than you, like GOD, and how you treat beings lower than you, like animals.

THE TRUE LAWS of GOD are not ephemeral, not transitory, not circumstantial, not based on anything temporary, nor are they based on Human culture or human preferences.

The true LAWS OF GOD ARE ETERNAL and can be applied to anyone at any time in history or in the future no matter who they are or where or when they are from or what culture they might have.

Keeping this in mind, let's observe a few examples of what is and is not OF GOD. Again, this is not some exhaustive list, they are merely examples:

- A law that demands you must not shave is cultural and has nothing to do with how you treat other people. Such a law is NOT of GOD.
- A law that demands you cannot have a tattoo or an ear or body piercing is cultural and again has nothing to do with how you treat others. It is NOT of GOD.
- A law that says do not have sex with an animal IS of GOD because that animal instinctively does not want you mating with it. If you don't want some gorilla

taking you captive and mating with you, don't do it to another animal.

- A law that says you must get married to have a family is NOT of GOD. GOD did not instruct or create the institution of marriage. Marriage is a Human cultural construct and despite what the Church says, GOD never once commanded marriage. You don't need to marry to have a deeply loving relationship with someone or to have a family.
- Likewise, a law that says you can only have sex once you are married is again, cultural, and is NOT something that GOD ever instructed. Even within Torah today, you cannot find a single law that says you need to be married to have sex. But listening to the Church you would think there was a whole book devoted to not having sex before marriage! These are man-made cultural traditions. They are not the instructions of GOD. Sure, you can teach that abstinence or practicing safe sex are wise or beneficial, no one should have a problem with that. Just do not try to bring GOD into your cultural or social argument. If consenting adults want to have sex, it's not a sin and it's also none of ours or the Church's business because it does not at all break the Golden Rule.
- A law that says you can only be married to one person is cultural, it is NOT of GOD. Throughout history, many cultures allowed more than one wife or even multiple husbands. While it can be debated how many or how few should be allowed to be married within a culture or society, that's fine. But don't try to draw GOD into your cultural or legal argument. GOD

doesn't care who or how many you marry as long as each member of the union is treated in full accordance with the Golden Rule.

- GOD did NOT intend for only males to be the head of the household. This is inherited culture. Likewise, GOD did not make females any kind of "lesser" gender. This patriarchal nonsense came out of a culture that should have died 3,000 years ago, but sadly, because of man's unholy religious tradition, is still alive and well within Christian circles. Married people are a TEAM of equal stature. Again, this stems from the Golden Rule. If you don't want to be subservient to your spouse, do not try to make them subservient to you just because you're male. Treating your wife like a subordinate slave doesn't make you a man, it makes you an arrogant ass.
- GOD does not care who you have sex with. The Church has created this hypersensitivity within the culture of the Human race that sex is somehow "dirty" unless it's only conducted their way. Again, this is a cultural issue that tyrants in the Church created. It is NOT of GOD. If two or more consenting partners of adult age want to engage in whatever kind of sex, that is none yours or anyone's business. Do not attempt to bring GOD into your personal sexual preference.
- GOD DOES CARE if you take advantage of or "defile" someone who doesn't want your sexual advances; this includes rape and those too young to know better. Jesus talked quite a bit about protecting children from harm and this includes abuse and sexual predators. If you want to send yourself to hell ... well, you get the picture.

- GOD does not care what you wear or don't wear. Again, this is Human custom. Do not try to drag GOD into your cultural preference for wearing some clothing or not wearing it at all. If you want to join a nudist colony or sun yourself on a beach, the gossipmongers in the Church will be horrified, but GOD isn't going to care.
- And speaking of gossip, GOD does care about how you treat others. If you don't want people gossiping about you and harming your reputation, don't gossip about others and harming their reputation.
- GOD cares about how you treat those less able and less fortunate than yourself.
- GOD cares about giving to the poor. Because if you were poor, and I have been there, you are grateful when someone helps you out.
- GOD cares about sheltering the homeless.
- GOD cares about feeding the hungry.
- GOD cares about standing up for the weak and defenseless and downtrodden.
- GOD cares about helping and healing the sick.
- GOD cares about defending the helpless and the innocent; this includes police protecting our cities and the military protecting a nation from evil invaders. While some Christian denominations seem to pride

themselves on being “contentious objectors” to war, there is no more honorable profession than defending the defenseless from fascists. Jesus was hardly a pacifist if his chasing the money-changers out of the Temple with a whip is any indication.

- Finally, and some of you are going to think I’m getting political here, but I’m not, I’m being moral. GOD cares about people’s lives, including the unborn. Don’t stop reading, you need to hear this. We have been spoon-fed a diatribe of political bilge trying to call the unborn “fetuses” and turning our children into something unliving and disposable for our own convenience. This is at least something the Church has gotten very right. Life begins the moment it starts. If you leave the two cells alone, they will grow and divide and mature into a human being. Period. This is not even debatable. But here again we have chosen our sides, not based on reason or logic, but on our pet political views and our own convenience. The Golden Rule prevails: If you were that unborn child would you want someone to kill you in the womb? Deprive you of existence because they’re scared, confused, or simply because they don’t want you? The Church and governments need to step up their game to help bring unwanted children into the world with love and dignity instead of just killing them because they’re a temporary inconvenience.

In any event, put yourself in the situation of the other person—if you wouldn’t want to be where they are, GOD cares about how you help them because you would want to be helped if you were in their shoes.

Again, this is not intended to be some codified or exhaustive list of do’s and don’ts, but merely an example of

how to see if what we are doing is going to violate the Golden Rule.

All of these are merely examples. I am not building fences around the Golden Rule by creating specific laws that need to be codified as holy—no one should be doing that. This was the mistake of the ancient Priesthood and it remains the mistake of the Christian Church today with all of their man-made tradition masquerading as the Law of GOD.

If you don't want or wouldn't want someone doing something to you, don't do it someone else.

It's very simple.

The Nature of GOD

Previously in the book I referred to GOD as "they", as if GOD is a plurality of beings. Now you are going to understand why. I'm not saying I'm right, I'm only reading the Scriptures.

If the Genesis account of Creation can be trusted, then who and what we call "God" is not a singular being, but rather many. In Genesis we see passages like:

"Let us make man in our image."

This is an ACCURATE rendering of the Hebrew and one that both Judaism and Christianity struggle with because the tradition that we inherited is to only worship ONE GOD, not many.

Elohim, or *El* for short, is the Hebrew term that is translated as "God" in the Bible, and it is without question a *plural* noun, it is not singular.

Most of us simply think that this plural rendering of the ancient Hebraic is simply referring to Roman Catholicism's "Trinity". Unfortunately, the concept of a "Trinity" (Father,

Son, and Holy Spirit) is the sole invention of the Roman Catholic Church inherited via Paul's Mithraic version of Jesus. The ancient Hebrews had no concept of a Trinity as espoused by the much later Christian Church. It is something neither Jesus nor the Apostles would have ever taught.

If we can trust the text of Genesis 6:4, GOD has or is a family and they are not Humanity. There is not one son of GOD, but many sons of GOD; and that would likely mean many daughters of GOD as well. Note the text also found in Genesis:

*"The Nephilim were on the earth in those days—and also afterward—when the sons of God went to the daughters of humans and had children by them. They were the heroes of old, men of renown."*⁷⁹

Just who and what these beings called GOD are remains a mystery to us. But it is something we should be deeply exploring instead of just accepting Rome's Pagan version of God.

The Holy Spirit

Regarding the so-called "holy spirit", the Hebrews had a concept of the *ruach kodesh*, or "holy spirit" of GOD. *Ruach* simply means "wind" in paleo-Hebrew; it's a very simple language. This spirit is simply the essence of GOD and is not some entity unto its own. That is not how the Hebrews perceived the spirit of GOD. The holy spirit is simply the manifestation of the presence of GOD. Many of us have felt this presence at times.

⁷⁹ Genesis 6:4

I Desire Mercy, Not Sacrifice

I think it is refreshing to know that GOD NEVER commanded blood sacrifices, animal or Human. GOD can easily forgive without them. All GOD desires is repentance. Repentance is nothing more than apologizing; recognizing that what we did was hurtful to someone else; and if possible, repairing the damage caused by our actions.

GOD's Autonomy

Can we just for once admit that GOD is going to do what GOD is going to do? HUMANITY does not have the power to affect or otherwise influence GOD. GOD knows what we need before we do. And praying, even fervently alone or in groups of so-called Prayer Warriors, for healing does not insure we will receive it. Christianity has bought into this "name it and claim it" nonsense.

GOD is not your holy genie or Santa Claus.

GOD's will, GOD's timing, GOD's blessings, are all GOD's own and there is nothing we can say or do to affect what GOD is going to do. We need to stop thinking we can make demands on GOD based on some passage we read out of context in the Psalms or Proverbs or wherever.

Yes, GOD watches over us. No question. But it's time we started acknowledging that GOD does whatever GOD is going to do and they do not always save us from bad health, war, or evil fascist governments, nor ever death.

GOD is not Surprised or Offended

GOD is not a man that GOD should care, or be surprised by, or be offended by, anything man does. We cannot affect GOD in any way.

GOD has a Sense of Humor

Like you and I, GOD has a sense of humor. Never forget that.

GOD is the GOD of both Good and Evil

This observation sends the typical Christian into conniptions. We don't want to ever perceive that GOD is committing evil. So, let's just come clean from the inherited tradition and look at GOD as what GOD has done in the history of mankind.

Many people, including my wife, believe that the only thing that can explain why GOD permits evil is that without the choice to do evil, our CHOICE to do good means nothing. That doesn't mean that seeing people or animals being horribly hurt or abused or murdered shouldn't horrify those of us who strive to be lights in the world. It just means that we'll have a lot to question GOD about later.

But, we reason, if GOD is "allowing" evil to happen, then GOD is committing evil. GOD has the power to stop it. But they don't. And in fact, GOD sent the Assyrians and Babylonians into Israel as punishment for their sin. GOD allowed Stalin, Mussolini, Hitler, Mao, Castro, and every other tin-horned fascist dictator you can think of to come into power and murder people literally by the millions.

Why? Why did GOD allow or permit or even cause these things to happen?

I don't have an answer.

None of us do. Not a rational one anyway.

Yes, GOD is GOOD.

But the very same GOD is also, or is capable of, egregious EVIL.

Whether we want to call this punishment or just the nature of existence or whatever, we're through with the Christianized sugar-coating of GOD as some big happy Santa Claus who never lets anything bad happen to GOD's children.

Again, GOD doesn't care what you believe or don't believe; GOD only cares what you DO, or don't do to others.

Solomon lamented, GOOD things happen to EVIL people and EVIL things happen to GOOD people. The Proverbs and even the prophets are filled with laments like this.

It is the NATURE of existence.

GOD does not always protect us from evil, or pain, or sickness or even death. 6 million Jews will tell you, GOD did not protect them from Hitler's wrath.

Stop trying to paint GOD as something GOD is not. Anyone can give you example after example of GOD's goodness, but any of us can also point to egregious evil that happened on GOD's watch as well.

Let's stop trying to turn GOD into something they are not.

To quote C.S. Lewis' famed Narnia series, Mr. Beaver describes Aslan as "not safe—but he is good."

GOD is not a Human

I am quite sure that GOD has feelings and emotions, but GOD is not some petty, butthurt, emotional tyrant who gets offended by anything man does. That is the kind of petty narcissistic god that petty narcissistic men create. In other words, we tend to see a god through the lens of our own making.

The Church's god creates an unattainable level of righteousness and is ready and willing to send you to hell for an eternal punishment for sins you never even committed UNLESS you believe what the Church tells you to believe and do what the Church tells you to do.

"But [the Church's god] loves you!"

This is a pile of horse manure.

Do we see the utter hypocrisy here? The Church's god is a god wrought of the traditions of petty conniving men with an agenda to control you and drain your pockets.

The GOD of the Hebrews, at least as far as they understood and understand GOD today, is dangerous. As we noted in the previous section, GOD is capable of carrying out both good and evil. The true GOD of Creation doesn't care what you think of GOD's actions or inactions. GOD is not offended, insulted, nor injured by what you or anyone thinks of GOD. In fact, you don't have the power to offend GOD personally.

GOD is not petty, narcissistic, self-centered, egotistical or vain. GOD doesn't demand our worship any more than we would want a bunch of people worshipping ourselves. I don't know about you, but I would not want a bunch of people running around, following me, worshipping me, wasting their time energy and money trying to get my attention with their veneration. Sure, your social media influencers might want that, but be glad they're not GOD.

A Grateful Heart

GOD appreciates a grateful heart, just like we would. Just because GOD is not a Human, does not mean GOD doesn't have feelings or doesn't care about us. I believe GOD does care about us; about our trivial dealings; about our successes and our failures. If we have feelings, being made in the image of GOD means that GOD has feelings as well.

Honoring GOD

When we were discussing the Greatest Commandments earlier in the book, we saw Jesus quoting Deuteronomy 6:5 as the first of the greatest commandments. But what the text in Matthew doesn't tell you is what Jesus quotes is a paramount Commandment within Hebraic thought. It is known within Judaism as the *Shema*, and the full text of this quote begins with verse 4:

*"Hear, O Israel: Aheych our God, Aheych is one. Love Aheych your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength."*⁸⁰

Jesus' quoting of the *Shema* is as interesting as it is powerful with regard to how he, James, Peter, John, and the rest of the Jewish Apostles viewed GOD.

In as much as GOD appreciates a grateful heart and spirit, GOD appreciates our willingness to walk humbly with them, just like you would appreciate a family member or a good friend who desires to be with and talk to you.

I do not perceive Aheych as Christianity views God.

To many Christians, it seems God has become little more than their holy genie of sorts, waiting hand and foot on their every prayer.

But that is not how Jesus taught us to pray and talk with GOD. It can also be tempting to want to assume that GOD is often aloof, but that is likely not accurate either. Just because we don't see GOD does not mean GOD isn't there.

In any event, I believe we honor GOD in the same way that we might honor a parent or a best friend. You wouldn't

⁸⁰ Deuteronomy 6:4-5

continually shower such people with praise and adoration 24/7. I'm pretty sure GOD feels the same way when we spend too much of our time supplicating and not enough of it DOING what will truly benefit ourselves and especially others.

GOD and Gender

At this point, there is no indication that GOD has a gender or that GOD is only one gender. Yes, a predominantly patriarchal culture of centuries and millennia ago assigned GOD a male gender; but my observation is that GOD is multiple beings and comprised of both genders.

Note Genesis 6:4 again when "the sons of God went to the daughters of humans and had children by them." I have no problem with people referring to GOD in either gender or with no gender. I prefer to keep GOD "gender neutral" at this point, but I am not offended when someone might want to refer to GOD as either.

Prayer

JESUS TAUGHT us to pray to GOD, our Father in Heaven, not to himself. I've never understood where this tradition of Christians praying to Jesus even came from, but it's not Biblical, even as messed up as the Bible is. This tradition of praying to Jesus is rather new to Christianity. In previous decades, when I was a boy, we were taught to pray to God in Jesus name. Huh? What does that even mean, "In the name of Jesus ..." Jesus never said this either.

Sure, we see people casting out demons, "in the name of Jesus," but just how trustworthy these snippets of Scripture are is debatable.

If you feel the need to pray to GOD, GOD already knows what you need.

In that sense, PRAYER is really for us, not GOD. GOD already knows what we need. Sitting in some prayer closet for an hour each day thinking that you are some kind of “prayer warrior” is NOT going to change the mind of GOD one way or the other. What prayer does is makes US feel better, that at least we talked with GOD and GOD, just maybe, might talk to us at some point.

When I am scared or confronted with a problem that is out of my control, I pray, just like you do. I don’t cling to some vacuous promise that GOD is going to answer my prayers because I have some super-human faith. I know GOD better than that. But I still pray and it makes me feel better that I at least talked with them.

The Nature of Jesus

The historical Jesus was a man. Before Paul’s Mithraic version of Jesus appeared, that’s exactly who and what Jesus was. In fact, his name wasn’t even “Jesus”—it was Joshua.

Huh?

That’s correct. The name “Jesus” is a twice transliterated name from the Hebrew, Yeshuah, into the Greek, Iesus, then into English “Jesus”.

Translating from the Hebrew, Yeshuah, directly into English is “Joshua”.

And yes, the Prophet Joshua and Jesus had the same name.

Even today, those pesky Judaizing Christian brethren of ours still refer to Jesus as “Yeshua”, a name many of us as Pagan Christians don’t even recognize.

The biggest problem Christian believers are going to have with Reformation, a Second Reformation, is that for forever, they have been taught by a Pagan Church to pray to, love, adore, worship, and sing praises to—a god named “Jesus”.

But Jesus NEVER taught anyone to pray to himself.

EVER.

We might feel like we’re switching gods here.

No, I get it.

It wasn’t that difficult for me once I realized that I really had been praying to GOD all along anyway, just with the Church’s Pagan tradition getting in the way. I personally have never prayed to Jesus, even in my Sunday School days, but others don’t have my same experience.

For some of us it’s going to be a difficult if not gradual shift.

The point is, we’re not really switching or changing gods.

Not at all.

We are in fact STILL following the same GOD Jesus (Yeshuah) knew. Only now, we have a much clearer, cleaner understanding of just WHO this GOD of Creation truthfully is.

The Nature of Man

If we can trust the words of Genesis, GOD created Humans in the image of GOD after GOD’s likeness. In Genesis 1:26 we see:

“And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness ...”

In the Hebrew, the word for “image” is *selem* meaning an illusion or shadow of; and “likeness” is *dāmût* as in the likeness of one’s offspring, a son or daughter.

This would seem to contradict the whole Adam being made from the dust of the ground story; and it would seem to be more in keeping with how the “sons of GOD went to the daughters of men and had children by them.” I’m not making a pronouncement, merely pointing out the discordance.

Some might think I am trying to turn man into GOD or making man like GOD. “That is what ‘Lucifer’ tried to do and GOD cast him from Heaven!” Grow up. I am not cowed, frightened into submission, nor intimidated by the Church’s fairytales.

The Church has gotten the Nature of Man dead wrong, and I am merely exploring the text to see what possible nuggets of truth might exist there. GOD is not going to be offended by the honest research of the children of GOD trying to understand who and what we are.

The Church

Dovetailing from my previous paragraph about the Nature of Man, it is the (people of the) Church who should be coming clean with GOD, repenting of their layers and layers of outright LIES. But most won’t. They will double-down on the lies and continue to misrepresent GOD as the wayward and murderous Satanic church they have always been.

“Wow, Keith, that’s pretty harsh.”

No. It’s not.

The Church has some deep soul-searching and house-cleaning to do. But as I said at the beginning of this book, it will not begin with some already organized corporate group of believers.

It will begin with individuals.

It will start with people reevaluating their understandings of GOD and acknowledging that the Church erred — deeply.

The Bible

This Bible is what it is: a collection of historical religious writings of the opinions, views, and interactions of the men who wrote its books and then later assembled those various books into a collection.

The Bible is not GOD in book form.

GOD did not assemble the Bible, Pagan (Gentile) men of the Church in Rome did. The belief that assumes or dictates that GOD assembled the Bible is a man-made and therefore errant tradition that has no basis in fact.

The Bible is a reflection of the beliefs of the early Pagan Church who assembled it; they chose books that reflected their own Pagan beliefs and traditions—and they specifically avoided those that were a reflection of the Jewish Apostles.

The Church's Bible did not dictate the early Church's beliefs. It could not, it did not exist yet. Ergo, the only way a book or writ found its way into the early Pagan Church's Bible is if that book or writ matched their already established Pagan beliefs.

Some of the writings within the Bible are likely truthful. Most are not truthful. We must always remember that the victors (re)write the history.

There is no such thing as inerrancy, infallibility, nor whole inspiration when it comes to a religious writ, and that includes

the Bible as assembled by whatever group of people in whatever era.

The Roman Catholic and by extension Protestant Bible was assembled by a group of Pagan (Gentile) men who did not know the Hebrew GOD and in fact, wanted nothing to do with the GOD Jesus knew and that the Apostles preached. They wanted what was popular within their own Pagan culture. What they themselves already knew.

The early Pagan Church's Bible indeed reflects their Pagan culture. But it is not a true reflection of what the Jewish Apostles taught.

The idea and concept of "Sola Scriptura", Scripture Alone, and by extension "Sola Fide", Faith Alone, et. al., are the creations of men. It was not GOD who created these beliefs. Men did.

Saul, called Paul of Tarsus, was and is a FALSE WITNESS; a charlatan apostle and his writs and Pagan Mithraic theology should be expunged from the whole of the Christian world as apostate. Such Pagan theology and soteriology have no place within the true Character of GOD.

Paul's "Gospel", Paul's "Jesus", Paul's "Spirit", are not consistent nor compatible with the teaching of the Jewish Apostles or the Hebrew GOD.

The Nature of Good and Evil

Christianity has done a bang-up job of creating as much myth surrounding the nature of good and evil as any other Pagan faith. As such, I would like to just bring this whole issue of Good versus Evil into focus.

Some of us go through our entire lives never encountering evil.

Still, Evil exists.

So does Good.

Within and among us there is, or appears to be, a realm of existence we cannot see, or hear, or even touch.

But quite often we can sense it.

Perhaps you've been sitting in a room or you walk into a place where you feel something in your spirit, for lack of a better term, and it causes you apprehension, a feeling of foreboding, even goosebumps. It can happen anywhere, in our homes, places we like to visit. I'm not trying to write some ghost story here; and this is not speculation; I have felt these things in my own experiences.

The exact opposite is true as well, we visit someplace and the vibe we get is awesome; pure; inviting and welcoming. We likely don't notice these good feelings as often as we should because, well, that's typically the norm.

I don't want to enter the slippery slope of so-called experiential Christianity, but I think most of us can agree on the fact that there have been times when we've sensed evil. Sometimes it's not so overt; but you have had thoughts and impulses to do or say something you know is not right. A thought enters your mind to do something heinous, like harm an animal or another person. Sometimes those thoughts and feelings are intense! Sometimes they are so subtle we don't even notice.

Human beings have an adversary, an enemy. In the Hebrew the term is *śāṭān* (pronounced "saw-tawn") and it's pretty much the same in the Greek *satanas* or *satan* or *diablos*. Christianity has attached all kinds of bogus mythology to the term(s), but strip away all of the myth and manufactured imagery, and at the end of the day human beings basically have a spiritual adversary.

Not surprisingly, the Church teaches, mostly via traditions of myth, that you are powerless without the name of “Jesus” to protect you from these spiritual beings. You must invoke the name of “Jesus” to do this or do that.

This is on its face—not true.

In fact, it’s complete hogwash.

That is the Church inserting itself to make you feel like you cannot do anything without them and without their gods.

Don’t believe it.

GOD would not do this to people who are not Christian and who have no means to defend themselves from evil. This is what is meant by GOD’s Law(s) are universal. You don’t need to be of one particular faith or religion to be blessed or empowered by GOD. Yes, this revelation gives the Church conniptions because you’ve just removed their exclusive patent on faith, but it never really existed in the first place. You just believed it did because you believed the lie the Church told you.

There is an order to the Nature of the spirit realm we cannot see, but it’s there. For some reason, Evil must depart if and when rebuked by us. James said,

“Resist the devil and he will flee from you.”⁸¹

I have encountered this paradigm more times in my life and journey through this life than I can remember. In my experience with so-called “spiritual warfare”, there are two things that make demons flee—the presence of love, and the choice of the person being plagued by the demons to have them leave. Because they have to respect the power of our personal choice.

⁸¹ James 4:7

However, there is another situation where a demonic spirit may refuse to leave, and that circumstance is where the evil spirit has been sent by GOD—as punishment. I doubt any of us will ever find ourselves in this predicament. But the Bible has given us a few examples of this happening.

The point is, you do not need the Church getting in the way. You don't need someone's holy name, like it was a charm from Harry Potter.

No.

GOD did not make this difficult.

And you are not experiencing anything that anyone else has ever had to deal with. The Church, over the years, has created a huge mythos of Heaven, Hell, Purgatory, demons, angels, End Times prophecies, blah, blah, blah.

It's all balderdash.

It's time to get real. Or as real as we can perceive.

GOD has given each one of us the power and ability to withstand any evil. And it is as simple as this:

Just say no.

Reject those thoughts.

Tell the evil to leave.

Resist it.

Rebuke it if you like.

Tell it to leave you alone and not come back.

It will come back later, or another one will, and you will have to rebuke that one too.

These things, whatever they are, spirits, *aggelos satan*, angels of the enemy, whatever, must flee and leave you alone. GOD makes them leave us alone.

This superpower, if you will, is not inherent to just Christianity but ANYONE. GOD's One Law is not limited to Christianity, and neither is our ability to resist evil.

Again, the ONLY EXCEPTION to this rule, this universal Law of GOD, is if you yourself are truly evil, committing evil,

and like the murderous Paul, GOD has saddled you with an angel of Satan because of your unrepentant heart and prolific sin.

I have known people in this predicament.

You don't want to be them.

If life and history has taught us anything, it is that Good doesn't always win. Evil people amass power and inflict their evil onto others. This direction is coming from the spirit realm. Look at someone who is committing egregious evil, and they are someone who is listening to Evil—perhaps to the point where they are controlled by evil.

Again, the very definition of sin and evil is doing something to someone you would not want them doing to you. We see sin and evil in people's everyday lives; in business with a heartless boss; on social media with people posting insults; even the people running social media do things to others every day that they would not want done to them!

They are being evil.

And the most egregious, of course, are evil governments who come to power through fascism and murder to enslave the people within their borders.

Rome was evil.

Fascists taking over nations is evil.

This is the definition of evil and GOD hasn't done anything to stop it.

Why?

We don't know.

Sure, we can speculate, but at the end of the day that is all we have, speculation. There is nothing wrong with speculating about these things—just stop building the speculation into an entire mythology that in reality doesn't exist.

Heaven and Hell

I am not against believing in an afterlife, a Heaven or Hell; but let's try to keep these definitions speculative and not authoritative. Honestly, the Christian definition of Heaven, sitting around all day doing nothing but praising some narcissistic Jesus, leaves me with hives. This sounds like a Heaven created by a five-year-old.

Furthermore, a god that gives evil people immortality just so this god can torture them in a fiery hell for all eternity is nonsense, or it's a picture of the most heinous god you can imagine. What these stories about hell really are, is the mythology of a Church or religion who is trying to TRAP YOU, rope you into their belief system with scare tactics and bullying. If anything, I would more see GOD merely destroying evil and they don't need some "hell at the center of the Earth" to do it.

At the end of the day, we don't know what will happen to us when we die. We can only see what GOD has given us the ability to see. And beyond that, is pure myth and speculation.

Holy Days

GOD has given us no laws regarding holy days to observe. All the so-called feasts and sabbaths were cultural to Israel. GOD is not impressed if you worship on this day or that. In fact, I am not convinced that GOD even requires our veneration. To me personally, it makes GOD sound petty and ultimately narcissistic. But I will fault no one who wants to pray and worship GOD in whichever way they seek.

I also have nothing to say about which day or days a congregation might decide to keep for gatherings. Jesus and the Apostles kept the 7th-day of the week as their Sabbath day

of rest and worship. This was inherited tradition based on the creation story found in Genesis, but the ancient Hebrews were not the only ones to observe a day of rest.

Even today, many Jews, and practically the entire nation of Israel, totally shut down on Saturdays in veneration of the day.

You read that right—we tend to venerate the day instead of just taking a rest. We use the day for worship instead resting. You know what it takes for many of us to get ready for church! We primp. We prepare food for the potluck. We fuss. In some families it's a major ordeal and it is NOT restful.

I like very much like the idea of a 2-day weekend. One day we can use to worship if we like, and the other we can use to seriously rest and recreate. Take your pick as to which day you choose for your Sabbath. Jesus and the Apostles used the 7th for worship. It would seem only fitting, if nothing else, to do what Jesus was doing.

As far as other holy days are concerned, GOD is not concerned if you keep any celebration, whether it is a Nationalist celebration, a Fertility celebration, a Mother's or Father's Day, a birthday party, a day dedicated to soldiers who kept the Peace, or any other celebration that celebrates the kindness, generosity, or personal sacrifice to others.

These are all things GOD loves to see in all of us.

However, a celebration should be one that includes all people, not just those of a peculiar race or political bent. Those kinds of events are usually designed by politicians to pander to whomever for political advantage; and that is not something GOD will bless.

If your so-called celebration leaves others feeling cold, disheartened, rejected, or excluded, you are very likely on the wrong side of GOD with what you are trying to do with your so-called celebration or event.

Vegetarian

I am not going to tell you what to eat or not eat. I will tell you that the historical James and Jesus were vegetarian. But the Pagan Roman Catholic versions of the books of the Bible illustrate Jesus eating fish and telling Peter that he had made all animals clean to eat. It was this kind of forgery that was happening in order to prove Paul's adamant assertion that it didn't matter what one ate. If Jesus ate fish, then it was going to be okay for anyone to.

This malicious inserting of dogma into various texts has also found its way into modern translations; we've already seen where the NIV translators have massaged the English so as to not cast Paul in any kind of bad light. This has also happened within the Tanakh (Old Testament) books as well.

I'm personally vegetarian; but the Libertarian side of me is also not going to tell you what to do. I will, however, point out that Christian translators are trying to hide some facts about other vegetarians in Bible you might want to know about.

First, when GOD places Adam and Eve in the garden, they are not eating meat. Some people call this the "Edenic Diet", it's basically vegan. It is not until Adam and Eve sin that they begin killing animals and eating meat. My take is that their sin *was* killing and eating flesh, but that's just my opinion. We'll never really know because the story is allegory and after the Priesthood's crayons were finished with Torah, well, the whole issue of the best diet for Humans was likely scribbled out.

We'll never know.

But we do have other evidence from the Prophets.

Daniel and his friends who were taken off to Babylon were also vegan or vegetarian. Christian translators try to hide this for some reason, my guess is because of the almighty Paul. Instead of translating the text properly, they try to conceal the

fact that these wise men of GOD are in fact vegan or vegetarian. Here is the passage that I'm talking about:

"But Daniel resolved not to defile himself with the royal food and wine, and he asked the chief official for permission not to defile himself this way."

Here's the same passage in the KJV:

"But Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank:"

The issue here is that in context, "meat" is really the proper translation because later in these verses we find out that Daniel and his friends eat only vegetables, which amazes the servants.

I'm not really trying to create a dust-up of controversy here, I'm only trying to point out that Bible translators are often stuck in the mold of Pauline tradition and that this perspective colors their judgment in translating the text.

I'm not telling you what to do or how to be holy or any of that. At this point we have no inspiration or commandment that I can find telling us to eat whatever; but we do have some examples of others in the Bible.

Anatomically, or naturally, if you will, Humans are not designed to eat meat. We don't have claws or fangs. Our teeth are designed for cutting and chewing, not tearing. Our intestines are long like other herbivores while the intestinal tract of carnivores is much shorter. Our bodies can digest meat, obviously, but that is not what they were optimally designed for.

In nature, yes, many animals, like bears for instance, are omnivores. Such beasts also survive on instinct; they are not driven by a higher intellect like Humans are.

Perhaps the bottom line is, the people of GOD have or should have a compassion for life and all living things. We don't harm animals for sport. We don't kill unnecessarily. We are not animals who hunt each other for survival. If I were hungry and the only thing for me to eat was something I needed to hunt or fish for, I don't have a problem with that. It would be considered survival. But this is not the world we live in, at least in most modern nations.

Again, I am not telling you what to do. I'm only offering my perspective and some facts for you to consider.

The Name of GOD

I have saved what I consider to be the most important tenet of reformation for last. To me, this is what draws us closer into a relationship than anything we can give another outside of our time—our name. Not our surname. Not our title. Not who or what we are.

But our name.

I dedicated the whole previous chapter to a discussion of the name of GOD because I wanted us to see clearly what happened both within Judaism and Christianity and why GOD took their name away from a blood-thirsty Humanity.

I am not telling people to run out and start proclaiming the name of Aheyeh from the mountain tops. If GOD wants us using their name, it will be something that happens within all of us with a change of heart and mindset about who GOD is.

If you still believe that GOD somehow asked for, commanded or required blood sacrifice, especially a Human one, or any kind of sacrifice that would atone for your sins, then you should not be using GOD's true name within your worship; stick with the Pagan one you were taught or raised

with. Stick with the one you see (or rather don't see) in the Pagan (Gentile) Roman Catholic Bible.

I'm only guessing, but considering what GOD did to Israel, I think it would be a bad idea for Pagan Christians to begin using the true name of GOD.

But if you have begun to see who GOD is anew; if you are beginning to see the true Character of a truly loving GOD who does not need sacrifice to forgive, then this restoration of the name of GOD, I believe, is something that will begin to happen naturally; gradually; as GOD indeed returns their name to us.

25

Conclusion

“I cannot build my understanding of GOD on a lie.”

— Keith Michael

If you have learned anything from within the pages of this book, if there is but one take-away that I hope you hold on to, it is the simple understanding that GOD doesn't care what you believe, or who you pray to, or what church you attend, or any of that. GOD is not offended by any human belief or even unbelief. Unless that belief leads to hurting someone else.

The Christian Church of today is a powerful ministry for good in the world. The Church feeds, clothes, shelters and encourages millions of people each day.

GOD indeed blesses the Christian Church not because of what it believes, or who it prays to. GOD does not hold the Church of today accountable for whatever evil others do now or have done in the past.

GOD blesses the Church not because of what the Church does collectively, but because of what individual PEOPLE within it DO in the here and now.

We need to learn that GOD deals ONLY with individuals, not collections of them. The Church is merely a collection of individuals. As a group of people, our sin is not going to be forgiven because of what someone else did or does within any group or collection of individuals, and that includes whatever Church we decide to attend.

The duty of the Church is not to try to forgive others, that is not its job. ONLY GOD can forgive, and GOD doesn't need the Church or any self-ascribed intermediary getting in the way of that relationship attempting to do what ONLY GOD can do.

The Church is or should be a place of learning. A place of helping. A place growing. A place of healing.

The Church is NOT a place of atonement.

The Church is not needed to gain a better connection with GOD; in fact, it has been the Church and its wayward man-made traditions that has been getting in the way of people connecting with GOD for far too long.

The Church is not our judge, because people are not our judge.

Only GOD is our judge.

The Church should not be making lists of rules, commandments, laws, mitzvas or even fences around the ONE and ONLY Commandment GOD has given us to live by.

The ONE LAW of GOD is so easy to follow.

It is Natural, eternal, and never self-serving.

Simply treat others the way you yourself would want to be treated. And when you fail, apologize. And, if possible, repair whatever evil you inflicted. This is all repentance is. Nothing more.

You are not responsible for the sin of another. GOD does not hold you or anyone else accountable for their evil. And by the same measure, you will not inherit the righteousness of someone else just because you attend whatever Church and believe whatever it is they tell you to believe.

You are responsible for your own sin.

Repentance is a POWERFUL agent of change!

The very act of repentance is life-changing! It will give you a new perspective, a new spirit and a new heart for others.

And GOD is a forgiving GOD who is mighty to forgive a truly repentant heart!

A Second Reformation will not be about changing how the Church helps people in need. It will be about jettisoning long held entrenched Pagan beliefs to bring us closer to a more truthful understanding of GOD—to the point where maybe, just maybe, GOD will restore his name back to us to share GOD's true character and love with the world.

In the end, GOD's whole desire for us is to do nothing more than ...

“Act justly, love mercy,
and walk humbly with our GOD.”⁸²

⁸² Micha 6:8

HOW YOU CAN HELP SPREAD THE WORD

Copy and Share this Book with Everyone.

I've made this book available at very low cost on Amazon and for free to download from my website in various formats. I don't need your email; I'm not in this to make money. But it does take a small budget to run online ads and spread the word of what this book is delivering to the world. The more support I have, the more I can spread the word of the New Light GOD is bringing into the world.

In that regard I have established a Patreon page for anyone who might wish to help support my efforts to educate others who are interested and who are looking for the truths offered within a book like FALSE WITNESS.

If you feel led by GOD or even if you just want to help support my efforts for your own personal reasons, please consider supporting me and my efforts with a tiny monthly donation via Patreon.

<https://Patreon.com/KeithMichael>

Thank you for reading and please feel free to share links and email copies of this book to as many people as you think might be helped by it.

ABOUT KEITH MICHAEL

Raised in the Church since the age of 6, I was like many Christian believers for the better part of 40 years. I have attended numerous denominations in that time, been baptized, and taught Sunday School. But it wasn't until I had a heart-to-heart conversation with GOD that they spoke to me in that still small voice that only we can hear and know that it is without question GOD who is speaking to us.

I wanted to know GOD's truth. Not the Church's. Not man's. Not what was popular. GOD's.

Surprisingly, GOD spoke to me and asked me if I was sure that this is what I wanted to know? It was an odd question. I immediately replied, Yes! Then there was a brief pause in our short conversation. Then GOD asked me again, "Are you sure?"

Now I paused. GOD had just asked the same question twice. What was GOD about to tell me, about to reveal to me? I thought about this for maybe a minute or so. But I really did want to know. I replied in a much more thoughtful tone, "Yes, I'm sure." Then GOD spoke again. "Alright. But you're not going to like it."

That conversation with GOD started me down a journey from which there was no turning back. GOD would begin a process of revealing to me some ugly secrets; things the Church was hiding under a veil of half-truths, misdirection, and outright lies. Buried beneath centuries of wayward man-made tradition and supported by nothing more than compounded writings via millions of Christian books and media all parroting the same thing, building falsehood on top of falsehood, GOD unearthed to me the truth.

GOD's TRUTH.

I have not been the first GOD has called. And I will not be the last. Others have already laid the foundations; I am merely their messenger; there will be others; millions of others.

No one will be able to stop what is coming.

What GOD showed me I could not keep quiet about. Some say I have a chip on my shoulder regarding the Church, or that I hate the Church.

No. I do not hate the Church.

I am merely challenging the Church. The Church does not like to be challenged, confronted with its pagan errors.

However, I do hate lies. And as the purveyor of lies, well, the Church is the target of my revelation.

This journey that GOD has placed me on will not end with me. Little by little it is becoming readily apparent to me that GOD is bringing new light and reformation to the Church.

A Church who does not want to be corrected or reformed.

A Church who will reject both correction and GOD.

We in Christianity are on the precipice of new and powerful Second Reformation. One that will indeed split the Church once again.

Like Luther and the other Reformers of 500 years ago these new Reformers will be just as disliked, just as maligned and impugned, and just as hated by the mainstream modern Protestant Church as original Reformers were by the Roman Catholic Church.

So be it.

No one likes change, and no one wants to admit that what they have been preaching and believing for most of their lives was not true.

I get it.

But we're not going to have a choice in the matter.

Reformation is coming. And it is GOD who is bringing it.

The light of GOD is an advancing light that will not be silenced.

The Character of GOD will no longer be maligned by popular Pagan tradition.

The Christian Church will once again be dragged kicking and screaming into the light of GOD, whether they like it or not.

New light is coming.

In fact, it is already here.

But we're not going to like it.

As such, I have taken the pen name, Keith Michael, to produce what I hope will be not just this book, but perhaps a few more to come before I leave this Earth forever.

But I will not be the only Reformer of our era. From what I can see, GOD is already raising up others as well. We will be the "heretics" of the next Reformation. And it will be a label that I will gladly and proudly wear if it means bringing people into the new light of understanding the true Character of Aheyeh our GOD.

500 YEARS AGO, LUTHER AND THE REFORMERS CHANGED THE BIBLE.

Why? What had the Roman Catholic Church done to spur these people to upend a millennia of “holy tradition” and make changes to what the Church had originally wrought?

Just how truthful was the early Catholic Church in assembling its Bible canon of Scripture? Was the Church truly *following God* or merely what was in vogue for Rome?

After a lifetime of study within the Christian Church, Keith Michael takes you on a deep dive into the forces surrounding the formation of the early Church’s Bible, unearthing centuries of Christian myth layer by layer. But to what end?

Is the modern Christian Church approaching the precipice of a new and powerful Second Reformation—one that will challenge even what the Protestant Reformers themselves failed to realize? What is it that the Church continues hide about the Bible that needs to change so that we can advance into new light and a deeper understanding of GOD?

Are we as Christians still saddled with the Catholic Church’s early failings in assembling a Bible that was truthful of Jesus and his Apostles? Or did the early Church in Rome merely become its own self-serving — FALSE WITNESS.

Connect with Keith Michael at
www.keithmichael.org