

Why Do You Suppose They Executed Paul the Apostle?

We, as a nation and throughout our heritage, once used many words that were commonly found in the Bible. Over the centuries, the “powers to be” have slowly replaced many of those words using the sales pitch that it was “more accurate terminology” or the like, and they have done this for a reason. They have replaced so many of these old words now, that many of us look at the Bible as if the whole thing is totally archaic, or just too... *‘old fashioned’*.

Consider a few select words that they’ve changed over the years, and just those pertaining to the realm of law for now, as there are far too many words overall that their “word-twisting artists” (lawyers) have intentionally “weaned us away from” to list in this humble study...

Changing biblical “morals” to secular “ethics”:

First, the Father always used the words “lawful” and “unlawful” to describe what was and was not permitted in His universe. Then satan came along and started teaching us to use the words, “legal” and “illegal” as replacement dialect for those words. A “sin” used to be the word that was used to denote a broken law in a biblically upright society. Now they call it a “crime”. Then those who broke such laws, who used to be called “sinners” were resultantly called “criminals”, and of course they used to “transgress” such *biblical* “laws, statutes, and judgments” in Father’s “kingdom”, where now they “break” *secular* “codes, acts, and sentences” in structures called “governments”. The whole thing being done to condition us into thinking that the entire law system of the Father is now but a legendary thing of the past, as if from some mythical fairy tale or something, done in order that its re-writers might someday take over as the new and glorious rightful legislators (gods) over all of mankind. Therefore, the words from the Bible, such as “sin” and “kingdom”, have been given this mystical aura of having come only from a deep, dark, unknown past, presented anymore as if it had been just a magical pretend world not unlike any kingdom in a Disney children’s story, making it sound like all of the fantastic stories out of the Bible are just that—fantastic stories. They want us to think that all of these present rumors about “God having written better laws” are just an old tale of the past, from a distant time when men of great courage even fought dragons (of which they also changed that word as well, replacing “dragon” with “dinosaur” to also help with this gradual conditioning of the peasantry to see the Bible as a mere collection of medieval narratives of a *“long ago and far away”* adventure).

It also used to be better common knowledge that this ongoing life we are living was generally understood by the masses to be a literal struggle between the God of the Bible and satan. That perception has been gradually lost through many dwindling societies (including our own), now changed to be seen instead as a power struggle between endless “religions” and a “secular” or an imaginary “neutral ground” area, again encouraging us to believe that everything from the Bible is a thing of the past and only a fable just like all the other religions (that they had also created, trying to confuse us away from that Bible; see our book “Bullies for satan”). Yet millions if not billions of gullible ‘Christians’ are biting on this, hook line and sinker, parroting the trendy line that *“the law is dead”*, and that the Bible is now just a book of suggestions written by men who once loved this “genie in the sky” who now only just happily walks around

dishing out love and forgiveness whenever ordered to do so by those who feel like “doing God a favor” and “accepting Him in their heart” that He still merely exists or something. I mean, they still call Him “Lord” and “King” of course, but only as a sympathetic residual formality it seems, as all He is ever allowed to “rule over” (in the churches that *they* are now the gods over), is how we should be “nice to one another”, offering just cuddly, politically harmless illustrations like the story of the good Samaritan and things of that nature, yet Himself (and *as God* mind you) being seen as totally inadequate and incapable of determining what is “nice” and what is “bad” for His people, that would otherwise help them to interact more peaceably with one another. This is absolutely tragic. But this is the result of how well these folks have been conditioned to snub their noses at their own god, and how those who say they believe in Him now gullibly have to go to their other gods (politicians, etc) to more accurately hear how the words “nice” or “bad” are now defined by today’s humanist “legalese” standards, thus being total servants to satan and his humanist, sin-centered law system instead of the Father’s.

*Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?
(Romans 6:16)*

Let’s now look at some real logic and how the Father’s simple, peaceful moral law has been so cleverly slid out from under our very noses.

There are a couple of commonly misunderstood points that the antinomians always bring up that I would like to address here today. One point is that they say “*the law is dead*”, and the second is that “*the only things we are to follow are the Savior’s two commandments*” of which in the latter they are referring to this passage found in the gospels:

*And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these.
(Mark 12:30-31)*

By the wording that they point out here, they feel that they somehow have a valid proof-text from which to state their claim. But the wording just prior to this lays out an interesting textural surrounding that their pastors somehow always seem to overlook some critical details of:

*And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, **Which is the first commandment of all?** And Jesus answered him, **The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord:**
(Mark 12:28-29)*

Let us first set the record straight: Does the Messiah (or the scribe for that matter) anywhere here say that these two are the ONLY commandments? No, in fact both the scribe and the Messiah use the word “ALL”, meaning *a number* of them, otherwise they would have said “both” if there was only two. And this especially lays responsibility upon the Messiah Himself, because if this truly was a matter of revealing such a new dramatic change in reducing “ALL” of the Hebrews’ previous laws, statutes, and judgments that were in place at that time, eliminating them “ALL”, and leaving just two *new* laws, the Messiah would not have repeated the scribe’s statement of “all”, but would have corrected him, even if just to casually re-word things without making an issue out of it. The Messiah was God in the flesh, and therefore very

meticulous about every single jot and tittle of what He said. He would not have repeated the same word “all”, but would have certainly used another adjective, like “both” or “pair of them” if there were only to be two commandments instead of “ALL” laws from this time period forward. The original Greek agrees with the implication that the word $\pi\alpha\varsigma$ or pas was easily intended to mean a plurality of laws in both the Strong’s Greek and the Thayers Greek dictionaries. In fact the Thayers also uses the word “collectively” in its definition, which, when you think about it, you can’t really accurately “collect” just two items. That even sounds silly if there are not at least three items that are “ALL” distanced from one another, where they can then “ALL” be “collected” into one place. When one says to another by phone for example, “We are all here”, does this suggest just two people are there? ...or three or more? If it were just two, the statement would have been, “We are both here”. Agreed?

Then Messiah also repeats the scribe’s own words who also uses the word “first”, as if there is a sequence they may be used to looking at for a large amount of laws, where again, if the Messiah was come to remove all but two of those, and correct this fellow (who would have, at a moment of such “change”, been understandably still thinking along the lines of an entirely functional civil law and justice system as they had at the time) there would have been a change of adjectives by the Messiah at such an opportunity to describe the dramatically lesser amount, instead of having erroneously and agreeably just reiterated the word “ALL” in regards to this supposed new lesser number of commandments. We would more logically wonder how it could have been such an announcement of a reduction to just two commandments, especially when so many indicators are mentioned together in one single phrase like this, where it seems impossible to suggest any less than three laws at the very least, which then begs the question: what is the third law if there was even just one more? I instead think that it is clear, that “all” the triune laws were still perfectly in place, and that the Messiah was instead showing the scribe how the whole of the law was still active by grouping them into two basic categories. Some may easily see that the “vertical” four of Father’s Decalogue were “first” and the “horizontal” six of the Ten Commandments were second, with all ten fitting handsomely into their respective new two-fold groupings. He also brilliantly explains how all of the laws are then correctly still attached or “hung” on those same two main precepts, recorded in the book of Matthew:

Master, which is the great commandment in the law? Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets. (Matthew 22:36-40)

The word “commandment” here is the Greek word $\epsilon\pi\tau\omicron\lambda\epsilon$ *en-tol-ay'*, which also means “precept” which by Webster’s 1828 definition says this:

Precept

PRE'CEPT, n. [L. proceptum, from proecipio, to command; proe, before, and capio, to take.]

1. In a general sense, any commandment or order intended as an authoritative rule of action; but applied particularly to commands respecting moral conduct. The ten commandments are so many precepts for the regulation of our moral conduct.
2. In law, a command or mandate in writing.

A “precept” then, is certainly not just a minor code or ordinance of some kind, but a major law, in which other laws or statutes can then categorically fall under, including the Ten Commandments themselves, and they do fit, in fact they fit perfectly: The first four commandments fitting into the “first” precept (*Love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, soul, mind, and strength*), and the second six Commandments, falling into the second precept (*Love thy neighbor as thyself*) like related official papers would fit into manilla folders.

Yeshua also says that, “*The Lord our God is one Lord*”, where this passage’s word “Lord” is defined by the Strong’s thusly:

G2962

Κύριος kurios *koo'-ree-os*

From κύριος kuros (*supremacy*); supreme in authority, that is, (as noun) controller; by implication *Mr.* (as a respectful title): - God, Lord, master, Sir.

If He is “supreme in authority”, and is the ONE “controller”, then is there any doubt that when He had said, “*There is none other commandment greater than these*”, that He was also making a statement that would forever be on record in Scripture that no one could ever stake any claim that anyone else (any man, beast, or even computer) would be permitted (let alone intellectually capable of) writing any laws that would be “supreme” over YHWH’s authority? Yet what does our own man-made law, the Constitution, actually say? It says that, “*This Constitution and the [man-made] laws of the United States ... shall be the supreme law of the land*”. Those very same people who say that Father’s law is dead, and who often also say that there are “too many of them anyway”, then run right back out into the world and bow down to every single jot and tittle of the law system of man that itself has hundreds of times as many laws than the Father’s system. They obey every single traffic law, fill out every page on their tax form (that contain tons of laws in and of themselves), sign every application, dot every “i”, cross every “t”, and pay every decreed tribute that Caesar wants them to pay, but now at the same time will proudly and boastfully say that they simply refuse to accept their very own claimed “Lord of lords” rules for their lives, in a sense spitting upon their very own Creator’s perfectly written laws, that were even given us to keep us protected from such oppressively legislating Caesars in the first place. How much more blatantly disrespectful and rebellious can such people get? This is outright idolatry in its most literal, clear-cut form, and pathetically motivated under the same temptation of just a glorified version of satan’s original “Yea, hath God said”?

Yeshua also makes sure to add the key words “and the prophets” in the above verse (and for the same reason He does the same in Matt. 7:12 as well) when speaking of the law, because it was Father’s anointed prophets, such as Moses and many others, who spelled out and further verified the remaining statutes and judgments as well, completing the picture here of a yet-existing full set of governing laws for those who wished to dwell in Father’s kingdom.

Lastly for this segment, Yeshua even emphasizes in verse 31 that “*there is none other [law] greater than these*”, clearly meaning that there yes, are “others” yet they are here intimated to be equal to or lesser in “greatness”. But there are clearly “others” eluded to here nonetheless.

Does the textual account of the political atmosphere of apostolic times support their claim?:

Another way to see the apostolic era and “*who was endorsing what law system*”, is this impossible to avoid question:

Why do you suppose Rome executed Paul the Apostle? Do we suppose that it was because he was *against* following the law of the Father, as so many today claim when they cherry-pick his various epistle’s statements to turn them upside down in favor of their sin? Or did Rome more realistically want Paul dead because he was truly causing people to be more disillusioned with the encroaching and oppressive laws of the Caesars, in cleverly showing how the same lawful throne of YHWH was still active and (*if again respected*) could once more save them from this growing monster of man-made laws if they would simply embrace Father’s again with courage as Yeshua was also crucified for preaching the “advancing of the kingdom (government) of YHWH” (see Luke 4:3; 9:2; 9:60, among others)?

Would Caesar have executed Paul (or Yeshua for that matter) if either had truly been an everyday “moderate” and was really pushing an actual “*give unto Caesar/render unto Caesar*”/“*the law of YHWH is dead*” message, as today’s antinomians are insisting? Of course not, as then they would have been “*playing ball with the big boys*” as so many are doing today, and they would have not only been released from bondage but would have never been taken into custody in the first place, where they would have been free to more effectively preach such a government-friendly message for them. Rome would have *wanted* Paul and Yeshua to encourage other moderates to not upset the status-quo apple cart, agreed? So how could this fit their claims? The Bible clearly agrees that the world would only hate those who are in opposition to such things, “*If the world hate you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.*” (John 15:18-19)

No, Paul was put to death because he was zealously and vociferously endorsing the *kingdom, law system, and authority of YHWH over all of mankind*, which threw serious wrenches into the Roman republic’s (and yes, even way back then...) planned world-wide tyrannical aspirations of the time. They are still trying to accomplish this today through the Romish-controlled churches, trying to also silence the more serious believers who actually believe that YHWH is truly still in authority. The elite certainly don’t want us preaching a message to return to Father’s law, at least not anywhere near the masses who are already upset with their man-made tyranny. And they also know that if we get too much of a foothold that, with YHWH’s help, we can and will defeat them. Yet the antinomian lukewarm church does not see any of this. They have been successfully taught to stay away from those fanatical “legalists”! They are fully indoctrinated into believing that their god (and since the time of Christ they say) must continue to take a back seat to the wiser laws of their idolized political gods like Obama, Trump or the more intelligent church leaders like Benny Hinn, Joyce Meyer, and the Pope. They feel that the small few of us must be wrong since there are so tiny a remnant of us now who still support Father’s wisdom over man’s, where they can’t see how utterly insulting this is to the god they think they worship. You see, they worship satan’s “Do what thou wilt” law system, but its through rosy-colored glasses through the dictates of man and humanism. Yet they are told by their “handlers” (Jesuit church leaders and political talking heads) that no matter how confused they may feel, that even though they never worship a single law of their God, they somehow still worship (obey the edicts of) the God of the Bible. This is called “double-think”, coined by a man known as George Orwell over half a century ago.

The greatest successful distraction of satan:

If one really looks at what is going on right now, our time's propaganda system is actually promoting and rewarding the pretend "Churchianity" masses with an amazing array of mainstream support and help. If middle-of-the-road Christianity was truly the opponent that the New World Order wanted snuffed out of the picture, then why are their own elitist-owned TV channels, government "stars", and news media talking heads so "buddy buddy" with today's [television celebrity] antinomian preachers? Think about it, they have all of the best "personalities" and talking heads money can buy, such as John Hagee, Oprah Winfrey, the Pope, Jonathan Cahn, Rick Warren, Joel Osteen (and many *many* others who all want you to disregard Father's authority over you, that you might better submit to man's growing law system), which then pushes these heathen/lukewarm Christian sheeple by the millions safely into somewhat of a law-neutral hypnosis where they can do no harm. These poor duped people are now trapped in cages of their own self-incarceration, themselves having even helped their captors to "train them" to spit on Father's authority over them, where many now submissively sit in their conditioned spiritual and (read: mind controlled) emotional state, fearfully waiting for further instructions from their new "god of law"... which is the beast church/state machine that they obey without question. These sad cowardly people (yes, cowardly; see their own NIV Bible in Rev 21:8) then conveniently obey satan and his machinery rather than YHWH, with most doing so in order to do exactly what they want to do anyway, which is to "*stay out of it all*" just as their type also wanted to "*stay out of*" the fight against the Midianites in Judges 7:2,3, and when they also wanted to "*stay out of*" the battle to advance Father's purity in the apostolic age, instead preferring to become compromising Catholics at a time when their otherwise truly faithful brethren were bravely being marched off to the bloodthirsty lions and gladiators. The act of denying YHWH's law over them in this manner is no different than how the fearful were pinching incense unto Caesar around the times of Christ, excusably and frightfully doing so to avoid being thrown to the lions, thereby foolishly acknowledging Caesar's power and authority over them, over their god, and over their very soul.

Winston Churchill said, "*An appeaser is one who feeds a crocodile, hoping it will eat him last.*"

The world's beast churches love the moderates who, out of their trembling fear in not wanting to be responsibly involved, will instead conveniently agree with "government god" that the Father's law and authority over them is dead. ...and why is that? Because these people and the men in such government(s) are becoming "two birds of a feather", or "two peas of a pod" perhaps, where both are excitedly willing to let bygones be bygones and allow an evil mankind (satan) to remain in charge of the increasingly oppressive laws over them, hoping that today's crocodiles will not come after them, but rather after those like ourselves perhaps, who are more "fanatically" disrupting their humanist (sin-friendly) law system, hmmmm?

Another issue with the antinomians is when Christians say, "Christ died for our sins" but they refuse to make the connections of what sin really is. What does the phrase "Christ died for our sins" really mean? Well, we all seem to know that Yeshua died for our sins, but let's break that down so there's no question as to what the definitives are, and see if the antinomian view has any true Scriptural backing, shall we?

Does the message "Christ died for our sins" mean that He died just for the sins of those folks *in the Old Testament only* (since they say that the law is dead in this "dispensation")? You see, if

the law is really dead, then how can people since Yeshua's resurrection technically be... "sinning"? If (and in the way that they see it) the law is dead, and if sin truly is the transgression of the law (as 1 John 3:4 tells us), then please tell me, how can one transgress a law that is no longer active? How do the mechanics of such types of logic really work? Again, to sin means to transgress, offend, or break a law, but if there are no valid or active laws to break, then how can one break a law that does not even exist? ... and well, if the law has been "done away with" since Christ's resurrection, then that also means that everyone since the time of Yeshua has never sinned. So then Christ died for nothing with everyone that was born after the Messiah's resurrection, and He must have only shed His blood on the cross for the sins of those of the Old Testament, right? But wait... to make their theory look somewhat plausible, they must also say (and they do) that the people of the Old Testament were "under the law" and the law only—not under grace, and then I suppose that if that means that there was no grace back then, then they must have worked their way back into Father's loving arms again by doing nothing but animal sacrifices and stuff... Right? (Well, at least that's what these antinomians seem to be saying anyway.) Yet even if that truly is the case, and they were able to "work" their way back into the Father's mercies using animal sacrifices, then I guess Christ didn't really die for their sins either (?)

- wow. -

Hmmm.. so, let me see here.... if the old testament crowd was "saved by works", and the new testament crew is saved by this strange form of grace (for sinners who aren't really sinners after all because the law was "done away with"), then according to them, Christ died for nothing in both Old and New Testament periods !!! They are, in effect, calling Yeshua a liar, trying to say that He couldn't have come to save us from our sins, as He doesn't fit their theological worldview for them! They are saved because there is no more law to sin against, and thus they don't need Christ at all anymore (I guess).

Again... wow.

And so lastly, if the law was "nailed to the cross", then how does one "sin" in this age, to then need any "forgiveness" in the first place? When one of these antinomians says that they have been forgiven by Christ, which sin did they technically commit? Which law did they break to have a sinful mark on their record that needed to be expunged by Yeshua's blood sacrifice to begin with? If the law is dead, and they therefore can't specifically say which sin needed covered, then did they really repent of the specific infraction (and how *could* they repent of a sin if they didn't even know what it was they were sinning against) where therefore we might also ask, "Was Christ even really able to forgive them, if they didn't even know what law they had broken and thereby can't even repent of it?" Man, this all sounds so complicated, doesn't it? [something about a tangled web seems to fit in here somehow, I think]

Yet if they say that they broke one of the two of the afore-mentioned major laws, then... in which precise way did they do this? What part of either of those "two only" laws did they actually break? If they say that they broke the first one, and hadn't technically loved the Lord their God with all their heart, soul, mind, and strength, then how did they do so? How did they technically "un" love Him? Could they be more specific for folks like myself who would like to make sure that I know how such a terrible sin was committed so that I would never even be accidentally caught doing so myself?

On the other hand, if it was the second commandment that they needed forgiveness for, in that they didn't love their neighbor as themselves, then how specifically did they "unlove" their neighbor? Can they show me how this precept was broken so I might not break that law myself as well? Did they run over their neighbor's prize petunias with their lawn tractor out of spite? I mean, what if you hate petunias, and prefer a yard full of concrete so you can put that lawn tractor away forever. Could you not be thinking that this was "loving your neighbor as yourself", helping them get rid of those stupid petunias for them? Is that what "loving thy neighbor as thyself" is then defined as? ...forcing your neighbor to like what you like? Or did this individual instead perhaps agree with some power-hungry politician to raise another man's taxes so they could take a little cut of money from that neighbor's sweat equity for himself? What are the specifics here? Who is supposed to determine these details? And if the antinomians then say that man is supposed to write these laws in the form of some "neutral" or "secular" civil government, then there are two serious problems with that: 1). They are then saying that they themselves apparently and personally feel that man is wiser than YHWH, and that *man is therefore more intellectually capable of writing better laws for us* (which is ludicrous and even blasphemous), and 2). they are then also implying that man is also now then responsible to detail out what civil laws must be applied to not just the second law (of their so-called accepted "two part" commandment system), but then even more so must detail the specifics of the first of these two, or the *greatest* commandment of them all, which again, is to love the LORD thy God with all thy heart, soul, mind and strength. Where we would then ask, "What law details (as opposed to the Father's own original first through fourth commandments that *do* coincidentally lay out such details by the way) then determines who that god (and His character) even is, if man writes these laws?" Is the "LORD" (that their government is then encouraging us to follow with all our hearts, soul, mind and strength) supposed to be ALLAH, like we are *also* heading towards in America now? yeeesh! This is your idea of a wonderful law system? Well, if (and as many of them claim), man is supposed to be the one to write all of the details for our civil laws instead of YHWH, then why is not our wonderful illustrious government writing laws that compel us to love YHWH with all of our hearts, soul, mind, and strength... like we are letting them fill in all the other civil laws that are now oppressing us *away* from YHWH? Boy! Their system is sure causing my head to spin. How about you folks?

What is wrong with just going by YHWH's simple law system as it is, where we can get back to being protected by Him as well, and throw away the hundreds of thousands of overburdening laws that man has now purposefully generated to so completely and confusingly enslave us? What is wrong with that? Well, it gets in the way of the sins of many of our professing Christian neighbors, is what is wrong with that. They all want to continue in their own sins of choice, and even unto death it now seems. But I would caution you my friends, to watch closely, because when the bodies start falling all around them here very soon, I have a hunch they may see things a little differently. —Will it be too late for them?

Remember, that Yeshua Himself warned that those who are spreading this lawlessness, are the ones who will be especially in danger of Father's wrath...

*Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to **fulfil**. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed*

the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven. (Matthew 5:17-20)

Excerpts from what Matthew Henry wrote regarding verses 17- 20 above:

“Thus the word *plērōsai* [**fulfil**] properly signifies. If we consider the law as a vessel that had some water in it before, he did not come to pour out the water, but to fill the vessel up to the brim; or, as a picture that is first rough-drawn, displays some outlines only of the piece intended, which are afterwards filled up; so Christ made an improvement of the law and the prophets by his additions and explications. [5.] To carry on the same design; the Christian institutes are so far from thwarting and contradicting that which was the main design of the Jewish religion, that they promote it to the highest degree. The gospel is the *time of reformation* ([Heb 9:10](#)), not the repeal of the law, but the amendment of it, and, consequently, its establishment. ... It is impudence enough to break the command, but is a greater degree of it to teach men so. This plainly refers to those who at this time sat in Moses' seat, and by their comments corrupted and perverted the text. Opinions that tend to the destruction of serious godliness and the vitals of religion, by corrupt glosses on the scripture, are bad when they are held, but worse when they are propagated and taught, as the word of God. He that does so, shall be called *least in the kingdom of heaven*, in the kingdom of glory; he shall never come thither, but be eternally excluded; or, rather, in the kingdom of the gospel-church. He is so far from deserving the dignity of a teacher in it, that he shall not so much as be accounted a member of it.”

A summary hope and warning for our law-denying loved ones and neighbors:

So, just as Father was looking for Adam and Eve after they had fallen for satan's ploy to pull them away from His authority thousands of years ago... Can some of us now imagine Father's footsteps getting closer and louder in this coming wrath... as He is again walking in the garden looking for those who have disobeyed Him?

I would lovingly but strongly suggest (and just as I have endlessly tried to show how unbiblical this “*the law is dead*” thing is over the years), that these folks simply get back on their knees with a little more respect. I would also hope that they might better see that they need to seek some real forgiveness this time, now knowing how badly they had been duped, and how (technically) they had actually been sinning even worse than the heathen, having been adding hypocrisy and false teaching to their already overloaded meter of disrespected sins. Please help me pray for their souls that they might see this and need not be turned over to satan for the destruction of the flesh.

And so to the many doubting Thomases I respond... Yea, God hath said! All glory to YHWH.

—dwaine
Biblical Correctness Ministries

“As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom (government) all things that offend (defy the law), and them which do iniquity (lawlessness); And shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous (law-abiding) shine forth as the sun in the [eternal] kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.”
(Matthew 13:40-43)

learn more. stay updated.
www.bcmi.us